

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Criteria Note**

Item	Subject
1.	<p><b>OVERVIEW</b></p> <p>The Strategic Housing and Employment Availability Assessment (SHELAA) is a desk-based assessment that, in line with NPPF and PPG guidance, scores submitted sites against Suitability, Availability and Achievability criteria. The outcome of these scores will determine whether a site is likely deliverable, developable or neither.</p>
2.	<p><b>CONSTRAINTS</b></p> <p>Two categories of constraints are taken into consideration within the SHELAA: Absolute Constraints and Capped Constraints.</p> <p><b>ABSOLUTE CONSTRAINT</b></p> <p>If any portion of the submitted site lies within land considered to be a hazard to human health, this part of the site will be discounted from the SHELAA assessment.</p> <p>The remaining portion of the site will then be assessed against the suitability, availability and achievability criteria listed further on within this document.</p> <p>We consider a hazard constraint to include: gas pipelines, electricity towers, electricity substations, gas installation buffers, gas pipeline feeders, high pressure gas pipelines, gas pipeline buffers and oil pipelines.</p> <p><b>CAPPED CONSTRAINTS</b></p> <p>If any part of the site meets the criteria detailed below, the assessment will cap the site's weighted Suitability Score and resultantly cap the overall Category for the site. Please note that some designations will include a suitable land buffer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a site proposed for any use other than employment or retail lies outside of any Defined Settlement Boundary (Policy S7)</li> <li>• Where a site proposed for any use other than employment lies within an existing/proposed employment area (Policy DM4)</li> <li>• Where a site proposed for any use other than ground floor retail lies within the Primary frontage, Secondary frontage, a Principal Neighbourhood Centre or other Neighbourhood Centre (Policy DM5)</li> <li>• Site is in excess of 400m walking distance from any existing/proposed public transport service (Policy DM20)</li> <li>• Site lies within the Green Belt or a Green Wedge (Policies S11, DM6, DM7)</li> <li>• Site has identified constraints that would prevent the implementation of a vehicle access route to the site via road (Policies S9, DM20)</li> <li>• Site lies within a Waste/Minerals site or Waste/Minerals site with extant Planning Permission (Policy DM30)</li> <li>• Site proposed for residential or mixed use development which is constrained by lawful neighbouring uses with no potential for mitigation (Policy DM29)</li> <li>• Site would result in the loss (without replacement) of community facilities such as school/healthcare facility/place of worship/sports, leisure or recreation facility (Policies DM21, DM22)</li> <li>• Development on site is likely to be unviable (Policy S10)</li> </ul> <p>Details will be provided within the site output sheet to indicate why the score has been capped. More information on scoring can be found under item 6.</p>

