



# Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) - Explanatory Note June 2019

## 1. Overview

- 1.1 National planning guidance requires local planning authorities to prepare and keep up-to-date a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)<sup>1</sup>. Its purpose is to provide information on the deliverability of sites for potential development.
- 1.2 A SHLAA is an evidence base document to inform and support the preparation of a Development Plan. Its principal aim is to identify sufficient sites within the local authority area that are capable of meeting the requirements identified for housing development over a plan period.
- 1.3 It is important to stress that the identification of a site in a SHLAA does not, in itself, determine whether or not it will be allocated for housing in the Development Plan. Nor does it imply that the site will receive planning permission. It is the role of the SHLAA to provide information on the range of sites which are available to meet need, and a distinction should be drawn between whether a site is suitable for development and whether development is appropriate on a particular site.
- 1.4 In short, the SHLAA is about whether a site *could* be developed; not whether a site *should* be developed.
- 1.5 More information about the SHLAA can be found on the District Council's website at [www.stratford.gov.uk/shlaa19](http://www.stratford.gov.uk/shlaa19).

## 2. Background

- 2.1 This new SHLAA updates and supersedes previous versions of the SHLAA that provided an input to the identification of housing allocations in the Core Strategy. This version is also the first to be prepared in accordance with the national Planning Practice

---

<sup>1</sup> See paragraph 67 in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), February 2019

Guidance (PPG)<sup>2</sup> and the joint methodology agreed in 2015 by the Warwickshire and Coventry local authorities to provide a consistent approach across the sub-region.

- 2.2 This particular SHLAA has been produced to inform the identification of reserve housing sites as required by the Core Strategy. Reserve sites will be identified in the Site Allocations Plan that, when adopted, will sit alongside the Core Strategy as the statutory Development Plan for Stratford-on-Avon District.
- 2.3 Section 7 below provides further explanation on the need for reserve sites and the relationship between the SHLAA and the Site Allocations Plan.
- 2.4 The PPG advises that a SHLAA should identify and assess all sites and broad locations regardless of the amount of development needed, in order to provide an audit of available land. However, the current version of the SHLAA has a more specific and focused purpose which is to inform the identification of reserve housing sites for inclusion in the SAP. For that reason it does not cover a number of matters that SHLAAs usually do, eg. assessing the scope for small-scale windfalls or the extent of the urban capacity of the District. This is because such sites are likely to conform to the Core Strategy and could come forward for development in any case. On that basis, they would not be suitable as reserve sites which will only be released for development if certain criteria are met.
- 2.5 Furthermore, its focus is on locations established in Core Strategy Policy CS.16: namely, Stratford-upon-Avon, Main Rural Centres, Local Service Villages outside the Green Belt and large freestanding sites. It does not cover other settlements or small greenfield sites in open countryside. Neither does it cover urban and rural brownfield sites because the principle of their redevelopment may be appropriate in any case.
- 2.6 The main outputs of this SHLAA are to:
  - Identify locations with potential as reserve housing sites in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS.16;
  - Assess the potential and capacity of sites by analysing their suitability, availability and achievability;
  - Identify constraints to the implementation of specific sites and the scope for effective mitigation; and
  - Assess when specific sites are capable of being developed if required.

#### *Relationship to the 'Call for Sites'*

- 2.7 A 'call for sites' is an opportunity for landowners and other interested parties to advise the Council about land that is potentially available for development. Unlike previous versions of the SHLAA, and in line with the PPG, this SHLAA does not rely solely on sites

---

<sup>2</sup> Planning Practice Guidance that accompanies the NPPF is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

that have been promoted to the Council. Instead, most land around applicable settlements has been assessed, together with specific locations in open countryside. Information from the 'call for sites' has been used to assist in assessing the availability and achievability of development.

### **3. Consultation on Draft SHLAA**

- 3.1 In undertaking the assessment of sites, the District Council is required to involve key parties who are able to assist the process of identifying deliverable sites. The draft SHLAA was published for consultation in August 2018 to provide an opportunity for further input from landowners, housebuilders, local communities, infrastructure providers and other agencies. The consultation notification explained that the SHLAA being produced at this time is to inform the selection of reserve housing sites.
- 3.2 A total of 520 responses were submitted. Most of these related to specific land parcels in the Draft SHLAA and how they had been assessed. However, some respondents also commented on the methodology being used and how this compared with national guidance and the sub-regional methodology. The opportunity was also taken to submit additional sites for consideration.
- 3.3 The responses submitted were considered in updating the SHLAA, although it should be borne in mind that a wide range of other changes have been made in the final version to reflect additional information and further assessment.

