

SLAA Assessment Criteria Note

SLAA Assessment Criteria Note

Item	Subject
1.	<p>ABSOLUTE CONSTRAINTS</p> <p>If any of the following conditions are fulfilled, the site will be completely ruled out of the SLAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site lies in the Metropolitan Green Belt (Policy CP5 and Draft Policy S13, CO1) ▪ Site lies in Flood Zone 3b (Policy DC22 and Draft Policy S3) ▪ Site lies within a Green Wedge or Green Corridor (Policy DC9 and Draft Policy S13, CO1) ▪ Site lies within a Special Area of Conservation, RAMSAR or Special Protection Area ▪ Site lies within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) ▪ Site lies within a Registered Park or Garden of Special Historic Interest ▪ Site contains all or part of a Scheduled Monument ▪ Site lies on route of safeguarded corridor for strategic Trunk roads ▪ Sites highly unlikely to be available during the SLAA period ▪ Sites highly unlikely to be achievable during the SLAA period ▪ Allocated Mineral sites or Mineral sites with extant Planning Permission¹ ▪ Allocated Waste sites or Waste sites with extant Planning Permission² <p>Where only part of the site falls within one of these designations, only the part of the site which falls outside of the designation is considered in the SLAA (subject to the inclusion of a suitable buffer where appropriate).</p>
2.	<p>‘SUITABILITY’ CRITERIA</p> <p>Note: <u>Underlined</u> criteria are considered particularly important. If a site achieves a low score against any underlined criteria, the site’s overall suitability score will be capped accordingly (as described in more detail below). Where a site falls only partially within a designation which constitutes a key criterion, we will look at the possibility of excluding part of the site and assessing only those parts of the site which fall outside the designation.</p> <p>2a. Policy Restrictions or Limitations</p> <p><i>Suitability of Location for Development (Local Plan Policy CP5 and Draft Policy S14, CO1)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site is in Chelmsford or South Woodham Ferrers Urban Area, or Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan 5 ▪ Site is within a Defined Settlement Boundary 4 ▪ Site is adjacent to Chelmsford or South Woodham Ferrers Urban Area, or Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan 3 ▪ Site is adjacent to a Defined Settlement Boundary 2 ▪ Site is outside of any Defined Settlement Boundary or Town/City/Urban area in the countryside 0 <p><i>Impact on Areas of Defined Open Space (Local Plan Policy DC39 and Draft Policy CA2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site not within an area defined as Public Open Space or ‘Other’ Green Space 5 ▪ Site partially within an area defined as Public Open Space or ‘Other’ Green Space 3 ▪ Site wholly within an area defined as Public Open Space or ‘Other’ Green Space 0

¹ Preferred and reserved Mineral sites identified in the Essex County Council Minerals Plan (2014)

² Sites in the Essex County Council Replacement Waste plan (2017)

Item	Subject
	<p><i>Impact on Locally Protected Natural Features (Local Plan Policy DC10, DC13, DC14 and Draft Policy NE1, NE2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site not within an area of Ancient Woodland, Local Wildlife site, Local Nature Reserve, Essex Wildlife Site or Coastal Protection Belt 5 ▪ Site partially within an area of Ancient Woodland, Local Wildlife site, Local Nature Reserve, Essex Wildlife Site or Coastal Protection Belt 3 ▪ Site wholly within an area of Ancient Woodland, Local Wildlife site, Local Nature Reserve, Essex Wildlife Site or Coastal Protection Belt 0 <p>2b. Physical Problems or Limitations</p> <p>It is outside the scope of a strategic study of this nature to assess physical constraints in depth. Thus, the following criteria focus on <u>obvious</u> constraints or those constraints identified by statutory consultees.</p> <p>Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No known constraints to achieving a suitable access 5 ▪ Some minor constraints to achieving a suitable access 3 ▪ Achieving a suitable access likely to be subject to significant constraints 0 <p><i>Impact on Air Quality Management Area's (Policy DC28 and Draft Policy PA2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site more than 800m away from a designated AQMA 5 ▪ Site is between 200 and 800m from a designated AQMA 3 ▪ Site is within 200m of a designated AQMA 0 <p><i>Bad Neighbour Constraints</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site has no 'bad neighbours' 5 ▪ Site has bad neighbours with potential for mitigation 3 ▪ Site has bad neighbours with no potential for mitigation 0 <p><i>Ground Condition Constraints (Policy DC26, DC27 and Draft Policy PA2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Treatment not expected to be required (e.g. sites within primarily residential areas, where there is no obvious indication of previous contaminating uses) 5 ▪ Treatment expected to be required on part of the site (e.g. sites where an existing industrial use occupies only a small proportion of the overall site area) 3 ▪ Treatment expected to be required on the majority of the site (e.g. sites within employment areas, which would potentially require contamination treatment) 0 <p><u><i>Impact on Flood Risk Areas (Policy DC22 and Draft Policy S3, NE3) (as defined by the SFRA Flood Maps)</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site is within Flood Zone 1 5 ▪ Site is wholly or partially within Flood Zone 2 4 ▪ 10% - 25% of site area is within Flood Zone 3 2 ▪ 25% - 50% of site area is within Flood Zone 3 1 ▪ Over 50% of site area is within Flood Zone 3 0 <p><i>Minerals Constraints</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site does not fall within an identified Mineral Safeguarding Area 5 ▪ Site is wholly or partially within an identified Mineral Safeguarding Area 0 <p>Where a site falls within a Mineral Safeguarded Area but Essex County Council, as the Minerals</p>