	<p>In exceptional circumstances, there may be additional constraints not listed above that will be taken into account within a site assessment. These exceptions will always be fully explained within the site output sheet.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>'SUITABILITY' CRITERIA</b></p> <p>The following criteria are predominantly assessed using evidence from Chelmsford City Council's GIS mapping and using information provided by the site submitter.</p> <p>Each site is assigned a weighted suitability score based upon its performance within the criteria detailed below. 1 is regarded as the best possible suitability score, whilst 3 is regarded as the worst. More information on scoring can be found under item 6.</p> <p>Note: Underlined criteria are Policy Restrictions and therefore considered particularly important. For criteria with a <u>single underline</u>, if a site achieves a score of (0) under any underlined criteria, the site's overall weighted suitability score will be capped at 2. For criteria with a <u>double underline</u>, if a site achieves a score of (0) under any underlined criteria, the site's overall weighted suitability score will be capped at 3.</p> <p><b>3a. Physical Criteria</b></p> <p><b><u>Locality of Development</u></b></p> <p>(5) Site is within the Chelmsford Urban Area or South Woodham Ferrers Urban Area  (4) Site is within a Defined Settlement Boundary  (3) Site is adjacent to the Chelmsford Urban Area or South Woodham Ferrers Urban Area  (2) Site is adjacent to a Defined Settlement Boundary  (0) Site is outside of any Defined Settlement Boundary</p> <p><b><u>Proximity to Employment Development</u></b></p> <p><i>Where site is NOT proposed for employment development:</i></p> <p>(5) Site is outside of any existing/proposed employment allocation  (3) Site is adjacent to an existing/proposed employment allocation  (0) Site is wholly/partially located within an existing/proposed employment allocation</p> <p><b><u>Proximity to Retail Development</u></b></p> <p><i>Where site is NOT proposed for retail development:</i></p> <p>(5) Site is outside of any primary/secondary frontage, Principal Neighbourhood Centre or other Neighbourhood Centre  (3) Site is adjacent to a primary/secondary frontage, Principal Neighbourhood Centre or other Neighbourhood Centre  (0) Site is wholly/partially located within a primary/secondary frontage, Principal Neighbourhood Centre or other Neighbourhood Centre</p> <p><b>Proximity to the Workplace</b></p> <p><i>Where site is proposed for residential development:</i></p> <p>(5) Site is within 2km walking distance of an employment allocation  (0) Site is in excess of 2km walking distance of an employment allocation</p> <p><b>Proximity to the Workforce</b></p> <p><i>Where site is proposed for employment or retail development:</i></p> <p>(5) Site is within 2km walking distance of the Chelmsford Urban Area or South Woodham Ferrers Urban Area and/or a Defined Settlement Boundary</p>

(0) Site is in excess of 2km walking distance of the Chelmsford Urban Area or South Woodham Ferrers Urban Area and/or a Defined Settlement Boundary

**Public Transport**

*For the purpose of this assessment, public transport services consist of proposed/existing bus stops, rail stations and park and ride facilities.*

- (5) Site is within 400m walking distance of all services
- (3) Site is within 400m walking distance of one or more services
- (0) Site is in excess of 400m walking distance from all services

**Vehicle Access**

*Visible constraints include (but are not limited to) all constraints listed in section 2 as well as established buildings and areas of designated open space*

- (5) A route exists enabling vehicle access into/adjacent to the site
- (3) There are no visible constraints that would likely prevent the implementation of a route enabling vehicle access into/adjacent to the site
- (0) There are visible constraints that would likely prevent the implementation of a route enabling vehicle access into/adjacent to the site

**Strategic Road Access**

*Where site is proposed for employment or retail development or Gypsy & Traveller use:*

- (5) Site has direct access to or is adjacent to the strategic road network
- (4) Site has direct access to or is adjacent to a primary road network
- (2) Site has direct access to or is adjacent to a safeguarded trunk road or B road
- (0) Site has no direct access to nor adjacent to the strategic road network, primary road network, a safeguarded trunk road or a B road

**Impact on Designated Heritage Assets**

*Designated heritage assets include: Grade 1 listed buildings, Grade 2\* listed buildings, Grade 2 listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Parks or Gardens of Special Historic Interest, Conservation Areas*

- (5) Site does not contain any designated heritage assets
- (3) Site is adjacent to one or more designated heritage assets
- (0) Site contains one or more designated heritage asset

**Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

*Non-designated heritage assets include: protected lanes, buildings of local land value and the inventory of landscape of local interest*

- (5) Site does not contain any non-designated heritage assets
- (3) Site is adjacent to one or more non-designated heritage assets
- (0) Site contains one or more non-designated heritage asset

**Impact on Archaeological Assets**

- (5) Site is not thought to contain any assets of archaeological interest
- (3) Site is thought to be adjacent to one or more assets of archaeological interest
- (0) Site is thought to contain one or more assets of archaeological interest

**Mineral and Waste Constraints**

- (5) Site does not fall within an identified Minerals or Waste Safeguarding Area
- (0) Site is wholly or partially within an identified Minerals or Waste Safeguarding Area

### **3b. Environmental Criteria**

#### **Impact on Areas of Defined Open Space**

*For the purpose of this assessment, 'Other' Green Space includes (but is not limited to) planned strategic landscape enhancements, future recreation areas and areas of Sustainable Drainage (SUDs)*

