Epping Forest District Local Plan Report on Site Selection

### F1.3 Stage 2 Assessment

| Issue | September 2016

### EB801AC



		CR AFF	
	THE	2/PAR-BA	
	WARRAND THE ADDRESS CONTRACTORS OF SMALL AND A THE ADDRESS AND A THE ADDRESS AND A THE ADDRESS AND ADDRES		
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0020-Rev1	Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
Report on Site Selection ARUP	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0020-Rev1 Date: September 2016	Content           Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in Chigwell           Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNESXAirbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, Swisstop and the GIS User Community.	Legend Stage 2 Sites Parish Boundary

Sile Suila	Dinty Assessment	
Site Reference	: SR-0190	Hertf
Parish:	Chigwell	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	7.3	
Address:	Land at Luxborough Lane, Chigwell, Essex, IG7 5AA	CI
Primary use:	Employment	1
SLAA notes:	Site part of the former Luxborough Lane Water Treatment Works (8.5ha no longer used and available for development)	AT
SLAA yield:	34,000 sqm commercial	Clien
SLAA source for baseline yield:	8.5ha developable area assumed 0.4 plot ratio or 30dph	Epi Job 1 Epi
SLAA site contraints:	Highway access to site is significantly constrained, which may significantly restrict capacity. Circa 10% of the site has potential landfill contamination which reduces capacity of employment.	Draw
Site selection adjustment:	None	Draw SR-

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### Comm. (sq.m.): 30600

### Hettrord Harlow Cheshuat Ahro Brentwood

### Epping Forest District Council Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No SR-0190 Issue P1 Epping Forest District Council Uncouncil U

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swiestopo Mapmriydial, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.):</u> <u>30600</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potentia strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses the whole of a BAP priority habitat with no main features and a small area of Wood Pasture an Parkland habitat. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, and effects may be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 87% of the site is in Flood Zone 1 with the remaining 13% in Flood Zone 2, of which less than 1% is in Floc Zone 3a. The higher Flood Risk Zones are located in the north-western corner of the site and can be avoided throug site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development would result in the loss of poorer quality agricultural land (grade 4-5).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any developmer would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Site access is from a private road and would need substantial upgrading to achieve substantial development.
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to be mitigated.	Part of site on Landfill and rest on former sewage works which may preclude development due to gas risks from sewage sludge.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

one ouna	binty Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0366
Parish:	Chigwell
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	15.95
Address:	West Hatch High school Playing Fields and adjacent land
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	School playing fields and vacant scrub land adjacent.
SLAA yield:	64,280 sqm employment
SLAA source for baseline	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4 for employment
yield:	
<b></b>	
SLAA site contraints:	Gas pipeline runs through site, reducing potential capacity by 25%. Excluding this quarter of the site another 25% has potential landfill contamination. Capacity reduced accordingly.
Site selection	None
adjustment:	

ŝ adjustment:

Community feedback: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 32140</u>

### T 4106 Brentw

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0366	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

a.... Generative right (2016) 9, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop ors, and the GIS User Community hear Control of the community s, and the GIS User Community ar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, and the GIS User Community ce, GeoEye, Earth GN, IGP, swiesto Ge



<u>Comm. (Sq.m.). 32140</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	()	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.	The site encompasses the majority of a BAP priority habitat with no main features, multiple Deciduous Woodland habitats, and a small area of Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat. The site is likely to directly impact, which may not be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Chigwell).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	Approximately 9% of the site is in HSE inner consultation zone. Due to the size of the site mitigation is possible Sensitivity level 2 assuming more than 100 employment occupants. HSE guidance advise against development fo affected area.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access could be achieved off of Luxborough Lane and High Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to be mitigated.	Part of site subject to landfills are unsuitable for development. Potential contamination associated with gas compound that could be mitigated. No potential contamination has been identified for parts of site on sports fields.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference	: SR-0551
Parish:	Chigwell
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	1.54
Address:	Olympic Compound Site - Plots A.B & C Land North Of Roding Lane
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Site accessed off the motorway. Building for the police and open land beside.
SLAA yield:	6,160 sqm employment
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 6160</u>

### rlient Toping Forest District Council

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0551	P1	
ARUP	Epping Fores District Count	



Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadatsr NL, Ordannes Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Surver: Earl, Igliadiolobic, GeoSey, Earlhatar Geographics, CHES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,

<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 6160</u>	-		
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 1,000sq.m. of non-residential), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat. The site is within the relevant and BAP priority habitat with no main features buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for Roding Valley Meadows LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is located adjacent the M11 Motorway, and provides opportunity for employment intensification. The proposed development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	Approximately 18% of the site falls in the HSE middle zone. The pipeline runs through the middle of the site but there is potential for mitigation through layout design. HSE guidance is don't advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Military Uses / Electricity Sub Station / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference	: SR-0558
Parish:	Chigwell
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	4.36
Address:	Land adjacent West Hatch Academy
Brimany uso:	Frankovmant

Primary use:EmploymentSLAA notes:Thames Water site, cannot gain access.



SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection N

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17440</u>

### Hertford Harlow Cheshuat Alto Brentwood

Client	
Epping Forest Distr	ict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0558	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Eeri, HERE, DeLorre, Internap, Incerenze HP Corp., GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeeBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esr Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Magmirfulia, OpenSiretelApa contributors, and the OSIS User Comunity Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeeEye, Eanthard Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Gelmaphing, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, wisstopo, and the OSIS User Comunity



Criteria         1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites         1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites         1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites         1.7 Flood risk	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Score Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites). Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	Qualitative Assessment           Employment site located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites         1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0 0 0 0 0	combination with other sites). Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	strategic air quality impact.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0 0 0	development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0		
Ancient Woodland          1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites			
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites		Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.7 Flood risk	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 26% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 with the remainder in Flood Zone 1. Less than 3% of the site is also located in Flood Zone 3a and 3b. The higher Flood Risk Zones are located on the site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Woodford).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposed density is higher than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	()	There is no means of access to the site and no likely prospect of achieving access.	Access cannot be provided to the site.
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to be mitigated.	Site unsuitable for development. May be feasible to install adequate level of gas protection in managed commercial buildings to protect against gases from landfill site.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference: SR-0560		
Parish:	Chigwell	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	1.34	
Address:	Chigwell Civic Amenity Site, Luxborough Lane	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Recycling centre.	
SLAA yield:	5,360 sqm employment	

SLAA source Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4 for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 5360</u>

### Hertford Cheshual Allo Brentwood

Client Epping Forest District Council			
			Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Issue			
P1			
Epping Forest District Council			



@ Contains US data @ L'Outome, opyngit and o database npt (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, Deloume, intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GedBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METT, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, C OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GSI Suer Community Source: Earl, DigliaGlöber, Cooley, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Gemapping, Aarord, IGN, IGP, wisstopo, and the GSI Suer Community

<u>oomin: (oq.m.).</u>	<u>nm. (sq.m.): 5360</u>				
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment		
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.		
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.			
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.			
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.			
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.			
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to an area of Deciduous Woodland, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.		
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.			
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.			
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.			
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.			
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.			
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.			
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.			
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.			
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.			
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.			
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.			
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.			
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.			
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.			
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, 500m from existing settlements (Chigwell and Buckhurst Hill).		
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).			
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.			
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.				
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is an existing recycling centre. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.		
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.			
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.			
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.			
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.			
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.			
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to be mitigated.	Site unsuitable for development. May be feasible to install adequate level of gas protection in managed commercial buildings to protect against gases from landfill site.		
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.		

# EB801AC R-0278

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0021-Rev1	Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment ir	Le
ARUP	Date: September 2016	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics,	
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:15,000 @A3	CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	L.

### Legend



Ν

Site Reference: SR-0278		
Parish:	Epping	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.38	
Address:	Bower Hill Industrial Estate	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment None	
SLAA yield:	1,520 sqm commercial	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4	
SLAA site contraints:	None	

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on EPP-4 which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

### Hertford Harlow Cheshuat

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0278	P1		
	Epping Forest District Council		

Client

D'unitalità Us data è unomi copyrigin ani u usausasi rigini (uni u) Souross: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopc programmine, Engli (Calcinate Magen Entotes, and Honol SL est C-Kanina), engli (Calcinate Magen Entotes), and the Inter Soura (Calcinate), Geomapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 1520</u>	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community			
Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potentia strategic air quality impact.	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.		
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.		
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	earest rail/tube station (+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.			
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0 The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.			
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++) Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.		100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.		
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.		
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is located on a brownfield site. Re-development could enhance the character of the area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.		
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.		
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Gas Works / Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	Not applicable.		Not applicable.	