Item	Subject												
	<p>Authority, has assessed the site as not requiring a Minerals Resource Assessment the site has been given a score of 5.</p> <p>Overall Score for ‘Suitability’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum possible unweighted ‘suitability’ score = 45 (i.e. 9 criteria, each with a maximum potential score of 5) Sites with a total ‘suitability’ score of over 36 are given an overall suitability score of 3 (site is suitable and could go to make up part of the five year supply). Sites with a total ‘suitability’ score of 21-35 are given an overall suitability score of 2 (site is potentially suitable but faces some constraints and should not be included in the five year supply). Sites with a total ‘suitability’ score of under 20 are given an overall suitability score of 1 (site faces significant suitability constraints). Criteria marked by underlining are particularly important. If a site scores 0 against any of these criteria, the site can only achieve a maximum overall ‘suitability’ score of 1. If a site scores 3 against any of these underlined criteria, the site can only achieve a maximum overall ‘suitability’ score of 2. 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. 												
3.	<p>‘AVAILABILITY’ CRITERIA</p> <p>It is outside the scope of a strategic study of this nature to collect and assess detailed information on legal and ownership issues. Thus, sites will be scored on the basis of available information as follows:</p> <table> <tr> <td>▪ Held by developer/willing owner/public sector (e.g. Call for Sites submissions, and sites being actively marketed), and sites where it is known that pre-application discussions are underway</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Vacant land and buildings</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Low intensity land uses (e.g. agriculture, informal car parking)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Established single use (e.g. business, sports club, school)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Established multiple uses (e.g. industrial estate, retail parade)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ Thought to be in particularly complex/multiple ownership, or apparently subject to ransom strip</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table> <p>Note: Where a site is known to be held by a developer, willing owner or public sector body then it should score 5 even if one of the other conditions is also fulfilled – so, for example, an established business where the site is being promoted for housing by the landowner would score 5.</p> <p>Overall Score for ‘Availability’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The above key criterion directly scores the ‘availability’ of each site. A score of 5 or 4 gives an overall ‘Availability’ score of 3 (site is available and can be included in the 5 year supply). A score of 3 or 2 gives an overall ‘Availability’ score of 2 (site is potentially available but faces some constraints and should not be included in the 5 year supply). A score of 1 or 0 gives an overall ‘Availability’ score of 1 (site faces significant availability constraints). 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. 	▪ Held by developer/willing owner/public sector (e.g. Call for Sites submissions, and sites being actively marketed), and sites where it is known that pre-application discussions are underway	5	▪ Vacant land and buildings	4	▪ Low intensity land uses (e.g. agriculture, informal car parking)	3	▪ Established single use (e.g. business, sports club, school)	2	▪ Established multiple uses (e.g. industrial estate, retail parade)	1	▪ Thought to be in particularly complex/multiple ownership, or apparently subject to ransom strip	0
▪ Held by developer/willing owner/public sector (e.g. Call for Sites submissions, and sites being actively marketed), and sites where it is known that pre-application discussions are underway	5												
▪ Vacant land and buildings	4												
▪ Low intensity land uses (e.g. agriculture, informal car parking)	3												
▪ Established single use (e.g. business, sports club, school)	2												
▪ Established multiple uses (e.g. industrial estate, retail parade)	1												
▪ Thought to be in particularly complex/multiple ownership, or apparently subject to ransom strip	0												

