

ANNEXURE F
EVALUATION OF SITES AGAINST CRITERIA

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

1 - Zone A

8/10 78.1%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	52 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95
Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic-Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
10.00	Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
5.00	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
5.00		5.00

17.00	Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	26.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	3.00
1.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	4.00
1.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	3.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00
5.00		5.00

8.00	Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)** Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	33.00
3.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00
5.00		5.00

17.00	Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	5.00
5.00	Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	4.00
5.00	Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	4.00
1.00	More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	4.00
1.00	Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	12.00
5.00	Not on high agricultural land or soil	4.00

DESIGN RATING		
10.00	Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)** Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
5.00	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
5.00		5.00

26.00	Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)** The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
3.00	Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
4.00	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
3.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
5.00	Services and clustered	5.00
3.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
5.00	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

33.00	Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)** Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
5.00	Defines street edge	5.00
5.00	Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
2.00	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
5.00	Streets designed for universal access	5.00
5.00	Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
3.00	Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
4.00	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00
4.00		4.00

12.00	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)** Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
4.00	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
5.00	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
3.00		3.00

IMPACT RATING		
10.00	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
1.00	No Cost	1.00
3.00	Capital Savings	3.00
3.00	Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
3.00	Invest to save	3.00

15.00	Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
5.00	Municipality	5.00
5.00	Existing Town Residents	5.00
5.00	New Development	5.00

15.00	Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
5.00	Municipality	5.00
5.00	Larger Town Residents	5.00
5.00	New Development Residents	5.00

17.00	Environmental Impact *	17.00
3.00	Minimise resource consumption	3.00
3.00	Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
3.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
3.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
5.00	Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

17.00	Social Outcome *	17.00
3.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
4.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
5.00	Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
5.00	Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

1 - Zone A
Date: 2018-10-23

8/10 79.2%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	53 /70
Design Rating	83 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	X
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
		5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
		5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	18.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	2.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	
		5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	28.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00	
Services and clustered	5.00	
		3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	
		4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	
		5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	
		4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00	
		3.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

1.A - Overhills Site

8/10 78.1%

Date: 2018-10-22

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	52 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?		5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context		5.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**		21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*		26.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		17.00
Minimise resource consumption		3.00
Maximise resource efficiency		4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*		33.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)		5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**		13.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 32m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

1 - Zone A

8/10 80.8%

SITE:

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 56 /70
 Design Rating 81 /100
 Impact Rating 77 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Score
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	Score
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00
	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

IMPACT RATING	Score
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	18.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

1 Zone A

8/10

79.2%

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	55 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	8.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
		3.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00	
		4.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	24.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	4.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	
		5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	30.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	5.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	
		4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	10.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	
		5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	34.00	
Defines street edge	4.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00	
Streets designed for universal access	4.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00	
		4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	13.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	2.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	2.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	3.00	
		3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	
		3.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To:*	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To:*	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact*	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome*	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

1 - Zone B

8/10 81.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 60 /70
 Design Rating 81 /100
 Impact Rating 74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	X
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?		5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric.	10.00	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context		5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	17.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00	3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	3.00
Services and clustered	3.00	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?		5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	5.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		17.00
Minimise resource consumption		3.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE
1 - Zone B

8/10 81.5%

OVERALL SCORE

Date: 2018-10-23

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	X
Construction Phase	

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	82 /100
Impact Rating	78 /95

• Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

•• Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land. (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00
Accessibility and integration. (answer yes/no)**	18.00	26.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	2.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	3.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	5.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00	26.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	5.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	34.00	34.00
Defines street edge	5.00	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	4.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00	5.00
	3.00	3.00

Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas. (answer yes/no)**	19.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise prediction	4.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	4.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality	15.00	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development	5.00	5.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality	15.00	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00	5.00
Environmental Impact *		
Minimise resource consumption	19.00	19.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00	4.00
Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context	18.00	18.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	5.00

Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas. (answer yes/no)**	19.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise prediction	4.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	4.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00	11.00
No Cost	1.00	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	3.00
Invest to save	4.00	4.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

1 B - Overhills Site

8/10 80.8%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	52 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	81 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	35.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	13.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00
More than 32m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	24.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

1 - Zone B

SITE:

8/10 80.0%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	78 /100
Impact Rating	78 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
10.00	Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	
5.00	Is the site within the urban edge?	
5.00	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	
5.00		

DESIGN RATING		
10.00	Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
5.00	Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	
5.00	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	
5.00		

21.00	Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	
1.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	

26.00	Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
3.00	The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	
4.00	Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	
3.00	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	
5.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	
3.00	Services are clustered	
5.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	
3.00	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	

8.00	Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
3.00	Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	
5.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	

33.00	Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
5.00	Easy to navigate street layout	
5.00	Defines street edge	
2.00	Streets give pedestrians priority	
5.00	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	
5.00	Streets designed for universal access	
3.00	Streets designed to increase safety	
4.00	Space is identified for communal food gardening	
4.00	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	

17.00	Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
5.00	Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	
5.00	Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	
1.00	More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	
1.00	Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	
5.00	Not on high-agricultural land or soil	

9.00	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
3.00	Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	
3.00	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	
3.00	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	
5.00		

IMPACT RATING		
10.00	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	
1.00	No Cost	
3.00	Capital Savings	
2.00	Spend a little, save a lot	
4.00	Invest to save	

15.00	Financial Benefit To: *	
5.00	Municipality	
5.00	Existing Town Residents	
5.00	New Development	

15.00	Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
5.00	Municipality	
5.00	Larger Town Residents	
5.00	New Development Residents	

20.00	Environmental Impact *	
3.00	Minimise resource consumption	
4.00	Maximise resource efficiency	
4.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	
4.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	
5.00	Improve quality of life for residents	

18.00	Social Outcome *	
4.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	
4.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	
5.00	Maximise quality living environment for residents	
5.00	Maximise access to social amenities	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

1 Zone B

8/10 76.2%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 51 /70
 Design Rating 77 /100
 Impact Rating 74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	7.00	6.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	3.00
	2.00	3.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	6.00	28.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00	4.00
	3.00	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	24.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	4.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	3.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	4.00	5.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00	3.00
Services and clustered	3.00	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	10.00	34.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	4.00
	5.00	4.00
	5.00	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	4.00	4.00
Defines street edge	4.00	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	10.00	9.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	2.00	3.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	3.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	15.00
No Cost	1.00	5.00
Capital Savings	3.00	5.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	5.00
Invest to save	3.00	5.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

1 - Zone C

8/10 76.6%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	X
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	6.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	17.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00
	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	17.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
This site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	35.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00
	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	17.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00
	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

1 - Zone C

8/10 81.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	83 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	8.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	3.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	19.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	20.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	4.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00
	5.00

