ANNEXURE F

EVALUATION OF SITES AGAINST CRITERIA

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE: 1 - Zone A

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 78.1%

Land Rating	52 /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 (answe 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)**	17.00
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)?	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)*	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)**	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

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 *	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 A

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 79.2%

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 (answe 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)**	18.00
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)?	2.00
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 (answe 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

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)*	28.00
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	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)	4.00

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	3.00
Opportunities for mixed land uses identified (formal and informal)	5.00
Streets designed for universal access	4.00
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 *	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 A - Overhills Site

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 78.1%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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 *	**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

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 A

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 80.8%

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	77 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

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	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

SITE 1 Zone A **Date: 2018-10-16**

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 79.2%

Land Rating	55 /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 (answe yes/no)**	**8.00**
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?	3.00

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

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 (answe 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

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

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.	4.00
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	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**34.00**
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	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	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	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: *	**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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.1%

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 (answe 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)**	**17.00**
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)?	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)*	**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)**	**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)*	**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 *	**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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.5%

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	82 /100
Impact Rating	78 /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 (answe 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)**	18.00
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)?	2.00
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 (answe yes/no)**	19.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	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

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)*	34.00
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	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 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: *	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

SITE 1 B - Overhills Site **Date: 2018-10-22**

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 80.8%

Land Rating	52 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	81 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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 *	**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

SITE: 1 - Zone B

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 80.0%

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	78 /100
Impact Rating	78 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

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)*	**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 *	**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 *	**20.00**
Minimise resource consumption	3.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
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

SITE 1 Zone B

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 76.2%

Land Rating	51 /70
Design Rating	77 /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 (answe yes/no)**	**7.00**
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?	2.00

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

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 (answe yes/no)**	**10.00**
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?)	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)*	**28.00**
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	5.00
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	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)*	**34.00**
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	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	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	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: *	**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 C

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 76.6%

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 (answe yes/no)**	**6.00**
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?	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	**17.00**
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)?	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)*	**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)**	**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

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 *	**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 C

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.1%

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	83 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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 avallable 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 (answe 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

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)*	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	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 *	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

SITE 1 C - Overhills Site

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 80.4%

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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 *	**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

SITE: 1 - Zone C

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 79.6%

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	78 /100
Impact Rating	77 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

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)*	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 *	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

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE 1 - Zone C

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.1%

Land Rating	56 /70
Design Rating	83 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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 (answe 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

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)*	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	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 *	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

SITE 2

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 67.5%

Land Rating	57 /70
Design Rating	60 /100
Impact Rating	62 /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 (answe 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 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?	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 (answe 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 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.	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	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)	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	28.00
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)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
Streets designed to increase safety	3.00
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

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	8.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
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	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

SITE 2

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 72.1%

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	66 /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 (answe 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)**	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 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 (answe yes/no)**	23.00
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	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)*	9.00
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	4.00

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
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	1.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00
Services and clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	29.00
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)	1.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
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	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	4.00
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 *	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: *	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 *	18.00
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	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 Area 2

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 79.2%

Land Rating	52 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	77 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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 *	**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	2
OVERALL SCORE	**8/10** 76.2%

Date: 2018-10-22

Land Rating	58 /70
Design Rating	71 /100
Impact Rating	73 /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 (answe 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)**	**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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**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)*	**26.00**
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	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	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)*	**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

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 2

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.5%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	80 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe yes/no)**	**17.00**
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	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	3.00

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

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.	4.00
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	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**33.00**
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	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

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 *	**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 3

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 84.9%

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	76 /100
Impact Rating	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)

Well-located land (answe 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 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?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	**23.00**
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	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

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

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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 87.5%

Land Rating	65 /70
Design Rating	79 /100
Impact Rating	88 /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 (answe 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)**	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 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?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	25.00
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	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	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)*	29.00
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)	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

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 *	15.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	5.00
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 *	24.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	4.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	5.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
Improve quality of life for residents	5.00

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 Area 3

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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

SITE 3

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.9%

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	76 /100
Impact Rating	75 /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 (answe 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)**	**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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**28.00**
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	5.00
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)*	**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