### **4. Methodology for identifying Land Parcels**

- 4.1 Because this SHLAA is being used to inform the selection of reserve housing sites, the focus of this SHLAA is on locations established in Core Strategy Policy CS.16; namely, Stratford-upon-Avon, Main Rural Centres, Local Service Villages and large freestanding sites. It does not cover other settlements or small greenfield sites in open countryside. Neither does it cover urban and rural brownfield sites because the principle of their redevelopment may be appropriate in any case.
- 4.2 Local Service Villages that are 'washed over' by Green Belt have also been excluded from this SHLAA. This is because the SHLAA is being used to identify reserve sites. In order for a site in the Green Belt to be allocated, it would first need to be removed from the Green Belt. It would not be logical to remove individual sites from the Green Belt without removing the adjacent settlement. Reviewing Green Belt boundaries is not part of the scope of the Site Allocations Plan on the basis that the 'parent' Core Strategy does not provide for amendments to be made to Green Belt boundaries to facilitate housing development. Furthermore, a detailed Green Belt Review has not been undertaken to inform this matter.
- 4.3 For each of the settlements to be covered in this SHLAA, land parcels were identified that abut their existing built form. The boundaries of these parcels mostly follow physical features on the ground except where they would otherwise have been too extensive.

- 4.4 In certain cases, land adjacent to settlements has not been covered if it is in a specific use, such as a sports ground, unless it has been promoted by the owner.
- 4.5 Land that lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 has generally been excluded because it is evident that sufficient land is present outside flood risk areas for the sequential approach to be applied.
- 4.6 The sub-regional methodology specifies that sites capable of providing fewer than five homes will not be identified in SHLAAs. The latest national guidance also advises that a site threshold of 0.25 hectares or 5 dwellings should be applied. In respect of this SHLAA it is deemed appropriate to apply a higher threshold of 50 dwellings to Stratford-upon-Avon and the Main Rural Centres because of their physical size and character. It is also appropriate to do so given this SHLAA's specific purpose to inform the identification of reserve sites rather than to provide a comprehensive basis for showing how the housing requirement for the District would be met. However, a degree of flexibility has been applied in assessing individual land parcels whereby the capacity of some of them is lower than this threshold.

## 5. Assessment of Land Parcels

- 5.1 The PPG requires the assessment of sites according to their suitability for housing, availability for development and achievability of implementation. The sub-regional methodology was applied to the assessment of land parcels, with a small number of minor adjustments and refinements based on the experience of applying the criteria to the character of Stratford District. The Site Evaluation Criteria is provided at **Appendix 1**.
- 5.2 Some concerns have been raised about the differences between the sub-regional methodology and that used by the District Council. These are minor refinements in order to apply the methodology effectively to Stratford District and do not change its substance. **Appendix 2** provides a comparison between the two and the reasons for these differences.
- 5.3 For all of the land parcels identified, an initial desk top survey was carried out based on the sub-regional methodology. The Council's comprehensive GIS data was used for this assessment.
- 5.4 It was supplemented by site visits in order to assess the relationship of each parcel, individually and comparatively, to the settlement and the landscape around it, and issues such as heritage and natural features, topography and neighbouring uses. The County Highway Authority advised on the scope to provide a vehicular access to sites.
- 5.5 In accordance with the sub-regional methodology, a Red-Amber-Green (RAG) convention has been used to assess each site against the criteria. For many criteria, the existence of a constraint that is considered able to be overcome is identified as Amber. For certain criteria where there is a major impact or constraint, a Red outcome is clearly appropriate.

5.6 The purpose of the RAG assessment is to highlight where issues that constrain sustainable development exist. The conclusions provide the opportunity for a professional judgement to be made, taking the assessment in the round, as to whether the existence of any particular constraint is of such significance that it renders the site undeliverable or inappropriate for development, having taken into account the scope for mitigation.

5.7 The following sub-sections cover the specific parts of the site assessment process identified in the flowchart in the PPG:

*(i) Suitability*

5.8 In assessing a parcel's suitability for housing, the following considerations were taken into account:

- policy designations, such as Green Belt, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Special Landscape Areas;
- protected areas of acknowledged importance, eg. Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Conservation Areas;
- potential impact upon local features including landscape, settlement character, natural and heritage assets;
- physical problems or limitations, including access, infrastructure, flood risk, contamination;
- environmental conditions which would be experienced by prospective residents;
- adverse impacts of development on nearby land uses;
- loss of existing uses on the site.

5.9 The overall suitability conclusion is derived from the consideration of these criteria and the application of professional judgement. The benefit of assessing sites in this way is that it simply and transparently highlights areas where issues may exist. It is not the case that the suitability of a parcel is determined by totalling up the number of criteria that have been satisfied.

*(ii) Availability*

5.10 A site is available for development when, on the best information available, there is confidence that no legal or ownership problems exist, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners. To be available, a site should be controlled by a housing developer who has expressed an intention to develop or by a landowner who would be prepared to sell the site for development.

5.11 The lack of availability of an individual site is only an issue if it is identified as being suitable and otherwise achievable for development.

*(iii) Achievability*

5.12 A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that residential development could be achieved on the site. Assessing achievability is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site and the ability of the developer

to implement a scheme. In the case of Stratford-on-Avon District, very few sites would not be attractive to housebuilders because the local housing market is so buoyant.