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	27.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	34.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00
Identify and mitigate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	11.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	4.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	18.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

1.C - Overhills Site
8/10 80.4%

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00 5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00 5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Eroven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	26.00 3.00 4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00 3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge	33.00 5.00 5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00 4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

1-Zone C

8/10 79.6%

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 56 /70
 Design Rating 78 /100
 Impact Rating 77 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)** Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	26.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING

Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	4.00
Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00
Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00
Social Outcome *	18.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

ACCESSIBILITY AND INTEGRATION (answer yes/no)**

Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

RESILIENT SERVICES PROVISION (answer from most likely to least likely)*

Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

SAFE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS AND ECOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS (answer yes/no)**

Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	17.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00
	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE: 1 - Zone C
 Date: 2018-10-23
 8/10 81.1%
 OVERALL SCORE
 Land Rating: 56 /70
 Design Rating: 83 /100
 Impact Rating: 76 /95
 * Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

DESIGN RATING	DESIGN RATING
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	8.00
	3.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	27.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lines on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services are clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	19.00
	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	34.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	9.00
	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	20.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	4.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

IMPACT RATING	IMPACT RATING
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	4.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	18.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

2

7/10 67.5%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 57 /70
 Design Rating 60 /100
 Impact Rating 62 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	3.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

DESIGN FOR RESOURCE EFFICIENCY (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	17.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
	1.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	2.00

DESIGN FOR ACCESSIBILITY (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	28.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00
	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN TO MAKE USE OF ECOLOGICAL SERVICE PROVISION (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	8.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	8.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	11.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	3.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development: Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	14.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

2

7/10 72.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	66 /100
Impact Rating	64 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	9.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	22.00	18.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	2.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	2.00
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)**	6.00	4.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	1.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)** Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	9.00	9.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	5.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)** The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	18.00	18.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00	1.00
Services and clustered	2.00	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)** Easy to navigate street layout	29.00	29.00
Defines street edge	3.00	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00	5.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)** Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	10.00	10.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	3.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	9.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	22.00	18.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	2.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	2.00
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)**	6.00	4.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	1.00

FINANCIAL BENEFIT TO:		
No Cost	9.00	9.00
Capital Savings	1.00	1.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00	2.00
Invest to save	3.00	3.00
FINANCIAL BENEFIT TO:		
Municipality	11.00	11.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00	4.00
New Development	3.00	3.00
SOCIAL/ECONOMIC BENEFIT TO:		
Municipality	12.00	12.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00	4.00
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:		
Minimise resource consumption	18.00	18.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00	4.00
SOCIAL OUTCOME:		
Maximise integration with existing urban context	14.00	14.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	3.00	3.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00	4.00

SAFE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS AND ECOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS (answer yes/no)**		
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	23.00	23.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	5.00

DESIGN FOR ACCESSIBILITY (answer from most likely to least likely)**		
Easy to navigate street layout	29.00	29.00
Defines street edge	3.00	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00	5.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)**	10.00	10.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 2

8/10 79.2%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	52 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	77 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Erven are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	13.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental impact *	20.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

SITE

8/10 76.2%

OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

Land Rating	58 /70
Design Rating	71 /100
Impact Rating	73 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	2.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services are clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	30.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	3.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	16.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

8/10 81.5%

2

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	80 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	4.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	30.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	10.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	17.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00
	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00
	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	17.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

3
8/10 84.9%

SITE
OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	76 /100
Impact Rating	85 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for Spatial Integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery stores, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	23.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	4.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	28.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	15.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	5.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	14.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	4.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	14.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental impact: *	22.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	20.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	5.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	5.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

3

9/10 87.5%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	65 /70
Design Rating	79 /100
Impact Rating	88 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00
		5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	5.00
		5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	22.00	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	2.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	4.00
		5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	25.00	25.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	4.00	4.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00	4.00
Services are clustered	4.00	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	5.00
		3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	29.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	4.00	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00	5.00
		4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	29.00	29.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00	1.00
Public space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	15.00	15.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	5.00	5.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	5.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00	5.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	15.00	15.00
No Cost	3.00	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	5.00	5.00
Invest to save	4.00	4.00

Financial Benefit To:*	14.00	14.00
Municipality	5.00	5.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00	4.00
New Development	5.00	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To:*	15.00	15.00
Municipality	5.00	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00	5.00

Environmental Impact*	24.00	24.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	5.00

Social Outcome*	20.00	20.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	5.00	5.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	5.00	5.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 3

9/10 85.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00	
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00	
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 32m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To:*	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To:*	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact*	25.00	
Minimise resource consumption	5.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome*	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

3

8/10 81.9%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	76 /100
Impact Rating	75 /85

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	28.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00	
Services and clustered	5.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	29.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	2.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	4.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	14.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	4.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact *	18.00	
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

3

9/10 89.4%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	93 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	34.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	37.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		
No Cost		10.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality		15.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality		15.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		
Minimise resource consumption		17.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context		17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		4.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 04

7/10 67.9%

Date: 2018-10-23

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 62 /70
 Design Rating 53 /100
 Impact Rating 65 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	4.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	18.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	24.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00
	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	1.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	14.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 04
8/10 76.6%

Site 04
8/10 76.6%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE
Land Rating: 66 /70
Design Rating: 63 /100
Impact Rating: 74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	IMPACT RATING
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development * No Cost: 12.00 Capital Savings: 1.00 Spend a little, save a lot: 3.00 Invest to save: 5.00 3.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	Financial Benefit To: * Municipality: 12.00 Existing Town Residents: 4.00 New Development: 4.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	Social/Economic Benefit To: * Municipality: 12.00 Larger Town Residents: 4.00 New Development Residents: 4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	Environmental Impact * Minimise resource consumption: 23.00 Maximise resource efficiency: 5.00 Protect/enhance ecological systems: 5.00 Minimise exposure to environmental risk: 4.00 Improve quality of life for residents: 5.00 4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	Social Outcome * Maximise integration with existing urban context: 15.00 Maximise access to employment opportunities: 4.00 Maximise quality living environment for residents: 3.00 Maximise access to social amenities: 4.00 4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	

DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	23.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00
Services and clustered	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge	28.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00
	1.00
	1.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically-sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?) Not on high agricultural land or soil	25.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
--	---

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
---	------------------------------

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 4

9/10 85.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
		5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**		
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00	
		3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?		
		5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**		
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
		5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00	
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00	
Services and clustered	5.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	
		3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Easy to navigate street layout	33.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00	
		5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00	
		4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality		15.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality		15.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental impact *		
Minimise resource consumption		25.00
Maximise resource efficiency		5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		5.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context		17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		4.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

4

8/10 81.9%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	78 /100
Impact Rating	73 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00 5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00 5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery stores, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	28.00 3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services are clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00 3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	31.00 5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	2.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00 3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	13.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	16.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

4

9/10 89.4%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	93 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00 5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery stores, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	34.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	5.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services are clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	37.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

Site 05

7/10 70.6%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	60 /70
Design Rating	56 /100
Impact Rating	71 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	X
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1.