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

SITE 3

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 89.4%

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	93 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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)*	**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)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
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)*	**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 Site 04

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 67.9%

Land Rating	62 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	**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

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.	4.00
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	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)	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**24.00**
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)	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

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**3.00**
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	1.00
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 Site 04

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 76.6%

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	63 /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 (answe 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)**	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 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?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	9.00
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	4.00

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
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	2.00
High-medium density to reduce material and service requirements, including thermal performance	2.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

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	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	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)*	3.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	1.00
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 *	12.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	5.00
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 *	23.00
Minimise resource consumption	5.00
Maximise resource efficiency	5.00
Protect/enhance ecological systems	4.00
Minimise exposure to environmental risk	5.00
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	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	4.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE Area 4

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

SITE 4

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.9%

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	78 /100
Impact Rating	73 /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 (answe 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)**	**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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**28.00**
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	5.00
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)*	**31.00**
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)	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

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 *	**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

SITE 4

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 89.4%

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	93 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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)*	**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)	2.00
Streets designed for universal access	5.00
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)*	**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	**Site 05**	**Date: 2018-10-23**
OVERALL SCORE	**7/10** 70.6%	

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 (answe 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 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 (answe yes/no)**	**23.00**
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
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	5.00

DESIGN RATING

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	3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	2.00

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.	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 and clustered	3.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**26.00**
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)	1.00
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	3.00

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**3.00**
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	1.00
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: *	**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	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 *	**14.00**
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
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 05 Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 80.8%

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	72 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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)**	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?	4.00
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?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe yes/no)**	24.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	5.00
Outside of a 100 year flood line and sea level rise predictions	4.00
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)*	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)*	29.00
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	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	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	29.00
Easy to navigate street layout	4.00
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	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 *	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 *	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 Site 5 — **Date:** 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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

SITE 5

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 78.9%

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	73 /100
Impact Rating	70 /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 (answe 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)**	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)*	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 (answe 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)*	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	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)	2.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	30.00
Easy to navigate street layout	4.00
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

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 *	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: *	14.00
Municipality	5.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
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

SITE 5

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	91 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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	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?)	4.00
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)*	**35.00**
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	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	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 Site 06

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 72.5%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	66 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	**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

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 and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	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

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

SITE Site 06

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 74.0%

Land Rating	66 /70
Design Rating	66 /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 (answe 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)**	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 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?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	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

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 and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	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

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

SITE Area 6

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

SITE	6	**Date: 2018-10-23**
OVERALL SCORE	**8/10** 78.9%	
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 (answe 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)**	**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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**30.00**
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	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

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)	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	3.00

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 *	**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	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 6

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 84.9%

Land Rating	63 /70
Design Rating	88 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe yes/no)**	**18.00**
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	2.00
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

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)*	**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

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

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 Site 07

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 67.9%

Date: 2018-10-23

Land Rating	62 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	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	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

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

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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 67.2%

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 (answe 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)**	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 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 (answe yes/no)**	22.00
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	4.00
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	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

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	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

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

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 Area 7

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

Date: 2018-10-22

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

SITE 7

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 78.9%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	79 /100
Impact Rating	68 /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 (answe 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)**	**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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**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)*	**30.00**
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	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

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)	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	3.00

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 *	**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

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 84.9%

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	90 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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

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)*	**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

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 Site 08 **Date: 2018-10-23**

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 70.6%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	60 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	**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)*	**20.00**
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	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	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)*	**24.00**
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)	3.00
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

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	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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 67.2%

Land Rating	55 /70
Design Rating	58 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe yes/no)**	**18.00**
Outside of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and ecological corridors	3.00
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?)	4.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	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

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
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	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	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**24.00**
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)	3.00
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

Design to make use of ecological service provision (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**7.00**
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	2.00
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	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 Area 8

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 82.3%

Land Rating	60 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	77 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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
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 *	**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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 77.7%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	79 /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 (answe 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)**	**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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**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)*	**30.00**
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	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

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)	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	3.00

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 *	**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

SITE 8

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 79.6%

Land Rating	55 /70
Design Rating	82 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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 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)*	**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

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

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 Site 09

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 84.9%

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)