Item	Subject
4.	<p>ACHIEVABILITY' CRITERIA</p> <p>4a. Market/Cost/Delivery Factors</p> <p>Deliverability of the Site</p> <p>We will score on the basis of known information (e.g. on land values, locality, market conditions, physical constraints, etc), using a sliding scale as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good marketability and/or viability. Site faces few achievability constraints and is likely to be achievable within 5 years 3 ▪ Moderate marketability and/or viability. Site is potentially achievable but faces some constraints and should not be included in the 5 year supply 2 ▪ Poor marketability and/or viability. Site faces significant achievability constraints and is unlikely to be achievable within the first ten years of the study 1 <p>Overall Score for 'Achievability'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The above key criterion directly scores the 'achievability' of each site. ▪ The 'availability' score can range from 1 to 3
5.	<p>OVERALL SCORE AND SITE CATEGORISATION</p> <p>Each site thus achieves three separate scores, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ an overall 'suitability score' of 3, 2 or 1; ▪ an overall 'availability score' of 3, 2 or 1; and ▪ an overall 'achievability score' of 3, 2 or 1. <p>The sites are assigned to an overall Category band (1, 2 or 3) on the basis of these scores. Our approach to site categorisation is set out in Table 5.1 below.</p> <p>In sum, 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'; that means according to footnote 11 of the NPPF 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 and in particular that development of the site is viable'. Category 1 sites must, therefore, attain high overall scores against each of the suitability and availability criteria, and a moderate to high overall score against the achievability criteria.</p> <p>Sites designated as 'Category 2' are those likely to be 'developable' over the next 10 years, but which are not deliverable within the first 5 years. Footnote 12 of the NPPF defines that 'to be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged'. Category 2 sites must, therefore, attain a high overall score against the 'suitability' criteria, and reasonable overall scores against the 'availability' and 'achievability' criteria.</p> <p>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 unlikely to come forward for development in the next 10 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>

Item	Subject																																										
<p>Table 5.1 – Summary of Site Categorisation Methodology</p> <table> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th><th rowspan="2">Permutation of Scores</th><th colspan="3">Overall Score (out of 5)</th></tr> <tr> <th>Suitability Criteria</th><th>Availability Criteria</th><th>Achievability Criteria</th></tr> <tr> <td>Category 1 – Deliverable Sites</td><td>A</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Category 2 – Developable Sites</td><td>A</td><td>2</td><td>2 – 3</td><td>2 - 3</td></tr> <tr> <td>B</td><td>2 – 3</td><td>2</td><td>2 – 3</td></tr> <tr> <td>C</td><td>2 - 3</td><td>2 - 3</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Category 3 – Not Currently Developable Sites</td><td>A</td><td>1</td><td>1 – 3</td><td>1 – 3</td></tr> <tr> <td>B</td><td>1 – 3</td><td>1</td><td>1 - 3</td></tr> <tr> <td>C</td><td>1 - 3</td><td>1 - 3</td><td>1</td></tr> </table> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thus Table 5.1 shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 1 sites must achieve high overall scores of 3 against the suitability, availability and achievability criteria; Category 2 sites achieve moderate (but not low) overall scores against one, two or all three of the criteria. Thus, if a site achieves an overall score of 2 against the suitability criteria, or 2 against the availability criteria, or 2 against the achievability criteria – and scores higher than 1 for all criteria - it is designated as Category 2; and Category 3 sites achieve low scores against one, two or all three of the criteria. Thus, if a site achieves an overall score of 1 against the suitability criteria, or 1 against the availability criteria, or 1 against the achievability criteria, it is designated as Category 3. 		Permutation of Scores	Overall Score (out of 5)			Suitability Criteria	Availability Criteria	Achievability Criteria	Category 1 – Deliverable Sites	A	3	3	3	Category 2 – Developable Sites	A	2	2 – 3	2 - 3	B	2 – 3	2	2 – 3	C	2 - 3	2 - 3	2	Category 3 – Not Currently Developable Sites	A	1	1 – 3	1 – 3	B	1 – 3	1	1 - 3	C	1 - 3	1 - 3	1				
			Permutation of Scores	Overall Score (out of 5)																																							
	Suitability Criteria	Availability Criteria		Achievability Criteria																																							
Category 1 – Deliverable Sites	A	3	3	3																																							
Category 2 – Developable Sites	A	2	2 – 3	2 - 3																																							
	B	2 – 3	2	2 – 3																																							
	C	2 - 3	2 - 3	2																																							
Category 3 – Not Currently Developable Sites	A	1	1 – 3	1 – 3																																							
	B	1 – 3	1	1 - 3																																							
	C	1 - 3	1 - 3	1																																							