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00
	2.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	4.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services are clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	26.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	23.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	1.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	17.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	2.00
Improve quality of life for residents	3.00
	4.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	14.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00
	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

Site 05

8/10 80.8%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	72 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

Project Phase (max with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	3.00	7.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	4.00
Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**		29.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	4.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	4.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00	11.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality	5.00	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development	5.00	5.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality	5.00	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	4.00	19.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	4.00
Services and clustered	5.00	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00	29.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure resuscitation and bulk services?	4.00	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Easy to navigate street layout	4.00	4.00
Defines street edge	5.00	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**		
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	24.00	24.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	4.00	4.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00	7.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	1.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		11.00
No Cost	1.00	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	4.00	4.00
Invest to save	3.00	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality	5.00	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development	5.00	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality	5.00	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00	5.00

Environmental Impact *		
Minimise resource consumption	4.00	19.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00	4.00

Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00	16.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00	4.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 5

9/10 85.7%

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating

64 /70

Design Rating

81 /100

Impact Rating

82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

• Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00	
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00	
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	35.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 32m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact *	25.00	
Minimise resource consumption	5.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

5

8/10 78.9%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	73 /100
Impact Rating	70 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	27.00	3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00	2.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	2.00	2.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	30.00	4.00
Defines street edge	5.00	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	2.00	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	2.00	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	5.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	5.00
Outside of a 100-year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	5.00

Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00	2.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	2.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00	2.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	9.00	1.00
No Cost	1.00	2.00
Capital Savings	2.00	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	3.00
Invest to save	3.00	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00	4.00
Municipality	4.00	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00	4.00
New Development	4.00	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	14.00	5.00
Municipality	5.00	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00	5.00

Environmental Impact *	18.00	3.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00	3.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	5.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

5
9/10 85.7%

SITE
OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

62 /70
91 /100
74 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Well-located land (answers yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
5.00	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
5.00		5.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Accessibility and integration (answers yes/no)**	25.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Resilient services provision (answers from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
5.00	Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
5.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answers yes/no)**	17.00
5.00	Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
2.00	Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	2.00
1.00	More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
4.00	Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	4.00
5.00	Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	Design for spatial integration (answers from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
5.00	Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
5.00	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

DESIGN RATING	Design for resource efficiency (answers from most likely to least likely)*	34.00
5.00	The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	5.00
4.00	Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
5.00	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00
5.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
5.00	Services and clustered	5.00
5.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
5.00	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

DESIGN RATING	Design for accessibility (answers from most likely to least likely)*	35.00
5.00	Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
5.00	Defines street edge	5.00
5.00	Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
2.00	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
5.00	Streets designed for universal access	5.00
5.00	Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
4.00	Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
4.00	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

DESIGN RATING	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answers from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
4.00	Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
4.00	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
4.00	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00

IMPACT RATING	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	10.00
1.00	No Cost	1.00
3.00	Capital Savings	3.00
3.00	Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
3.00	Invest to save	3.00

IMPACT RATING	Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
5.00	Municipality	5.00
5.00	Existing Town Residents	5.00
5.00	New Development	5.00

IMPACT RATING	Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
5.00	Municipality	5.00
5.00	Larger Town Residents	5.00
5.00	New Development Residents	5.00

IMPACT RATING	Environmental Impact *	17.00
3.00	Minimise resource consumption	3.00
3.00	Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
3.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
3.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
5.00	Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

IMPACT RATING	Social Outcome *	17.00
3.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
4.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
5.00	Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
5.00	Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 06
7/10 72.5%
 Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE
 Land Rating 62 /70
 Design Rating 66 /100
 Impact Rating 64 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	8.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	1.00
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		8.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		2.00
Invest to save		2.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00	
Municipality	4.00	
Existing Town Residents	4.00	
New Development	4.00	
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00	
Municipality	4.00	
Larger Town Residents	4.00	
New Development Residents	4.00	
Environmental Impact *	37.00	
Minimise resource consumption	4.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00	
Social Outcome *	15.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The Street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	21.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge	30.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

Site 06

7/10 74.0%

OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project: Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	66 /100
Impact Rating	64 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)	8.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	23.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

DESIGN FOR RESOURCE EFFICIENCY (answer from most likely to least likely)*	21.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	4.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services are clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reutilization and bulk services?	4.00

DESIGN FOR ACCESSIBILITY (answer from most likely to least likely)*	30.00
Easy to navigate street layout	3.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN TO MAKE USE OF ECOLOGICAL SERVICE PROVISION (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	8.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00
Invest to save	2.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	15.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 6

9/10 85.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing.	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00
	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32.m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	25.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

6

8/10 78.9%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	79 /100
Impact Rating	64 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00	
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00	
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	30.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	5.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	2.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		
No Cost	1.00	8.00
Capital Savings	2.00	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00	2.00
Invest to save	3.00	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality	11.00	
Existing Town Residents	4.00	
New Development	3.00	
	4.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality	12.00	
Larger Town Residents	4.00	
New Development Residents	4.00	

Environmental Impact *		
Minimise resource consumption	17.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context	16.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

6

SITE

8/10 84,9%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	63 /70
Design Rating	88 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land* (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement-links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	32.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services are clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	10.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00
	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	34.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	18.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	2.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	2.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	4.00
	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	17.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 07

Date: 2018-10-23

7/10 67.9%

OVERALL SCORE

62 /70
53 /100
65 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answers yes/no)**	10.00	
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00	
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	4.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answers yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	17.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	2.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	22.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	3.00	
Defines street edge	3.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answers yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	4.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00	
Municipality	4.00	
Existing Town Residents	4.00	
New Development	4.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00	
Municipality	4.00	
Larger Town Residents	4.00	
New Development Residents	4.00	

Environmental Impact *	15.00	
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00	

Social Outcome *	15.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

Site 07

OVERALL SCORE

7/10 67.2%

Date: 2018-10-23

Land Rating	60 /70
Design Rating	53 /100
Impact Rating	65 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	7.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	4.00
	5.00	3.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)** Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00	11.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00	1.00
	3.00	4.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	22.00	17.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	2.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	2.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	2.00
	5.00	3.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)** The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	2.00	4.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00	4.00
Services are clustered	3.00	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)** Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00	22.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	3.00
	3.00	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)** Easy to navigate street layout	22.00	15.00
Defines street edge	3.00	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00	4.00
	3.00	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	22.00	15.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	4.00	4.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00	4.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	4.00
	5.00	4.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)** Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00	15.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	4.00
	1.00	4.00