Well-located land (answe 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 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?	4.00
Are there opportunities to increase resource efficiency in the municipality through retrofitting infrastructure reticulation and bulk services?	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	**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

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.	5.00
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	1.00
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	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

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	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	3.00
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)*	**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 *	**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 Site 09 **Date:** 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 88.7%

Land Rating	68 /70
Design Rating	82 /100
Impact Rating	85 /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 (answe 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)**	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)*	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

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	9.00
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	4.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	29.00
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	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	5.00
Services and clustered	5.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	4.00

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	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	3.00
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)*	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 *	16.00
No Cost	3.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	5.00
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 Area 9

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

SITE 9

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 86.0%

Land Rating	68 /70
Design Rating	86 /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 (answe 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)**	**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)*	**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

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	**31.00**
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	5.00
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	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)	3.00
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	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: *	**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 *	**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 9

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 89.4%

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	93 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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)*	**35.00**
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	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 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)	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)*	**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 Site 10 **Date: 2018-10-23**

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 75.1%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	67 /100
Impact Rating	70 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	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)*	20.00
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	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)*	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	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	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 *	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 Site 10 **Date:** 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 75.1%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	67 /100
Impact Rating	70 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	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)*	20.00
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	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)*	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	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	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 *	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 Area 10

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

SITE 10

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.1%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	82 /100
Impact Rating	71 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	**9.00**
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	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**28.00**
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	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)*	**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)	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)*	**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	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

SITE 10

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 89.1%

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	92 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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)	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)*	**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 Site 11

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 69.1%

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)

Well-located land (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	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

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.	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	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)	2.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
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	3.00
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)*	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 *	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: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

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

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE: Site 11

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE 7/10 69.1%

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)

Well-located land (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	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

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.	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	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)	2.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
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	3.00
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)*	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 *	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: *	12.00
Municipality	4.00
Larger Town Residents	4.00
New Development Residents	4.00

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

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE Area 11

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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

SITE 11

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 77.0%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	76 /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)

Well-located land (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	9.00
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	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
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	2.00
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

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	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	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 *	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: *	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

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 11

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 88.3%

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	90 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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)*	**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

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)	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)*	**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 Site 12

OVERALL SCORE **6/10** 61.1%

Date: 2018-10-23

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	39 /100
Impact Rating	62 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	**2.00**
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	1.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**13.00**
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	1.00
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)	2.00

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

IMPACT RATING

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

SITE Site 12

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **6/10** 61.1%

Land Rating	61 /70
Design Rating	39 /100
Impact Rating	62 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	**2.00**
Identify opportunities to connect the project site to surrounding street layout and fabric	1.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**13.00**
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	1.00
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)	2.00

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

IMPACT RATING

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

SITE Area 12

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 85.7%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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

SITE 12

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 77.7%

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 (answe 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)**	17.00
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)?	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)*	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 (answe 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)*	26.00
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	2.00
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	5.00
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)*	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)	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)*	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 *	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

SITE 12

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **9/10** 88.3%

Land Rating	70 /70
Design Rating	90 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 (answe 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)*	**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

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)	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)*	**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 Site 13 **Date: 2018-10-23**

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 80.4%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	71 /100
Impact Rating	80 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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)*	**9.00**
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	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	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 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)*	**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

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 *	**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: *	**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

SITE Site 13 **Date: 2018-10-23**

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 82.3%

Land Rating	64 /70
Design Rating	73 /100
Impact Rating	81 /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 (answe 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)**	**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 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)*	**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 reticulation and bulk services?	3.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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)*	**23.00**
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	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 and clustered	4.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	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

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

SITE Area 13

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 84.2%

Land Rating	60 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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
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

SITE 13

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 78.5%

Land Rating	62 /70
Design Rating	70 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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 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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**8.00**
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	5.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**24.00**
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	2.00
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

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**30.00**
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	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)*	**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

SITE 13

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 81.1%

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 (answe 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)**	**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

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 (answe 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	3.00
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	4.00

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)*	**28.00**
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	4.00
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)	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**30.00**
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	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)*	**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 *	**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 Site 14