- (5) Site is not within an area defined as Open Space, an existing/proposed Country Park or 'Other' Green Space
- (3) Site is partially within an area defined as Open Space, an existing/proposed Country Park or 'Other' Green Space
- (0) Site is wholly within an area defined as Open Space, an existing/proposed Country Park or 'Other' Green Space

#### **Impact on the Green Belt & Green Wedge**

- (5) Site does not lie within the Metropolitan Green Belt or Green Wedge
- (3) Site partially lie within the Metropolitan Green Belt or Green Wedge
- (0) Site wholly lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt or Green Wedge

#### **Land Classification**

*Agricultural land classification categories are as per Natural England's ALC map East Region (ALC008)*

- (5) Site is predominantly Previously Developed Land
- (3) Site is predominantly Greenfield and primarily within the agricultural land classification/s: Grade 4, Grade 5, non-agricultural use, or urban use
- (1) Site is predominantly Greenfield and primarily within the agricultural land classification/s: Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3

#### **Impact on Locally Protected Natural Features**

- (5) Site does not comprise of any areas of: Ancient Woodland, TPOs, SSSIs, LoWs, Local Nature Reserve, RAMSAR, Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation, Essex Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve, Marine Conservation Zone or Coastal Protection Belt
- (3) Site partially comprises of areas of: Ancient Woodland, TPOs, SSSIs, LoWs, Local Nature Reserve, RAMSAR, Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation, Essex Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve, Marine Conservation Zone or Coastal Protection Belt
- (0) Site is wholly comprised of areas of: Ancient Woodland, TPOs, SSSIs, LoWs, Local Nature Reserve, RAMSAR, Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation, Essex Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve, Marine Conservation Zone or Coastal Protection Belt

#### **Impact on Flood Risk**

- (5) Site is within Flood Zone 1
- (4) Site is wholly or partially within Flood Zone 2
- (2) Up to 25% of site area is within Flood Zone 3
- (1) 25%-50% of site area is within Flood Zone 3
- (0) Over 50% of site area is within Flood Zone 3

#### **Impact on Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)**

- (5) Site is in excess of 500m from a designated AQMA
- (3) Site is within 500m from a designated AQMA
- (0) Site is within a designated AQMA

#### **Ground Condition Constraints**

- (5) Treatment is not expected to be required
- (3) Treatment expected to be required on part of the site
- (0) Treatment expected to be required on the majority of the site

### **3c. Social Criteria**

#### **Neighbouring Constraints**

*For the purpose of this assessment, a site has a neighbouring constraint if existing B2 or B8 use classes are present on or adjacent to the site; or if a major road or dual carriageway runs adjacent to the site.*

*Where site is proposed for any residential development excluding Gypsy & Traveller use:*

- (5) Site has no neighbouring constraints
- (3) Site has neighbouring constraints with potential for mitigation
- (0) Site has neighbouring constraints with no potential for mitigation

#### **Impact on Community Facilities**

(5) Site would not result in the loss (without replacement) of an existing/proposed school/healthcare facility/place of worship/sports, leisure or recreation facility

(0) Site would result in the loss (without replacement) of an existing/proposed school/healthcare facility/place of worship/sports, leisure or recreation facility

#### **Overall Score for 'Suitability'**

Note that, the proposed use of a site determines which Suitability criteria the site is tested against. This is to ensure that the assessment only takes into consideration factors that have the potential to impact the deliverability or developability of a site based on its use.

As a result, the maximum unweighted Suitability scores will vary depending on the proposed use. To account for this variation, the weighted Suitability scores are determined by their percentage of the maximum unweighted Suitability score for each proposed use.