- 5.13 The SHLAA provides a starting point for the consideration of the viability of a site that will inevitably be informed by more detailed consideration and evidence as a site is progressed through the plan-making and planning application processes. Viability assessments for individual sites have not been carried out as part of this SHLAA. If there are obvious constraints present on a site that will have implications for the viability of development, such as extensive contamination as an example, these have been identified. In the absence of such constraints it is assumed that sites would be financially viable for development.

*(iv) Overall Deliverability*

- 5.14 Taking the suitability, availability and achievability assessments together, an overall conclusion is reached about the deliverability of each parcel. However, while conclusions can be drawn based on a comparative assessment of parcels, it is not as straightforward as adding up the number of Green, Amber and Red grades for an individual parcel because the criteria have not been weighted.
- 5.15 In practice, however, certain factors are more critical than others. For example, impact on a Conservation Area is more significant than impact on a Public Right of Way in that the former is a national designation which needs to be protected or enhanced by development and the latter can be overcome by incorporating the PROW into the development of the site.
- 5.16 Coming to an overall conclusion for each parcel involves making a judgement as to the relative importance of each factor, taking into account any designation that covers the land and the nature of any physical, environmental or technical constraints that have been identified.
- 5.17 A major change made between the draft and final versions of the SHLAA has been the insertion of an assessment of mitigation. As an outcome of this, a distinction is made between the initial overall deliverability and an adjusted overall deliverability for a site, having considered the scope for mitigation. For those land parcels which are Amber, the provision of mitigation measures are set out in the associated Site Proformas.

*(v) Development potential*

- 5.18 Establishing the appropriate number of homes that could be provided on a land parcel is an important aspect of establishing the eventual capacity of reserve sites, individually and cumulatively. This assessment has only been undertaken in this SHLAA for those land parcels that are deemed to be suitable, available and achievable.
- 5.19 For each of these land parcels, one of two approaches has been used to determine their capacity. For those parcels where most of the gross area is suitable for development a density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been applied to the net area, having taken structural landscaping and other specific factors into account. For those parcels where a significant part has been identified as not

appropriate for development (due to specific circumstances such as flood risk, settlement character, landscape impact), a 30dph density has been applied to the developable area only.

#### *(v) Timescales*

- 5.20 For those land parcels that are identified as being potential reserve sites, an indication is given as to the expected timescale for their delivery from the base date of the SHLAA (ie. 2018). These timescales depend on the information known about each site in relation to its suitability and availability for housing at the time of the assessment.
- 5.21 Assumptions have been made about build out rates and lead in times. In general terms, if there are no known constraints to development and the site is owned or controlled by a landowner/developer who is actively promoting it for development, it is placed in the 0-5 year timescale. If a site is complex, in multiple-ownership or has constraints to development, or there is no clear immediate intent to develop, it is assigned a later timescale, ie. 6-10 years or 11-15 years. Large sites can straddle more than one phasing period based on the likely rate of implementation.

## **6. Core Outputs**

- 6.1 In line with the PPG, this SHLAA is consistent with the following set of standard outputs, which should be produced from the assessment to ensure consistency, accessibility and transparency:
- a list of all sites considered, cross-referenced to their location shown on maps;
  - an assessment of each site, in terms of its suitability for development, availability and achievability, including whether it is viable, to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed and when;
  - contains more detail for those sites which are considered to be realistic candidates for development, whereas others have been discounted for clearly evidenced and justified reasons;
  - the potential quantity of dwellings that could be delivered on each site, including a reasonable estimate of build out rates, setting out how any barriers to delivery could be overcome and when.
- 6.2 Site Proformas for each of the land parcels that has the potential to be identified as a reserve housing site in the SAP are appended to the final version of the SHLAA.

## **7. Relationship to Reserve Sites and the Site Allocations Plan**

- 7.1 Whilst the Core Strategy already plans for sufficient numbers of homes to meet its housing needs, there are always risks that some sites with planning permission will not get built as and when expected, or that additional housing needs arise that should be met within the District. The NPPF requires Development Plans to provide flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances. If such

eventualities were to occur and such provision is not made, it could lead to an undersupply of housing and a risk that the Core Strategy will become out of date and no longer valid.

- 7.2 To prevent this from happening, a sensible and pragmatic approach is to identify 'reserve sites'. Such sites would only be brought forward for development within the plan period if monitoring showed there to be a shortfall in housing supply that could not be met elsewhere, or other specific circumstances arose that required the provision of more housing. It enables the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to retain control of and continue to manage development in the District. Reserve sites also provide certainty to communities as to where alternative or additional development could take place rather than having to react to speculative applications or appeals.
- 7.3 Policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy<sup>3</sup> specifies that sufficient reserve housing sites should be identified that are capable of meeting 20% of the housing requirement to 2031, i.e. around 2,920 homes, and identifies the specific circumstances where a reserve site may need to be released for development. These are:
- To rectify any identified shortfall in housing delivery in order to maintain a 5 year supply of housing land in Stratford-on-Avon District;
  - To contribute to meeting any identified additional need for housing in relation to a net growth in jobs at Jaguar Land Rover arising from development of the employment allocation at Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath;
  - To contribute to meeting within the District any identified shortfall in housing across the Coventry and Warwickshire HMA as demonstrated through the agreed outcomes of ongoing joint working between the Coventry and Warwickshire local planning authorities;
  - To contribute to meeting any housing needs arising outside the Coventry and Warwickshire HMA that it is accepted through co-operation between the relevant councils as needing to be met within the HMA and most appropriately being met within the District.
- 7.4 It is not the purpose of the SHLAA to identify potential reserve sites. This is done through the Site Allocations Plan (SAP). However, the scope of this particular SHLAA is established by the clear purpose of the SAP in this respect. Decisions about which sites to identify are based on the findings of this SHLAA and other technical material, and is also informed by the recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment.