INDICATIVE COST OF ALL ASPECTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT*		
No Cost	1.00	11.00
Capital Savings	3.00	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	3.00
Invest to save	4.00	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality	4.00	12.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00	4.00
New Development	4.00	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality	4.00	12.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00	4.00

Environmental Impact *		
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	15.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00	2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00	4.00

Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00	15.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 7

9/10 85.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery stores, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental impact *	25.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	37.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

7

8/10 78.9%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	79 /100
Impact Rating	68 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	5.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	30.00	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00	33.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge Streets give pedestrians priority Opportunities for mixed land uses (identified formal and informal)	5.00	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00	16.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	3.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	6.00	2.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees (identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone)	2.00	2.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		9.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		2.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		12.00
Municipality		4.00
Existing Town Residents		4.00
New Development		4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		14.00
Municipality		4.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		17.00
Minimise resource consumption		3.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		16.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

7

Date: 2018-10-16

8/10 84.9%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	90 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
		5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
		5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance Services and clustered	34.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	
		5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	10.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	
		5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge Streets give pedestrians priority Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	34.00	
		5.00
		5.00
		5.00
		5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	16.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	2.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	3.00	
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Streets designed for universal access Streets designed to increase safety Space is identified for communal food gardening Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	2.00	
		5.00
		5.00
		5.00
		5.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	12.00	
		4.00
		4.00
		4.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact *	17.00	
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 08

7/10 70.6%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	60 /100
Impact Rating	65 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Score
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resource consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	Score
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	3.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	20.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	24.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00
	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	Score
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	15.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	15.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE: Site 08

7/10 67.2%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 55 /70
 Design Rating 58 /100
 Impact Rating 65 /95

Project Phase (marks with x)	X
Strategic Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	20.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	18.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	4.00
	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	24.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00
	1.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00
Environmental Impact: *	15.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00
Social Outcome *	15.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	18.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	4.00
	5.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	18.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	4.00
	5.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	18.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	4.00
	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 8

8/10 82.3%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	60 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	77 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
		5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00	
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context		5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge		5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)		5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		20.00
Minimise resource consumption		4.00
Maximise resource efficiency		4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		4.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

8

8/10 77.7%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	79 /100
Impact Rating	65 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	30.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	6.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00

IMPACT RATING

Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	8.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	11.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	3.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	14.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	15.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	2.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

8

8/10 79.6%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 55 /70
 Design Rating 82 /100
 Impact Rating 74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	32.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	5.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	34.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	3.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	2.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	2.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	2.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 09

8/10 84.9%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	78 /100
Impact Rating	83 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	X
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	IMPACT RATING
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 3.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	3.00 5.00

DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00 4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00 5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance Services and clustered	26.00 5.00 5.00 1.00 5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00 3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resource consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies? Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	8.00 4.00
--	--------------

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge Streets give pedestrians priority Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	35.00 5.00 5.00 4.00
---	-------------------------------

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?) Not on high agricultural land or soil	25.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
--	---

Streets designed for universal access Streets designed to increase safety Space is identified for communal food gardening Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00 5.00 4.00 5.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00 9.00 4.00 4.00 1.00

Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	14.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	5.00

Financial Benefit To:*	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To:*	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact*	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome*	20.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	5.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	5.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 09

9/10 88.7%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating
Design Rating
Impact Rating

68 /70
82 /100
85 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
10.00	Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	9.00
5.00	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
25.00	Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	29.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00
5.00		5.00

DESIGN RATING		
9.00	DESIGN for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	16.00
5.00	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00
4.00	DESIGN for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
5.00	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	15.00
1.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
5.00	Services and clustered	5.00
5.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	19.00
4.00	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00
4.00	DESIGN for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge	35.00
5.00	Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
4.00	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
4.00	Streets designed for universal access	4.00
5.00	Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
4.00	Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
3.00	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
5.00	DESIGN to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	9.00
4.00		4.00
1.00		1.00

8.00	Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	19.00
4.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure, reticulation and bulk services?	4.00
4.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure, reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

19.00	Environmental Impact *	19.00
4.00	Minimise resource consumption	4.00
4.00	Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
3.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
4.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
4.00	Improve quality of life for residents	4.00
20.00	Social Outcome *	20.00
5.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	5.00
5.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	5.00
5.00	Maximise quality/living environment for residents	5.00
5.00	Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

25.00	Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
5.00	Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
5.00	Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
5.00	More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
5.00	Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
5.00	Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

15.00	Financial Benefits To: *	15.00
5.00	Municipality	5.00
5.00	Existing Town Residents	5.00
5.00	New Development	5.00
25.00	Social/Economic Benefits To: *	25.00
5.00	Municipality	5.00
5.00	Larger Town Residents	5.00
5.00	New Development Residents	5.00
19.00	Environmental Impact *	19.00
4.00	Minimise resource consumption	4.00
4.00	Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
3.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
4.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
4.00	Improve quality of life for residents	4.00
20.00	Social Outcome *	20.00
5.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	5.00
5.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	5.00
5.00	Maximise quality/living environment for residents	5.00
5.00	Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 9

9/10 85.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	25.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

9/10 86.0%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	68 /70
Design Rating	86 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**		
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00	31.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00	5.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00	36.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**		
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00	9.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	3.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		11.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		4.00

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality		14.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		4.00
		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality		15.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		
Minimise resource consumption		17.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context		17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		4.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

9

9/10 89.4%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	93 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	35.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	5.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services are clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	36.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 30

8/10 75.1%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating

Design Rating

Impact Rating

62 /70

67 /100

70 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	3.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	20.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	16.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 10

8/10 75.1%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	67 /100
Impact Rating	70 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	IMPACT RATING
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	11.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a .1km walk to a public transport stop?	2.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	3.00

DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	20.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lines on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00
	1.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	IMPACT RATING
Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00
Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00
Social Outcome *	16.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	IMPACT RATING
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure, reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	IMPACT RATING
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure, reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	20.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lines on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00
	1.00

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	IMPACT RATING
Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00
Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00
Social Outcome *	16.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00

DESIGN RATING	IMPACT RATING
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	20.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lines on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00
	1.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 10

9/10 85.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context.	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	25.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

10

8/10 81.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	82 /100
Impact Rating	71 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00 5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00 3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reiteration and bulk services?	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	9.00 4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	28.00 3.00 3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge	36.00 5.00 5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00 3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00 3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	14.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