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 66.4%

Date: 2018-10-23

Land Rating	49 /70
Design Rating	59 /100
Impact Rating	68 /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 (answe yes/no)**	6.00
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?	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 (answe 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)*	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
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	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

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 *	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 14

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 67.2%

Land Rating	49 /70
Design Rating	59 /100
Impact Rating	70 /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 (answe yes/no)**	6.00
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?	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 (answe 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)*	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
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	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

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

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 75.1%

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	70 /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 (answe 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 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 (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)*	**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 *	**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

SITE	**14**	**Date: 2018-10-23**
OVERALL SCORE	**7/10** 73.6%	
Land Rating	58 /70	
Design Rating	61 /100	
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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 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)*	**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 (answe 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 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

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
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	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)	3.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**26.00**
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	4.00
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

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: *	**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

SITE 14

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 72.8%

Land Rating	59 /70
Design Rating	60 /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 (answe 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)**	**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

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 (answe 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 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

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
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	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)	4.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**27.00**
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	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

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 Site 15

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 66.8%

Land Rating	49 /70
Design Rating	57 /100
Impact Rating	71 /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 (answe 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)**	**17.00**
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?	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)*	**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 (answe 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)*	**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)*	**12.00**
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	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**26.00**
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	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)*	**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 *	**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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE 7/10 67.5%

Land Rating	49 /70
Design Rating	57 /100
Impact Rating	73 /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 (answe 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)**	17.00
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?	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)*	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 (answe 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)*	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)*	12.00
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	1.00
Services and clustered	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	26.00
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	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)*	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: *	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 Area 15

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 75.1%

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	70 /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 (answe 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 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 (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)*	**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 *	**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

SITE	15
OVERALL SCORE	**7/10** 74.3%

Date: 2018-10-23

Land Rating	50 /70
Design Rating	71 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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)**	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

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 (answe 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 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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	25.00
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	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

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	31.00
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)	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

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: *	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

SITE 15

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 75.5%

Land Rating	59 /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 (answe 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)**	**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

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 (answe 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 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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**25.00**
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	4.00
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)	4.00

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)	1.00
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

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 Site 16 Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **5/10** 53.2%

Land Rating	41 /70
Design Rating	42 /100
Impact Rating	58 /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 (answe 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)**	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

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 (answe 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)*	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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
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	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	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	19.00
Easy to navigate street layout	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

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 *	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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **5/10** 53.6%

Land Rating	41 /70
Design Rating	42 /100
Impact Rating	59 /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 (answe 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)**	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

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 (answe 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)*	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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	10.00
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	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	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	19.00
Easy to navigate street layout	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

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 *	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

SITE Area 16

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 75.8%

Land Rating	44 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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 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

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 *	**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

SITE 16

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 70.2%

Land Rating	46 /70
Design Rating	64 /100
Impact Rating	76 /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 (answe 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)**	**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

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 (answe 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 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

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

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

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

SITE 16

Date: 2018-10-16

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 74.7%

Land Rating	57 /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 (answe 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)**	**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?	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 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 (answe 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 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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**25.00**
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	4.00
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)	4.00

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)	1.00
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

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 Site 17

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **6/10** 55.1%

Land Rating	41 /70
Design Rating	45 /100
Impact Rating	60 /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 (answe yes/no)**	**6.00**
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?	5.00

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

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 (answe 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 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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**10.00**
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	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	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

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	3.00
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)*	**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 *	**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 *	**10.00**
Maximise integration with existing urban context	2.00
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	Date: 2018-10-23
OVERALL SCORE	**6/10** 55.8%	
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 (answe yes/no)**	6.00
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?	5.00

Accessibility and Integration (answer yes/no)**	10.00
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)?	2.00
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)*	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 (answe 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

DESIGN RATING

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	3.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	2.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	11.00
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	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	4.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

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	3.00
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)*	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 *	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

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 75.8%

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	81 /100
Impact Rating	72 /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 (answe 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 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 (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	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

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 *	**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

SITE 17

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **6/10** 62.3%

Land Rating	38 /70
Design Rating	54 /100
Impact Rating	73 /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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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
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)*	**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