---

<sup>3</sup> Find the full Core Strategy at [www.stratford.gov.uk/corestrategy](http://www.stratford.gov.uk/corestrategy)



7.5 The outcome of this assessment provides a basis for identifying in the Site Allocations Plan a wide range of reserve housing sites, in terms of size and location, which are capable of meeting the overall number of dwellings specified in Policy CS.16 in the Core Strategy.

# Appendix 1

## Strategic Housing Land Availability

### Assessment - Site Evaluation Criteria



#### A. Assessment of Suitability

##### i. Major planning considerations

Criteria	Purpose	Assessment
<b>Green Belt</b>	The NPPF seeks to maintain the openness of the Green Belt by restricting inappropriate development. Very special circumstances need to be demonstrated as to why development would outweigh the harm. Green Belt boundaries can be reviewed in exceptional circumstances through the preparation of a Local Plan.	Inside Green Belt = RED Outside Green Belt = GREEN
<b>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</b>	The NPPF requires great weight to be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Inside AONB = RED Adjacent to AONB = AMBER Outside AONB = GREEN
<b>Conservation Area</b>	Development should seek to enhance the significance of Conservation Areas and make a positive contribution.	Inside Conservation Area = RED Adjacent to Conservation Area = AMBER Not inside or adjacent to Conservation Area = GREEN
<b>European / National Wildlife Site</b>	The NPPF affords significant protection to these important wildlife habitats including RAMSAR, NNR, SAC, SSSI and Ancient Woodland. Development that causes harm to the geological and conservation value of such sites should not be permitted.	Inside protected site = RED Adjacent to protected site = AMBER Not inside or adjacent to protected site = GREEN

<b>Special Landscape Area / Area of Restraint</b>	The Core Strategy includes specific policies to resist development in areas deemed to be of important local landscape value and character. Development should not cause significant harm to these areas.	Inside Special Landscape Area or Area of Restraint = RED Outside Special Landscape Area or Area of Restraint = GREEN
<b>Flood Risk</b>	The NPPF sets out a sequential approach to development with the aim to steer development away from areas of highest risk. Surface water flooding could also act as a constraint to development. Information provided from the Environment Agency and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	Entirely or mostly inside Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 or subject to surface water flooding = RED Partly inside Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 or partly subject to surface water flooding = AMBER Outside Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 and not subject to surface water flooding = GREEN
<b>Heritage Assets</b>	The NPPF seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. Substantial harm or loss to Scheduled Monuments, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, and Listed Buildings should be exceptional or wholly exceptional.	Inside heritage asset = RED Adjacent to heritage asset = AMBER Not inside or adjacent to heritage asset = GREEN
<b>Major Infrastructure</b>	Development should avoid affecting or being affected by major existing and proposed infrastructure (e.g. route of High Speed 2, high pressure gas pipelines, high voltage electricity cables).	Infrastructure crosses substantial part of site = RED Infrastructure crosses small part of site or adjacent to it = AMBER Not affected = GREEN
<b>Agricultural Land Quality</b>	Is the site classified as being the best and most versatile agricultural land?	Grade 1 or 2 = RED Grade 3a or partly Grade 1 or 2 = AMBER Grade 3b, 4 or 5 / not relevant = GREEN
<b>Minerals and Waste</b>	Development should not affect sites allocated or safeguarded for minerals extraction or waste management in the Minerals and Waste Local Plans.	Entirely or mostly inside Minerals or Waste allocation = RED Inside Minerals or Waste safeguarding area = AMBER Not inside Minerals or Waste allocation/safeguarding area = GREEN