10

9/10 89.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	92 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5. Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	
	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	34.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	5.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	36.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00
	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

Site 11

7/10 69.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	56 /100
Impact Rating	66 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
10.00	Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
5.00	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
21.00	Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
1.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

5.00	Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resource consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	2.00
3.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

25.00	Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	5.00
5.00	Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
5.00	Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
5.00	More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
5.00	Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
5.00	Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING		
8.00	Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	4.00
4.00	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00

17.00	Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	5.00
2.00	Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00
1.00	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
2.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00
2.00	Services and clustered	2.00
3.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
2.00	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	2.00

26.00	Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
5.00	Defines street edge	5.00
3.00	Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
1.00	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
3.00	Streets designed for universal access	3.00
3.00	Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
3.00	Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
3.00	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

5.00	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
2.00	Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00
2.00	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
1.00	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING		
14.00	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	14.00
5.00	No Cost	5.00
3.00	Capital Savings	3.00
3.00	Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
3.00	Invest to save	3.00

11.00	Financial Benefit To: *	11.00
4.00	Municipality	4.00
3.00	Existing Town Residents	3.00
4.00	New Development	4.00

12.00	Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
4.00	Municipality	4.00
4.00	Larger Town Residents	4.00
4.00	New Development Residents	4.00

18.00	Environmental Impact *	18.00
4.00	Minimise resource consumption	4.00
3.00	Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
3.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
4.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
4.00	Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

11.00	Social Outcome *	11.00
3.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
2.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	2.00
3.00	Maximise quality living environment for residents	3.00
3.00	Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 11

Date: 2018-10-23

7/10 69.1%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	56 /100
Impact Rating	66 /95
Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Score
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00
Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	Score
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management	17.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	2.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	26.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to need of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	5.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	Score
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	14.00
No Cost	5.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00
Financial Benefit To: *	11.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	3.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	Score
Municipality	12.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	Score
Minimise resource consumption	18.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	Score
Maximise integration with existing urban context	11.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	2.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 11

9/10 85.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5. Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
		5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?		5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictors	5.00	
More than 32m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
		5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)		5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		25.00
Minimise resource consumption		5.00
Maximise resource efficiency		5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		5.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

11

8/10 77.0%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 62 /70
 Design Rating 76 /100
 Impact Rating 66 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	9.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	5.00

Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	8.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00
Invest to save	2.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	23.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	11.00
Municipality	3.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	13.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	35.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

SITE

OVERALL SCORE
9/10 88.3%

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	32.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	36.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00
	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	32.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 12

6/10 61.1%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 61 /70

Design Rating 39 /100

Impact Rating 62 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	2.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development* No Cost	14.00
Capital Savings	5.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	13.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	2.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
	2.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	9.00
Existing Town Residents	3.00
New Development	3.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	12.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	2.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge	19.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	16.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	5.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	11.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	2.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

Site 12

6/10 61.1%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	39 /100
Impact Rating	62 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5. Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	2.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00
	1.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	13.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	2.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	19.00
Easy to navigate street layout	3.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Improve ecological value with Indigenous vegetation	2.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	14.00
No Cost	5.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	9.00
Municipality	3.00
Existing Town Residents	3.00
New Development	3.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	16.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	3.00

Social Outcome *	11.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	2.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	3.00
Maximise access to social amenities	3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 12
9/10 85.7%

SITE
OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00
	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	25.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

12

8/10 77.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	58 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	67 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	17.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	1.00	
	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00	
Services and clustered	4.00	
	5.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	
	3.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	36.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	2.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	5.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		8.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		2.00
Invest to save		2.00

Financial Benefit To: *		12.00
Municipality		3.00
Existing Town Residents		4.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		13.00
Municipality		4.00
Larger Town Residents		4.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		17.00
Minimise resource consumption		3.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

SITE
9/10 88.3%

OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	90 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
		5.00
Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**		25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	10.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	
		5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**		
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
		5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	32.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services are clustered	5.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Easy to navigate street layout	36.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	2.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	5.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	
		5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees (identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone)	4.00	
		4.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *		
Municipality	15.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		
Municipality	15.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact *		
Minimise resource consumption	17.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *		
Maximise integration with existing urban context	17.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	
		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

Site 13

8/10 80.4%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	71 /100
Impact Rating	80 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	9.00 4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00 5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	22.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services are clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00 3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	31.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00 4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	25.00 5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00 4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	12.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	12.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	15.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	22.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	19.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	5.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

Site 13

8/10 82.3%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	73 /100
Impact Rating	81 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	22.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	2.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery stores, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	23.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	5.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services are clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure recalculation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	31.00
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
Defines street edge	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses (identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent), is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	13.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	22.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	19.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	5.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 13

8/10 84.2%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	60 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	82 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00	
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00	
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact *	25.00	
Minimise resource consumption	5.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

13

8/10 78,5%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	70 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	24.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services are clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	30.00
Defines street edge	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	25.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	18.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	5.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

13

8/10 81.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	65 /70
Design Rating	76 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00
	5.00	5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	5.00
	5.00	5.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	24.00	28.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	2.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	4.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	4.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	28.00	15.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	5.00	5.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00	5.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	5.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00	5.00
Services and clustered	4.00	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	5.00
Includes space for organic-waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00	17.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	3.00
	5.00	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	30.00	17.00
Easy to navigate street layout	4.00	3.00
Defines street edge	4.00	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00	3.00
	2.00	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00	17.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	3.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	4.00	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	4.00	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	17.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00	3.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	10.00
No Cost	1.00	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	3.00
Invest to save	3.00	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00	15.00
Municipality	5.00	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development	5.00	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	15.00
Municipality	5.00	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 14

7/10

66.4%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	49 /70
Design Rating	59 /100
Impact Rating	68 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	6.00
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	1.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	6.00
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	19.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	4.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	25.00
Easy to navigate street layout	4.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	9.00
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	1.00
No Cost	2.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	9.00
Municipality	3.00
Larger Town Residents	3.00
New Development Residents	3.00

Environmental Impact *	20.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	18.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 14

7/10 67.2%

7/10

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	49 /70
Design Rating	59 /100
Impact Rating	70 /95

Date: 2018-10-23

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (max with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	6.00	1.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	6.00	3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery stores, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	19.00	4.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00	
Services are clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	2.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?		