Sites will receive an overall weighted suitability score of 1 (site is suitable and could go to make up part of the five-year supply), 2 (site is potentially suitable but faces some constraints and should not be included in the five-year supply) or 3 (site faces significant suitability constraints)

#### **Residential, Gypsy & Traveller and Specialist Accommodation**

- Maximum possible unweighted 'suitability' score of 95 (i.e. 19 criteria applied, each with a maximum potential score of 5)
- Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 76 or over (80% or over) are given an overall weighted suitability score of 1
- Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 38-75 (40%-79%) are given an overall suitability score of 2
- Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 37 or under are given an overall suitability score of 3.

#### **Employment and Retail**

- Maximum possible unweighted 'suitability' score of 90 (i.e. 18 criteria applied, each with a maximum potential score of 5)
- Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 72 or over (80% or over) are given an overall weighted suitability score of 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 36-71 (40%-79%) are given an overall suitability score of 2</li> <li>• Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 35 or under are given an overall suitability score of 3.</li> </ul> <p>Mixed Use and Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum possible unweighted 'suitability' score of 105 (i.e. 21 criteria applied, each with a maximum potential score of 5)</li> <li>• Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 84 or over (80% or over) are given an overall weighted suitability score of 1</li> <li>• Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 42-83 (40%-79%) are given an overall suitability score of 2</li> <li>• Sites with a total 'suitability' score of 41 or under are given an overall suitability score of 3.</li> </ul> <p>In exceptional circumstances, suitability factors not listed above may be taken into account to give a different overall score. These exceptions will always be explained fully in the sites database.</p>
4.	<p><b>'AVAILABILITY' CRITERIA</b></p> <p>Criteria are assessed using information provided within the SHELAA questionnaire in relation to ownership, legal constraints and relocation of existing uses. This assessment identifies issues which have an impact on when and if a site may become available for development.</p> <p>Each site is assigned a weighted availability score based upon its performance within the criteria detailed below. 1 is the best availability score, whilst 3 is the worst availability score. More information on scoring can be found under item 6.</p> <p><b>Ownership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(5) Held by developer/willing owner/public sector</li> <li>(3) Promoter has an option to purchase site or collaborate with existing owner</li> <li>(0) Known to be in particularly complex/multiple ownership</li> </ul> <p><b>Land Condition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(5) Vacant land and buildings</li> <li>(4) Established single use</li> <li>(3) Low intensity land use</li> <li>(2) Established multiple uses</li> </ul> <p><b>Legal Constraints</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(5) Site does not face any known legal issues</li> <li>(3) Site may possibly face legal issues</li> <li>(0) Site faces known legal issues</li> </ul> <p><b>Overall Score for 'Availability'</b></p> <p>Sites will receive an overall weighted availability score of 1 (site is available and could go to make up part of the five-year supply), 2 (site is potentially available but faces some constraints and should not be included in the five-year supply) or 3 (site faces significant availability constraints)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum possible unweighted ‘availability’ score of 15 (i.e. 3 criteria applied, each with a maximum potential score of 5)</li> <li>• Sites with a total ‘availability’ score of 12 or over (80% or over) are given an overall weighted availability score of 1</li> <li>• Sites with a total ‘availability’ score of 6-11 (40%-79%) are given an overall availability score of 2</li> <li>• Sites with a total ‘availability’ score of 10 or under are given an overall availability score of 3.</li> </ul> <p>In exceptional circumstances, availability factors not listed above may be taken into account to give a different overall score. These exceptions will always be explained fully in the sites database.</p>
5.	<p><b>‘ACHIEVABILITY’ CRITERIA</b></p> <p>Criteria are predominantly assessed using information provided within the SHELAA questionnaire in relation to viability and timescales for deliverability. Viability is also determined using the results detailed within the SHELAA Viability Study (see Appendix 2).</p> <p>Each site is assigned a weighted achievability score based upon its performance within the criteria detailed below. 1 is the best achievability score, whilst 3 is the worst achievability score. More information on scoring can be found under item 6.</p> <p>Note: Underlined criteria are Policy Restrictions and therefore considered particularly important. If a site achieves a score of (0) under any underline criteria, the site’s overall weighted achievability score will be capped at 2.</p> <p><b>Timescale for Deliverability</b></p> <p>(5) Up to 5 years  (3) 5 to 10 years  (2) 10 to 15 years  (0) Over 15 years</p> <p><b><u>Viability</u></b></p> <p>(5) Development is likely viable  (3) Development is marginal  (0) Development is likely unviable</p> <p><b>Overall Score for ‘Achievability’</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum possible unweighted ‘achievability’ score of 10 (i.e. 2 criteria applied, each with a maximum potential score of 5)</li> <li>• Sites with a total ‘achievability’ score of 8 or over (80% or over) are given an overall weighted achievability score of 1</li> <li>• Sites with a total ‘achievability’ score of 4-7 (40%-79%) are given an overall achievability score of 2</li> <li>• Sites with a total ‘achievability’ score of 6 or under are given an overall achievability score of 3.</li> </ul> <p>In exceptional circumstances, achievability factors not listed above may be taken into account to give a different overall score. These exceptions will always be explained fully in the sites database.</p>
6.	<b>OVERALL SCORE AND SITE CATEGORISATION</b>