## ii. Other planning considerations

Criteria	Comment	Assessment
<b>Access to site (vehicles)</b>	Is there access to the site from the road network that is likely to meet highway standards?	No achievable access to site = RED Major works required = AMBER Minor works required = GREEN
<b>Access to site (walking and cycling)</b>	Is there access to the site for pedestrians and cyclists?	No achievable access to site = RED Major works required = AMBER Minor works required = GREEN
<b>Accessibility to Local Facilities</b>	Is the site within reasonable walking distance of local services and facilities (eg. shop, school, doctor's surgery)?	Beyond 800m/10mins = RED Within 800m/10mins = AMBER Within 400m/5mins = GREEN
<b>Public Transport</b>	Is the site within reasonable walking distance to public transport services (400m/5mins to bus or 800m/10mins to rail)?	Not accessible to service = RED Accessible to infrequent (ie. less than hourly) service = AMBER Accessible to frequent service = GREEN
<b>Relationship to Highway Network</b>	Is the site well located in respect of the road network and vehicle movements?	Adjacent to minor road only = RED Adjacent to/within 200 metres of B road = AMBER Adjacent to/within 200 metres of A road = GREEN
<b>Public Right of Way (PROW)</b>	Is the site affected by a Public Right of Way?	PROW crosses site = RED PROW runs along edge of site = AMBER No PROW across or along edge of site = GREEN
<b>Coalescence</b>	Does the site form an important contribution to defining and maintaining the separate identity of the settlement?	Significant contribution = RED Moderate contribution = AMBER Minor / no contribution = GREEN
<b>Settlement Form</b>	Is the site well-related to and capable of being integrated into the existing built form?	Poor relationship = RED Reasonable relationship = AMBER Good relationship = GREEN
<b>Settlement Character</b>	Does the site make an important contribution to the character of the settlement?	Significant contribution = RED Moderate contribution = AMBER Minor / no contribution = GREEN

<b>Neighbouring Amenity</b>	Would development of the site significantly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers (eg. overlooking etc.)?	Significant impact = RED Moderate impact = AMBER Minor / no impact = GREEN
<b>Neighbouring Land Uses</b>	Is the site affected by neighbouring uses (eg. noise, lighting, odour, etc.)?	Significant impact = RED Moderate impact = AMBER Minor / no impact = GREEN
<b>Non-designated Heritage Asset</b>	The NPPF seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, including non-designated features of historic and cultural importance, eg. ridge and furrow.	Inside non-designated asset = RED Outside non-designated asset = GREEN
<b>Landscape Sensitivity</b>	Is the site within a landscape that is sensitive to change as a result of development? (NB. see various Landscape Sensitivity Assessments)	High & High-Medium sensitivity = RED Medium & Medium-Low sensitivity = AMBER Low sensitivity = GREEN
<b>Contaminated Land</b>	Is the site likely to be affected by contaminated land (eg. petrol filling stations, industrial land etc.)?	Contamination identified = RED Potential contamination = AMBER Contamination unlikely = GREEN
<b>Tree Preservation Order (TPO)</b>	Trees provide amenity value and are an important feature of the townscape and landscape and should be retained.	TPO within site = RED TPO on edge of site = AMBER No TPO within or on edge of site = GREEN
<b>Local Wildlife or Geological Site</b>	In addition to nationally important sites, Warwickshire County Council has identified sites of local wildlife or geological value. Development should not significantly affect the biodiversity value of these sites.	Inside LWS or LGS = RED Adjacent to LWS or LGS = AMBER Not inside or adjacent to LWS or LGS = GREEN
<b>Natural Features</b>	There may be a range of features on the site that are valuable for their habitats but are not designated.	Significant impact = RED Moderate impact = AMBER Minor / no impact = GREEN
<b>Pollution</b>	Is the site likely to be affected by sources of pollution (eg. road, railway, business uses)?	Significant impact = RED Moderate impact = AMBER Minor / no impact = GREEN
<b>Site Assembly</b>	Are there any constraints to assembling the site for development (eg. multiple ownerships)?	Significant constraint = RED Potential constraint = AMBER No known constraint = GREEN

<b>Site Topography and Shape</b>	Does the physical nature of the site constrain development?	Significant constraint = RED Moderate constraint = AMBER Minor / no constraint = GREEN
----------------------------------	---	--

## B. Assessment of Availability

Criteria	Comment	Assessment
<b>Current Use</b>	There is a presumption against the loss of land in employment, community or leisure use, including public open space.	In active use, including agricultural buildings = RED Agricultural / forestry use = AMBER Vacant / undeveloped = GREEN
<b>Intentions</b>	Is there an intention by the landowner to sell/develop and is there a developer in place to bring the site forward for development?	No known intention to develop = RED Site promoted = AMBER Developer in place = GREEN
<b>Legal</b>	Are there any legal issues (eg. multiple land ownerships, ransom strips) that may affect the site coming forward for development?	Yes = RED Unknown = AMBER No = GREEN
<b>Ownership</b>	Has the landowner been identified?	Unknown = RED Known but no contact = AMBER Known with contact = GREEN

## C. Assessment of Achievability

Criteria	Comment	Assessment
<b>Local Market Analysis</b>	Is there demand within the local market for the site to sell?	Likely poor market conditions = RED Likely marginal market conditions = AMBER Likely good market conditions = GREEN
<b>SHLAA History</b>	Has the site been assessed in earlier version of the SHLAA?	Rejected = RED Inside Broad Location = AMBER With potential = GREEN Not previously assessed = GREY