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	25.00	4.00
Defines street edge	3.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00	
Streets designed for universal access	4.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	2.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	4.00	
Invest to save	4.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00	
Municipality	4.00	
Existing Town Residents	4.00	
New Development	4.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	9.00	
Municipality	3.00	
Larger Town Residents	3.00	
New Development Residents	3.00	

Environmental Impact *	20.00	
Minimise resource consumption	4.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00	

Social Outcome *	18.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

Area 14

8/10 75.1%

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	70 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00 5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00 5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	26.00 3.00 4.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00 3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge Streets give pedestrians priority Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	33.00 5.00 5.00 2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	9.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	12.00 4.00 5.00 3.00
---	-------------------------------

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	13.00
Minimise resource consumption	2.00
Maximise resource efficiency	2.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	3.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

14
7/10 73.6%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	58 /70
Design Rating	61 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Score
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	Score
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	4.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	20.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	26.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	Score
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

14

7/10 72.8%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 59 /70
 Design Rating 60 /100
 Impact Rating 74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00
	4.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	24.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high-quality public space?	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	20.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00
Services and clustered	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	10.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00
	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	27.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	15.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	3.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	2.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	2.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	5.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 15

7/10 66.8%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	49 /70
Design Rating	57 /100
Impact Rating	71 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	17.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	1.00	
	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	2.00	
	3.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	12.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00	
Services and clustered	1.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	1.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	
	1.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	26.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	
	1.00	
Streets designed for universal access	4.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00	
	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development*	9.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	2.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *	20.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	18.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	4.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

Site 15

OVERALL SCORE

7/10 67.5%

Date: 2018-10-23

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding Yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
10.00	Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
5.00	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
17.00	Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	12.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	4.00
1.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
1.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	1.00
5.00		5.00

DESIGN RATING		
10.00	Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
5.00	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
12.00	Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	12.00
4.00	Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
1.00	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
1.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
1.00	Services and clustered	1.00
1.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	1.00
3.00	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
1.00		1.00

5.00	Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
2.00	Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
3.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00
		3.00

26.00	Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
5.00	Easy to navigate street layout	5.00
5.00	Defines street edge	5.00
3.00	Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
1.00	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
4.00	Streets designed for universal access	4.00
4.00	Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
1.00	Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00
3.00	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

17.00	Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00
1.00	Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
5.00	Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
5.00	More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
1.00	Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
5.00	Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

9.00	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00
4.00	Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
4.00	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
1.00	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING		
11.00	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
1.00	No Cost	1.00
2.00	Capital Savings	2.00
4.00	Spend a little, save a lot	4.00
4.00	Invest to save	4.00

12.00	Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
4.00	Municipality	4.00
4.00	Existing Town Residents	4.00
4.00	New Development	4.00

12.00	Social/Economic Benefit To: *	12.00
4.00	Municipality	4.00
4.00	Larger Town Residents	4.00
4.00	New Development Residents	4.00

Environmental Impact *		
20.00	Minimise resource consumption	20.00
3.00	Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
4.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
5.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
4.00	Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *		
10.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	10.00
4.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
5.00	Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
5.00	Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 15

8/10 75.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	9.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00	
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	5.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	33.00	
Easy to navigate street layout	5.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	12.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		13.00
Minimise resource consumption		2.00
Maximise resource efficiency		2.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		3.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

SITE

7/10 74.3%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	50 /70
Design Rating	71 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	8.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	4.00
	5.00	4.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00	
	4.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	13.00	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	1.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	4.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00	
Services and clustered	4.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	31.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?		4.00
		4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	4.00	
Defines street edge	4.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	
Streets designed for universal access	4.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	7.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact *	19.00	
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

15
8/10 75.5%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	55 /70
Design Rating	67 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	5.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00	4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00	4.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	24.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	25.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00
Services and clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	29.00
Defines street edge	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	15.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	3.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	2.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	2.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	5.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		17.00
Minimise resource consumption		3.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site: 16

Date: 2018-10-23

5/10 53.2%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	41 /70
Design Rating	42 /100
Impact Rating	58 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	9.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	2.00
	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00
	1.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	10.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	1.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	19.00
Defines street edge	2.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00
	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00
	4.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	9.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	8.00
Municipality	3.00
Larger Town Residents	2.00
New Development Residents	3.00

Environmental Impact *	20.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	9.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	1.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	2.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

Site 16

5/10 53.6%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land listing
Design Rating
Impact Rating

41 /70
42 /100
59 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

• Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 •** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00 5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	4.00 3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	9.00 1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	10.00 2.00
Even are laid out for medium/high density semi-detached or row housing	1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services are clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	1.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00 2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	19.00 2.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	1.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	17.00 1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00 4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot.	3.00
Invest to save	4.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	8.00
Municipality	3.00
Larger Town Residents	2.00
New Development Residents	3.00

Environmental Impact *	20.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	9.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	1.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	2.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Area 16

8/10

75.8%

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	44 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00	
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00	
Services and clustered	5.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00	
	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	
	5.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00	
	5.00	
Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	5.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00	
More than 32m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00	
	4.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	5.00	
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental Impact *	19.00	
Minimise resource consumption	3.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

16

SITE

7/10 70.2%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	46 /70
Design Rating	64 /100
Impact Rating	76 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	10.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	13.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	22.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	28.00
Easy to navigate street layout	4.00
Defines street edge	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	2.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	17.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent), is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	11.00
No Cost	2.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	14.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	19.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

16

7/10 74.7%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	57 /70
Design Rating	67 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	8.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	4.00
	5.00	4.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	8.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	4.00	
	4.00	

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)**	23.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	25.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00
Services are clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	4.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	29.00
Easy to navigate street layout	4.00
Defines street edge	4.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	4.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	14.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	2.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	3.00
Outside of a fire risk area (If adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	2.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	2.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		17.00
Minimise resource consumption		3.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 17

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE
6/10 55.1%
 Land Rating 41 /70
 Design Rating 45 /100
 Impact Rating 60 /95

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating 41 /70
 Design Rating 45 /100
 Impact Rating 60 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	6.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00
	1.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	9.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	10.00
Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High+medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	1.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
	1.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	22.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	9.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	
Municipality	12.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	
Municipality	9.00
Larger Town Residents	3.00
New Development Residents	3.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	20.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00
	4.00

Social Outcome *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	10.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	2.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	2.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00
	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

Site 17

6/10 55.8%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	40 /70
Design Rating	47 /100
Impact Rating	61 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	6.00
	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	10.00
	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	2.00
	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	1.00
		5.00

DESIGN RATING	Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	5.00
	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00
	Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	2.00
	Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	1.00
	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
	Services and clustered	1.00
	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	1.00
	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00
	Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout.	22.00
	Defines street edge	3.00
	Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
	Streets designed for universal access	1.00
	Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
	Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	9.00
	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00
		1.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure (reticulation and bulk services)?	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	19.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	4.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	4.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