Each site thus achieves three separate scores, as follows:

- An overall 'suitability' score of 1, 2 or 3;
- An overall 'availability' score of 1, 2 or 3;
- An overall 'achievability' score of 1, 2 or 3.

The sites are assigned to an overall Category band on the basis of these scores. Our approach to site categorisation is set out in Table 6.1 below:

**Table 6.1 – Summary of Site Categorisation Methodology**

	Permutation of Scores	Sustainability Criteria	Availability Criteria	Achievability Criteria
Category 1 – Deliverable Sites	A	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Category 2 – Developable Sites	A	<b>2</b>	1 – 2	1 – 2
	B	1 – 2	<b>2</b>	1 – 2
	C	1 – 2	1 – 2	<b>2</b>
Category 3 – Not Currently Developable Sites	A	<b>3</b>	1 – 3	1 – 3
	B	1 – 3	<b>3</b>	1 – 3
	C	1 – 3	1 – 3	<b>3</b>

Note: Scores which are highlighted in bold in each row are definitive in determining the Category band of a site (as long as the site also scores within the defined range for each of the other two criteria)

There are three possible permutations of scores for Category 2 and Category 3 sites. The three different permutations have been labelled A, B and C.

Hence, Table 6.1 shows that:

- Category 1 sites must achieve overall scores of 1 against the suitability, availability and achievability criteria;
- Category 2 sites achieve moderate (but not low) scores against one, two or all three criteria. Thus, if a site achieves an overall score of 2 against the suitability criteria, **and/or** 2 against the availability criteria, **and/or** 2 against the achievability criteria – and scores higher than 3 for all other criteria – it is designated as Category 2; and
- Category 3 sites achieve low scores against one, two or all three criteria. Thus, if a site achieves an overall score of 3 against the suitability criteria, **and/or** 3 against the availability criteria, **and/or** 3 against the achievability criteria, it is designated as Category 3.

In summary, if a site is to form part of the Council's five-year housing land supply (i.e. a Category 1 site), it must be 'deliverable'. According to NPPF definitions, that means that the site 'should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years'. Category 1 sites must, therefore, attain high overall scores against each of the 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability' criteria.

Sites designated as 'Category 2' are those likely to be 'developable' over the next 10-15 years, but which are not developable within the first five years. NPPF definitions state that to be considered developable, 'sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged'. Category 2 sites must, therefore, attain a moderate overall score against the 'suitability' and/or 'availability' and/or 'achievability' criteria, and a high overall score against any of these categories that have not attained a moderate score.

Category 3 sites are those which can be regarded as 'not currently developable'. These sites are not likely to be appropriate for residential development in their current form or are

	<p>unlikely to come forward for development within the next 10-15 year period, unless evidence is brought forward to demonstrate that the significant constraints can be overcome / mitigated. Category 3 sites, therefore, attain low scores against any or all of the 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability' criteria.</p>
--	---