<b>Planning History</b>	Does the planning history of the site provide any indication as to its suitability for development?	Permission refused/appeal dismissed = RED No relevant history = GREY
<b>Viability</b>	Is development currently considered economically viable?	Not viable = RED Likely to be viable = AMBER Viable = GREEN

## Overall Assessment

Criteria	Comment	Assessment
<b>Availability</b>	Has the landowner (or other party) informed the District Council that the site is available for development?	No = RED Yes = GREEN
<b>Suitability - Environmental</b>	Are there any environmental constraints to the development of the site?	Significant constraints = RED Moderate constraints = AMBER Minor / no constraints = GREEN
<b>Suitability - Technical</b>	Are there any technical constraints to the development of the site?	Significant constraints = RED Moderate constraints = AMBER Minor / no constraints = GREEN
<b>Achievability</b>	Is development of the site achievable based on marketability, viability and previous history?	Significant constraints = RED Moderate constraints = AMBER Minor / no constraints = GREEN
<b>Initial Overall Deliverability</b>	Is development of the site deliverable taking into account environmental and technical constraints and availability?	Not deliverable = RED Likely to be deliverable = AMBER Definitely deliverable = GREEN
<b>Scope for Mitigation</b>	Assessment of sites that are RED under Initial Overall Deliverability and GREEN under Availability. It considers whether mitigation would be effective in overcoming major environmental and/or technical constraints to delivery.	Commentary
<b>Adjusted Overall Deliverability</b>	Is development of the site deliverable having taken into account the scope for mitigation?	Not deliverable = RED Likely to be deliverable = AMBER Definitely deliverable = GREEN

## Appendix 2

### Comparison of Coventry and Warwickshire SHLAA Joint Method Statement and Site Evaluation Criteria used by Stratford-on-Avon District Council

#### Major planning considerations

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
Green Belt	Included in Site Evaluation Criteria but not in Joint Method Statement		Included but not applied as a factor in assessing deliverability of sites
Special Landscape Area / Area of Restraint	Included in Site Evaluation Criteria but not in Joint Method Statement		Both designations are relevant to assessment of sites in Stratford District
Local Geological Sites	Included in Site Evaluation Criteria but not in Joint Method Statement		Have been covered together with Local Wildlife Sites
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	<i>Joint Method Statement</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / No impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inside AONB = RED</li> <li>▪ Adjacent to AONB = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Outside AONB = GREEN</li> </ul>	Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to designation as this will have a bearing on assessing impact of development
Conservation Areas	<i>Joint Method Statement</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / No impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inside Conservation Area = RED</li> <li>▪ Adjacent to Conservation Area = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Not inside or adjacent to Conservation Area = GREEN</li> </ul>	Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to designation as this will have a bearing on assessing impact of development
European / National Wildlife Site	<i>Joint Method Statement</i> Refers to “particular species and habitats being protected by law” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / No impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Omits reference to “particular species and habitats being protected by law” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inside protected site = RED</li> <li>▪ Adjacent to protected site = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Outside protected = GREEN</li> </ul>	Term “protected species” is covered by heading Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to designation as this will have a



Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
			bearing on assessing impact of development
Flood Risk	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Includes reference to surface water flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site at risk of surface water flooding = RED</li> <li>▪ Part of site at risk of flooding (e.g. Zone 2 or 3) = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Site not at risk of flooding = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Omits reference to surface water flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Entirely or mostly inside Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 or subject to surface water flooding = RED</li> <li>▪ Partly inside Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 or partly subject to surface water flooding = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Outside Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 and not subject to surface water flooding = GREEN</li> </ul>	This has been amended as risk of surface water flooding has been taken into account More comprehensive approach specified in SDC criteria
Heritage Assets	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / No impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inside heritage asset = RED</li> <li>▪ Adjacent to heritage asset = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Not inside or adjacent to heritage asset = GREEN</li> </ul>	Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to designation as this will have a bearing on assessing impact of development
Local Wildlife Site	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / No impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inside LWS = RED</li> <li>▪ Adjacent to LWS = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Not inside or adjacent to LWS = GREEN</li> </ul>	Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to designation as this will have a bearing on assessing impact of development
Major Infrastructure	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: "Is the site affected by major infrastructure (e.g. the route of High Speed 2, HSE Pipelines, Pylons etc)?"</p>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Comment text: "Development should avoid affecting or being affected by major existing and proposed infrastructure (e.g.</p>	For clarification purposes

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / No impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>route of High Speed 2, high pressure gas pipelines, high voltage electricity cables)”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Infrastructure crosses substantial part of site = RED</li> <li>▪ Infrastructure crosses small part of site or adjacent to it = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Not affected = GREEN</li> </ul>	Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to infrastructure as this will have a bearing on assessing impact of development
Agricultural Land Quality	Referred to as “Agricultural Land Classification” in Joint Method Statement		Terms refer to the same factor which relates to quality
Minerals and Waste	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / No impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Entirely or mostly inside Minerals or Waste allocation = RED</li> <li>▪ Inside Minerals or Waste safeguarding area = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Not inside Minerals or Waste allocation/safeguarding area = GREEN</li> </ul>	Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to designation as this will have a bearing on assessing impact of development

