

Appendix 1: 'Matrix' methodology

Consideration	Score	Weighting	Weighted Scores
Estimated resource to close case	3 – likely to be minimal resource to achieve resolution, less than 4 person day 2 – likely to be average resource, 4-10 person days 1 – likely to be significant resource required to resolve, over 10 person days	X2	6 4 2
Planning./criminal Immunity	3 – immune in 6 months or not known 2 – immune in 2 years 1 – immunity more than 2 years away	X3	9 6 3
Degree of harm	3 – irreparable or serious long term harm to environment or serious risk to public safety 2 – significant harm or loss of amenity 1 – sufficient harm or loss or amenity so that planning permission would not be granted, or would be granted only subject to conditions	X8.5	25.5 17 8.5
Local priorities	3 – high profile developers with more than 3 breaches where notices have been served or formal legal action taken in last 4 years OR in breach of approved conditions 2 – all other cases not failing within categories 1 or 3 1 – householders or small businesses – where impact of action is high or may result in loss of jobs or business	X2	6 4 2
Policy framework	3 – clear policy, legislative or national guidance support for refusing development 2 – policy, legislative or national guidance framework for refusing development possibly exists 1 – untested or non-existent policy, legislative or national guidance framework for refusing development	X3	9 6 3
Future impact	3 – situation will deteriorate if no action taken soon 2 – situation may deteriorate if no action taken soon 1 – situation not likely to deteriorate if no action taken soon	X2	6 4 2
ASB & Crime	3 – Serious organised crime 2 – Crime committed at a low level 1 – Anti-social behaviour causing nuisance or distress	x5	20 10 5
Illegal Activity	3 – Organised illegal activity causing greater harm of indictable or either way offences 2 – Activity causing lesser harm but at summary offence level 1 – Causing nuisance to local communities (as defined by the Crime and Policing Act 2014)	x3	8 6 2

Notes – A score is given to each consideration, as the importance of each consideration varies they are given weightings which are used to produce the final score (the weighted score column)

Worked Example (unauthorised caravan site)

Consideration	Score	Weighting	Weighted Scores
<i>Estimated resource to close case</i>	<i>3 – likely to be minimal resource to achieve resolution, less than 4 person days</i>	X2	6
<i>Immunity</i>	<i>3 – immune in 6 months</i>	X3	9
<i>Degree of harm</i>	<i>3 – irreparable or serious long term harm to environment or serious risk to public safety</i>	X 8.5	25.5
<i>Local priorities</i>	<i>3 – high profile developers with more than 3 breaches where notices have been served or formal legal action taken in last 4 years OR in breach of approved conditions</i>	X2	6
<i>Policy framework</i>	<i>3 – clear policy, legislative or national guidance support for refusing development</i>	X3	9
<i>Future impact</i>	<i>3 – situation will deteriorate if no action taken soon</i>	X2	6
		Total	61.5

Summary

The highest score is taken for each criterion due to the circumstances of the particular case, (i.e. 3 for immunity x weighting of 3 gives a score of 9) this gives the highest possible total score in this case of 61.5 and is therefore top priority.