SITE	17
OVERALL SCORE	**6/10** 61.1%
Land Rating	37 /70
Design Rating	51 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Date: 2018-10-16

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 (answe 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

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 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?	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 (answe 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 Site 18

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **5/10** 52.1%

Land Rating	33 /70
Design Rating	45 /100
Impact Rating	60 /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 (answe yes/no)**	**6.00**
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?	5.00

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

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 (answe 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

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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**11.00**
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	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	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

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	3.00
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)*	**8.00**
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
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 *	**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

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE Site 18 — Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **5/10** 54.3%

Land Rating	36 /70
Design Rating	48 /100
Impact Rating	60 /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 (answe yes/no)**	6.00
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?	5.00

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

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 (answe yes/no)**	16.00
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?)	1.00
Not on high agricultural land or soil	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

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	11.00
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	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	3.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	1.00

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	3.00
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)*	8.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
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 *	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

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE Area 18

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **8/10** 78.1%

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 (answe 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 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 (answe 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?)	- 1.00
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 *	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

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

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **6/10** 55.8%

Land Rating	34 /70
Design Rating	47 /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 (answe yes/no)**	**2.00**
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?	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 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 (answe 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

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
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	3.00
Services and clustered	2.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	2.00

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**18.00**
Easy to navigate street layout	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

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: *	**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

SITE	18	**Date: 2018-10-16**
OVERALL SCORE	**6/10** 55.8%	
Land Rating	34 /70	
Design Rating	40 /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 (answe 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

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 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?	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 (answe 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 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

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
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	1.00
Street lighting does not shine light upwards	5.00
Includes space for organic waste management (collection, storage, sorting, recycling)	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

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 Site 19 **Date: 2018-10-23**

OVERALL SCORE **6/10** 58.1%

Land Rating	33 /70
Design Rating	60 /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 (answe yes/no)**	**6.00**
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?	5.00

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?	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)?	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)*	**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 (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 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

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**9.00**
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	4.00

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.	3.00
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	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)*	**24.00**
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)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00
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)*	**8.00**
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
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: *	**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 19

Date: 2018-10-23

OVERALL SCORE **6/10** 64.2%

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	60 /100
Impact Rating	62 /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 (answe 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)**	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?	3.00
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)*	6.00
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?	4.00

Safe from environmental risks and ecologically sensitive areas (answe 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

DESIGN RATING

Design for spatial integration (answer from most likely to least likely)*	9.00
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	4.00

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.	3.00
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	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)*	24.00
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)	3.00
Streets designed for universal access	3.00
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)*	8.00
Improve ecological value with indigenous vegetation	3.00
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: *	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 *	12.00
Maximise integration with existing urban context	3.00
Maximise access to employment opportunities	3.00
Maximise quality living environment for residents	4.00
Maximise access to social amenities	2.00

Sustainable land procurement for Kleinmond human settlements

SITE Area 19

Date: 2018-10-22

OVERALL SCORE **7/10** 74.0%

Land Rating	48 /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 (answe 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 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 (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)*	**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 *	**10.00**
Minimise resource consumption	1.00
Maximise resource efficiency	2.00
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

SITE	19
OVERALL SCORE	6/10 64.5%

Date: 2018-10-23

Land Rating	48 /70
Design Rating	57 /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)

Well-located land (answe yes/no)**	2.00
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?	1.00

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)*	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)**	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

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	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	15.00
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	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

Design for accessibility (answer from most likely to least likely)*	28.00
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 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 *	9.00
No Cost	1.00
Capital Savings	3.00
Spend a little, save a lot	3.00
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 *	16.00
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	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

SITE	19
OVERALL SCORE	**6/10** 64.9%
Land Rating	44 /70
Design Rating	54 /100
Impact Rating	74 /95

Date: 2018-10-16

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 (answe yes/no)**	**4.00**
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?	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

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)**	**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

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	5.00
The site is not a separate entity to the existing urban fabric and has multiple movement links to its context	1.00

Design for resource efficiency (answer from most likely to least likely)*	**15.00**
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	1.00
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)*	**28.00**
Easy to navigate street layout	2.00
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	4.00
Parking space is provided according to needs of community and in places where it is not a nuisance or hazard	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