### Other Planning Considerations

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria			Comment
<p>Access to site (Joint Method Statement)</p> <p>Access to site - vehicles (Site Evaluation Criteria)</p> <p>Access to site - walking and cycling (Site Evaluation Criteria)</p>	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <p>Comment text: “Is there satisfactory access to the site from the road network that is likely to meet highway standards?”</p>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <p>Vehicles</p> <p>Comment text: “Is there access to the site from the road network that is likely to meet</p>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <p>Walking and cycling</p> <p>Comment text: “Is there access to the site for pedestrians and cyclists?”</p>	Appropriate to distinguish between provision of access for vehicles and for pedestrians/cyclists as the situation can be different for each.

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
		highway standards?"	
Accessibility to local facilities	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Example list of local services and villages: "convenience shop, primary school, doctor's surgery, public house"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No facilities reasonably accessible = RED</li> <li>▪ Some facilities reasonably accessible = AMBER</li> <li>▪ All facilities reasonably accessible = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Example list of local services and villages: "shop, school, doctor's surgery"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Beyond 800m/10mins = RED</li> <li>▪ Within 800m/10mins = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Within 400m/5mins = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>List of examples is not significantly different</p> <p>Appropriate to apply specific distances which relate to reasonable walking times</p>
Public transport	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Clarifies that 400m/5mins to bus and 800m/10mins to rail refers to walking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accessible to neither bus or rail = RED</li> <li>▪ Accessible to bus or rail = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Accessible to bus and rail = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> No clarification that 400m/5mins to bus and 800m/10 mins to rail refers to walking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not accessible to service = RED</li> <li>▪ Access to infrequent (i.e. less than hourly) service = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Accessible to frequent service = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>This has been clarified</p>
Relationship to Highway Network	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Poor = RED</li> <li>▪ Improvements likely = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Well related = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adjacent to minor road only = RED</li> <li>▪ Adjacent to/within 200 metres of B road = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Adjacent to/within 200 metres of A road = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>Appropriate to distinguish between classification of road to which a site has access</p>
Public Rights of Way	<i>Joint Method Statement</i>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i>	

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment	
	Comment text: "Does a Public Right of Way (PRoW) have a potential impact on the development of the site" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PRoW crosses the site = RED</li> <li>▪ PRoW on site boundary = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Site not affected by PRoW = GREEN</li> </ul>	Comment text: Is the site affected by a Public Right of Way? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PROW crosses site = RED</li> <li>▪ PROW runs along edge of site = AMBER</li> <li>▪ No PROW across or along edge of site = GREEN</li> </ul>	Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor	
Coalescence	<i>Joint Method Statement</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some contribution = AMBER</li> </ul>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Moderate contribution = AMBER</li> </ul>	Term "moderate" is more appropriate	
Integration with Settlement (Joint Method Statement) Settlement Form (Site Evaluation Criteria) Settlement Character (Site Evaluation Criteria)	<i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: "Does the site relate well to the existing built form / character of the settlement? NB: landscaping can help to mitigate effects" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sensitive site = RED</li> <li>▪ Mitigation achievable through good design = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Site / development integrates well = GREEN</li> </ul>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Settlement Form Comment text: "is the site well-related to and capable of being integrated into the existing built form?" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Poor relationship = RED</li> <li>▪ Reasonable relationship = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Good relationship = GREEN</li> </ul>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Settlement Character Comment text: "does the site make an important contribution to the character of the settlement?" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant contribution = RED</li> <li>▪ Moderate contribution = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / no contribution = GREEN</li> </ul>	Appropriate to apply two distinctive aspects to this criteria as many of the settlements covered in the SHLAA are villages rather than large urban areas  More appropriate basis for assessing distinctive aspects that have been applied
Neighbouring Amenity	<i>Joint Method Statement</i>	<i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i>		

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some contribution = AMBER</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Moderate contribution = AMBER</li> </ul>	Term “moderate” is more appropriate
Neighbouring Land Uses	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: “Is the site affected by neighbouring uses (e.g. incompatible use)”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some contribution = AMBER</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Comment text: “Is the site affected by neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, lighting, odour etc.)?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Moderate contribution = AMBER</li> </ul>	<p>Provides examples of potential impact</p> <p>Term “moderate” is more appropriate</p>
Landscape sensitivity	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comment text: “The sensitivity of the landscape is its ability to accommodate a certain type of change or development.”</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comment text: “Is the site within a landscape that is sensitive to change as a result of development? (NB. See various Landscape Sensitivity Assessments)”</li> </ul>	<p>Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor</p> <p>Landscape Sensitivity Studies produced for the District Council have been used as a basis for assessing this factor</p>
Contaminated Land	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Additional sentence in comment text: “Detailed site assessment may be required to establish whether actual contamination exists irrespective of this analysis”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contamination previously identified = RED</li> <li>▪ Potentially contaminated = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Less likely to be contaminated = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contamination identified = RED</li> <li>▪ Potential contamination = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Contamination unlikely = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>Acknowledged that further assessment of potential contamination may be required for certain sites</p> <p>Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor</p>
Tree Preservation Order	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / no impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TPO within site = RED</li> <li>▪ TPO on edge of site = AMBER</li> <li>▪ No TPO within or on edge of site = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>Appropriate to assess location of a site in relation to designation as this will have a bearing on assessing impact of development</p>