IMPACT RATING	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	9.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		2.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	9.00
Municipality	3.00
Larger Town Residents	3.00
New Development Residents	3.00

Environmental Impact *	20.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	11.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	2.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE

Site 17

OVERALL SCORE

8/10 75.8%

Date: 2018-10-22

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	72 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00	
	5.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00	
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	
	5.00	

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	26.00	
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00	
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00	
Services and clustered	3.00	
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00	
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	
	5.00	

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00	
Defines street edge	5.00	
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00	
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00	
	5.00	

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	9.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	
Outside of a 100-year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00	

Streets designed for universal access	5.00	
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00	
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00	
	5.00	
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00	
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees (identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone)	4.00	
	5.00	
	3.00	

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00	
No Cost	1.00	
Capital Savings	3.00	
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Existing Town Residents	5.00	
New Development	5.00	

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00	
Municipality	5.00	
Larger Town Residents	5.00	
New Development Residents	5.00	

Environmental impact *	15.00	
Minimise resource consumption	2.00	
Maximise resource efficiency	2.00	
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00	
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00	
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00	

Social Outcome *	17.00	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00	
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00	
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00	
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00	

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

17

6/10 62.3%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	36 /70
Design Rating	54 /100
Impact Rating	73 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	6.00	
Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00	
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?		1.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	13.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00	

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00	
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?		3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	13.00	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00	
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00	

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	6.00	
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric		3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context		3.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	18.00	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.		3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing		1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate		2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance		1.00
Services are clustered		3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards		5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)		3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	23.00	
Easy to navigate street layout		3.00
Defines street edge		3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority		3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)		2.00
Streets designed for universal access		2.00
Streets designed to increase safety		4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening		3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard		3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00	
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation		3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees		3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone		1.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		10.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		3.00
Spend a little, save a lot		3.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		14.00
Municipality		5.00
Existing Town Residents		5.00
New Development		4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		15.00
Municipality		5.00
Larger Town Residents		5.00
New Development Residents		5.00

Environmental Impact *		17.00
Minimise resource consumption		3.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		3.00
Improve quality of life for residents		5.00

Social Outcome *		17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		5.00
Maximise access to social amenities		5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

17

6/10 61.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	37 /70
Design Rating	51 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	3.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00
	2.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	16.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	2.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	2.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	2.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	13.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	4.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	2.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	7.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	17.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	2.00
Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	22.00
Easy to navigate street layout	3.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 18

5/10 52.1%

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating

Design Rating

Impact Rating

33 /70
45 /100
60 /95

Date: 2018-10-23

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	6.00	4.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00	3.00
Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	9.00	11.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	1.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric		4.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context		3.00
Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.		3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing		1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well defined and easy to navigate		1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance		1.00
Services and clustered		1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards		1.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)		3.00
Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout		22.00
Defines street edge		3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority		3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)		3.00
Streets designed for universal access		1.00
Streets designed to increase safety		3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening		3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard		3.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *		8.00
No Cost		1.00
Capital Savings		2.00
Spend a little, save a lot		2.00
Invest to save		3.00

Financial Benefit To: *		12.00
Municipality		4.00
Existing Town Residents		4.00
New Development		4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *		9.00
Municipality		3.00
Larger Town Residents		3.00
New Development Residents		3.00

Environmental Impact *		20.00
Minimise resource consumption		4.00
Maximise resource efficiency		3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems		4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk		5.00
Improve quality of life for residents		4.00

Social Outcome *		11.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context		3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities		2.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents		4.00
Maximise access to social amenities		2.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation		8.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone		4.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation		3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone		4.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation		3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**		13.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors		1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions		5.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland		1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)		1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil		5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*		5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?		2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?		3.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 18

5/10 54.3%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating
Design Rating
Impact Rating

36 /70
48 /100
60 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Score
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	5.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00

DESIGN RATING	Score
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	7.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00
	4.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	9.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	11.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	1.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00
	1.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	2.00
	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	22.00
Defines street edge	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)** Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	16.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	2.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	3.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00
	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	8.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00
	1.00

IMPACT RATING	Score
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	8.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	2.00
Spend a little, save a lot	2.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	Score
Municipality	12.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	Score
Municipality	9.00
Larger Town Residents	3.00
New Development Residents	3.00

Environmental Impact *	Score
Minimise resource consumption	20.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	4.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00
	4.00

Social Outcome *	Score
Maximise integration with existing urban context	11.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	2.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00
	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 18
8/10 78.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	52 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	
Strategic Project Planning	X
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	26.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	4.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00
	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00
Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	33.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	2.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	13.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	-
Not on high-agricultural land or soil	1.00
	5.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

SITE
OVERALL SCORE
6/10 55.8%

Project Phase (mark with x)
Strategic Project Planning X
Design Phase
Construction Phase

Land Rating 34 /70
Impact Rating 47 /100
67 /95

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)

Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	2.00 1.00	Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	6.00 3.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00	The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	3.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	13.00 1.00	Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	18.00 3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	1.00	Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	2.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00	Services and clustered	2.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	6.00 3.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00 2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00	Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	18.00 2.00
		Defines street edge	3.00
		Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00
		Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
		Streets designed for universal access	2.00
		Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
		Space is identified for communal food gardening	2.00
		Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	2.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	13.00	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	5.00 2.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	5.00	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00		
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00		
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00		

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

INDICATIVE COST OF ALL ASPECTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT*	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

FINANCIAL BENEFIT TO:	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	3.00
New Development	5.00

SOCIAL/ECONOMIC BENEFIT TO:	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT*	16.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

SOCIAL OUTCOME*	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

18

6/10 55.8%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	34 /70
Design Rating	40 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)**	3.00
Is the site within the urban edge?	1.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	2.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	4.00
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	4.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	14.00
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	2.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services are clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	2.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	2.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	17.00
Easy to navigate street layout	2.00
Defines street edge	2.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	2.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	2.00
Streets designed to increase safety	4.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	2.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	2.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	5.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent), is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	5.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	2.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	1.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: **	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-23

Site 19

6/10 58.1%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	33 /70
Design Rating	60 /100
Impact Rating	61 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	6.00	9.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00	5.00
	5.00	4.00

DESIGN RATING		
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	9.00	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00	4.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	13.00	19.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00	3.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	1.00	3.00
	5.00	3.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	19.00	3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	3.00	3.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00	3.00
Services and clustered	3.00	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00	3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	5.00	2.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	2.00	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	24.00	3.00
Defines street edge	3.00	3.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00	3.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	9.00	1.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00	1.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00	5.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00	

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	8.00	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	4.00	1.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00	1.00