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
Natural features	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: "Are there natural features to the site that may have ecological value or may affect the design and layout e.g. Watercourses, ponds, hedgerows etc."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Comment text: "There may be a range of features on the site that are valuable for their habitats but are not designated."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Moderate impact = AMBER</li> </ul>	<p>Clarifies that this factor relates to features that are not designated as these are covered elsewhere</p> <p>Term "moderate" is more appropriate</p>
Pollution	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: "Is the site likely to be affected by either noise or air pollution including AQMAs?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Comment text: "Is the site likely to be affected by sources of pollution (eg. road, railway, business uses)?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Moderate impact = AMBER</li> </ul>	<p>Gives wider range of examples of potential sources of pollution but acknowledged that AQMAs will have to be considered</p> <p>Term "moderate" is more appropriate</p>
Site Assembly	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: "Could the site form part of a larger site that is suitable for development? Would development of this site restrain other development"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prevent development = RED</li> <li>▪ Mitigated by design = AMBER</li> <li>▪ No = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Comment text: "Are there any constraints to assembling the site for development (e.g. multiple ownerships)?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant constraint = RED</li> <li>▪ Moderate constraint = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / no constraint = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor</p> <p>Not possible to be certain about situation at this stage of assessment</p>
Site Topography & Shape	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: "Do the topography/levels of the site or its shape constrain development?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant impact = RED</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Comment text: "Does the physical nature of the site constrain development?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significant constraint = RED</li> </ul>	<p>Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor</p>

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some impact = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / no impact = GREEN</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Moderate constraint = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Minor / no constraint = GREEN</li> </ul>	Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor

### Availability Criteria / Assessment of Availability

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria		Comment
Current Use	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: "Is the site currently in use? Is the whole of the site in use? Would any existing users / tenants need to be relocated? Occupied sites may affect the likelihood or the timescales of development particularly in the short-term.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In active use / occupied = RED</li> <li>▪ Agricultural use / Vacant / Under-used = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Derelict / Undeveloped = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Comment text: "There is a presumption against the loss of land in employment, community or leisure use, including public open space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In active use, including agricultural buildings = RED</li> <li>▪ Agricultural / forestry use = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Vacant /undeveloped = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p>Appropriate to identify what types of existing uses should normally be retained unless loss is justified</p> <p>Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor</p>
Intentions	Site Evaluation Criteria adds the word "known" to RED threshold		Appropriate to clarify this point
Legal	Site Evaluation Criteria omits "in the short term" from the comment text		Timescale is not necessarily a significant factor

## Achievability Criteria / Assessment of Achievability

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria			Comment
Local Market Analysis	Site Evaluation Criteria omits final sentence “What competition is there for prospective purchasers?”			This information is not generally known
Site History (Joint Method Statement) SHLAA History (Site Evaluation Criteria) Planning History (Site Evaluation Criteria)	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i> Comment text: “Does the Planning history provide any information as to the likely development of the site? (NB: the presence of planning permission does not automatically mean site will be developed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Permission refused / No permission = RED</li> <li>▪ Permission expired = AMBER</li> <li>▪ Extant permission = GREEN</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> SHLAA History Comment text: “Has the site been assessed in earlier version of the SHLAA?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rejected = RED</li> <li>▪ Inside Broad Location = AMBER</li> <li>▪ With Potential = GREEN</li> <li>▪ Not previously assessed = GREY</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i> Planning History Comment text: “Does the planning history of the site provide any indication of its suitability for development?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Permission refused/appeal dismissed = RED</li> <li>▪ No relevant history = GREY</li> </ul>	<p>Appropriate to identify how a site has been assessed in a previous SHLAA although this has not been an overriding factor</p> <p>Decision on a planning application is more relevant than whether a permission has expired or is extant</p>
Viability	<p><i>Joint Method Statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Issues likely to be overcome = AMBER</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site Evaluation Criteria</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Likely to be viable = AMBER</li> </ul>		Minor difference which has had no effect on assessment of factor



## Overall Assessment

Criteria	Difference between C&W Joint Method Statement and SDC Site Evaluation Criteria	Comment
Availability	Included in Site Evaluation Criteria but not in Joint Method Statement	This section in SDC's methodology brings together the overall findings of each Land Parcel Assessment. It also considers the scope for mitigation in accordance with national guidance on the preparation of SHLAAs in order to conclude with an Adjusted Overall Deliverability.
Suitability - Environmental		
Suitability - Technical		
Achievability		
Initial Overall Deliverability		
Scope for Mitigation		
Adjusted Overall Deliverability		