IMPACT RATING		
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	9.00	1.00
No Cost	1.00	2.00
Capital Savings	2.00	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00	3.00
Invest to save	3.00	

Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	9.00
Municipality	3.00
Larger Town Residents	3.00
New Development Residents	3.00

Environmental Impact *	20.00
Minimise resource consumption	4.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

Social Outcome *	11.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	2.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Site 19

6/10 64.2%

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	60 /100
Impact Rating	62 /95

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)		
10.00	Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	9.00
5.00	Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
5.00	Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	19.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	3.00
3.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	3.00
1.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	1.00
5.00	Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	3.00
5.00	Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)**	3.00

6.00	Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	24.00
2.00	Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00
4.00	Safe from environmental risk and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	3.00
13.00	Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA) and ecological corridors	3.00
1.00	Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00
5.00	More than 100m from watercourse or wetland	3.00
1.00	Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	3.00
1.00	Not on high agricultural land or soil	3.00

DESIGN RATING		
9.00	Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	9.00
5.00	This site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
4.00	Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	12.00
3.00	Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	4.00
3.00	There are dedicated NMT lines on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
1.00	High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	3.00
3.00	Services are clustered	3.00
3.00	Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
3.00	Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

ENVIRONMENTAL RATING		
24.00	Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout	24.00
3.00	Defines street edge	3.00
3.00	Streets give pedestrians priority	3.00
3.00	Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	3.00
3.00	Streets designed for universal access	3.00
3.00	Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
3.00	Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
3.00	Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	3.00
8.00	Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	8.00
3.00	Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
4.00	Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	4.00
1.00		1.00

IMPACT RATING		
12.00	Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	12.00
1.00	No Cost	1.00
2.00	Capital Savings	2.00
3.00	Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
3.00	Invest to save	3.00
12.00	Financial Benefit To: *	12.00
4.00	Municipality	4.00
4.00	Existing Town Residents	4.00
4.00	New Development	4.00
9.00	Social/Economic Benefit To: *	9.00
3.00	Municipality	3.00
3.00	Larger Town Residents	3.00
3.00	New Development Residents	3.00
20.00	Environmental Impact *	20.00
4.00	Minimise resource consumption	4.00
3.00	Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
4.00	Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
5.00	Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
4.00	Improve quality of life for residents	4.00
12.00	Social Outcome *	12.00
3.00	Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
3.00	Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
4.00	Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
2.00	Maximise access to social amenities	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-22

Area 19

7/10 74.0%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	67 /95

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least
 ** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answe yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	10.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	5.00
	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	21.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km traveling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	1.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00
	5.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe yes/no)**	9.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00
More than 32 m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	10.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Erven are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	26.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	3.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	4.00
Services and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge	33.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	5.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	2.00
	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	4.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	12.00
	4.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00
	3.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	
Minimise resource consumption	10.00
Maximise resource efficiency	1.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	2.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	2.00
Improve quality of life for residents	3.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

19
6/10 64.5%

SITE
OVERALL SCORE

Date: 2018-10-23

* Score each item on a scale 1-5: Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	57 /100
Impact Rating	66 /95

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	2.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	1.00

DESIGN RATING	
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	6.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	5.00
	1.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km traveling distance to community and social services?	5.00

DESIGN FOR ACCESSIBILITY (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Easy to navigate street layout	3.00
Defines street edge	5.00
Streets give pedestrians priority	4.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	2.00

DESIGN FOR RESOURCE EFFICIENCY (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management.	3.00
Even are laid out for medium-high density semi-detached or row housing	1.00
There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

DESIGN FOR ACCESSIBILITY (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Streets designed for universal access	1.00
Streets designed to increase safety	5.00
Space is identified for communal food gardening	3.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	2.00

DESIGN FOR ACCESSIBILITY (answer from most likely to least likely)*	
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees	3.00
Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	2.00

Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00
---	------

SAFE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS AND ECOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS (answer yes/no)**	
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	13.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	1.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	5.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	5.00

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT *	
Minimise resource consumption	16.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	4.00

SOCIAL/ECONOMIC BENEFIT TO: *	
Municipality	12.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

FINANCIAL BENEFIT TO: *	
Municipality	12.00
Existing Town Residents	4.00
New Development	4.00

SOCIAL OUTCOME *	
Maximise integration with existing urban context	17.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00

IMPACT RATING	
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	9.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

Date: 2018-10-16

19

6/10 64.9%

SITE

OVERALL SCORE

Project Phase (mark with x)	X
Strategic Project Planning	
Design Phase	
Construction Phase	

* Score each item on a scale 1-5; Rating of 5 is best and a rating of 1 is least

** Regarding yes/no questions: Yes = 5 No = 1

LAND RATING (rate 1-5)	Score
Well-located land (answer yes/no)** Is the site within the urban edge?	4.00 1.00
Is the site adjacent to or within existing service infrastructure systems (water, energy, sanitation, waste) with available capacity for the project?	3.00

DESIGN RATING	Score
Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)* Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	6.00 5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00

Accessibility and integration (answer yes/no)** Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to a public transport stop?	25.00 5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km travelling distance to a dedicated NMT network?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 1km walk to daily activities (grocery store, ATM)?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 500m walk to a high quality public space?	5.00
Is the site currently or planned to be within a 5km travelling distance to community and social services?	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)* The street layout enables dwellings that can exploit passive heating/cooling and storm water management. Even are laid out for medium+high density semi-detached or row housing There are dedicated NMT lanes on the primary mobility network and are well-defined and easy to navigate High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance Services and clustered	15.00 2.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	5.00 3.00

Resilient services provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Are there opportunities to reduce resources consumption in the municipality through demand management strategies?	8.00 3.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	5.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)* Easy to navigate street layout Defines street edge Streets give pedestrians priority Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	28.00 2.00 5.00 4.00
---	-------------------------------

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answer yes/no)**	7.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	1.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	3.00
More than 100m from a watercourse or wetland	1.00
Outside of a fire risk area (if adjacent, is there sufficient and monitors firebreak infrastructure in place?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	1.00

Streets designed for universal access Streets designed to increase safety Space is identified for communal food gardening Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	1.00 5.00 5.00 4.00
Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)* Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation Improve air quality by providing vegetation and trees Identify and integrate sensitive ecological areas in the design through the provision of a 100m active buffer zone	5.00 2.00 2.00 1.00

IMPACT RATING	Score
Indicative Cost of all aspects of the Development *	10.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
Invest to save	3.00

Financial Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Existing Town Residents	5.00
New Development	5.00

Social/Economic Benefit To: *	15.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	5.00
New Development Residents	5.00

Environmental Impact *	17.00
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	3.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	3.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	3.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

Social Outcome *	17.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	4.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	5.00
Maximise access to social amenities	5.00