Site Reference: SR-0281			
Parish:	Parish: Epping		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	3.01		
Address: St Johns Road Area, Epping Town Centre			

Primary use:EmploymentSLAA notes:None

SLAA yield: 50 dwellings

 

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 notional - but would be guided by development brief currently being prepared/consulted on

 SLAA site
 None

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community None feedback:

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 0</u>



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0281	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	



Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, UISGS, FAO, MPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, (IGN, Kadaster NJ, Ordnance Survey Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, @ OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri DigitalGiboe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CMES/alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites         1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats		Score Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects. Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site. Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites         1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	() 0 0 0 0	combination effects. Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site. Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0 0 0 0	development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site. Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Below IRZ consultation threshold
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site. Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Ancient Woodland           1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land           1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0		
	-	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0		
		Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology		Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is of mixed-use character including a mix of heritage and modern buildings. Development Brief identifies the site as major opportunity, and that any development will be expected to reflect the historic character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	would not be a significant constraint.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access to constituent development plots off of St Johns Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (3000m2 infilled gravel pit / Depot / Builders Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

### EB801AC

Ν



Denerten	Drawing No	Contont	Logand
A CO	1 into		
- Lin	Har I	- GAK	
( )	BOAR !!		MAR HANNING
A Contraction	1 5		A Contract of the second of th
~ 20	Sin Mar	DE TA	
man 1			

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0022-Rev1	Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
	Date: September 2016	High Ongar	Stage 2
ARUP		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid,	Parish B
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:25,000 @A3	IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	

L



one ouna	Sincy Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0394
Parish:	High Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	14.62
Address:	Land to East of High Ongar including Nash Hall Industrial Estate, High Ongar
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Existing small industrial/commercial estate and adjacent vacant/open land and agricultural fields.
SLAA yield:	307 dwellings and 17,500 sqm commercial
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 70:30 housing to employment at 30 dph and plot ratio of 0.4
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17500</u>

# Client

Epping Forest Distri	ct Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0394	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council





Name         Name <th< th=""><th><u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17500</u></th><th></th><th></th><th>And a should be should be should be a should be a should be a should be a shou</th></th<>	<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17500</u>			And a should be should be should be a should be a should be a should be a shou
Number of Statistics         No.         Statistics         No.           Listensis fractions         0         Statistics fractistics         0         Statistics fractistics         No.           Listensis fractistics         0         Statistics fractistics         0         Statistics         No.         No.           Listensis fractistics         0         Statistics         0         Statistics         No.         <	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
ControlControlControlControlControlControl12 mage and controlControl </td <td>1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
Initial controlPointPoint of the control of the	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
IndexendanceImage: Image:	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Westlands/Thistleland Springs Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect the buffer land, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning or compensation Woodland planting.
Market and automationViaMarket automationViaMarket automationVia12 market automationNoMarket automationNoNoNoNoNo12 market automationNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo12 market automationNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo13 market automationNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo13 market automationNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo13 market automationNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo13 market automationNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo13 market automationNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo13 Nonex it in the not in the no set of a state		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
11 Multicity Control10Person <td>1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land</td> <td>0</td> <td>Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.</td> <td></td>	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Name         Number of the second frame of the second	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat. There may be effects from this impact but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
I remain         Decision of cardial and the sequence	1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Westlands Spring/Thistlelands Spring LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
Name         Number of the state infigure.         Number of the state infigure.         Number of the state infigure.           18 knows in water of the state infigure.         0         defendes and infigure.         defendes and infigure.         defendes and infigure.           19 knows in water of the state infigure.         0         defendes and infigure.	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a, covering 10%, are located on the northern site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
Like Mackadow         O         attaisagout conct one test in:         D           11 Angout of a config         O         Statisagout conct one test in:         D           11 Angout of a config         O         Statisagout conct one test in:         D         D         Statisagout conct one test in:         D         D         Statisagout conct one test in:         D <tdd< td=""> <tdd< td=""> <tdd< td="" td<=""><td>1.8a Impact on heritage assets</td><td>(-)</td><td>effects can be mitigated.</td><td></td></tdd<></tdd<></tdd<>	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	effects can be mitigated.	
Link mit die dangeCPook is er gestelleConstructionCP211 ward runn forwan dat zwischeCPSie, einer rundal.Sie, einer rundal.Sie, einer rundal.211 haard runn forwan dat zwischeCPSie is ner Fan 4000m hande zwische of beie date band for databageren walle beierSie ward rundal.211 haard runn forwan dat zwischeCPSie is ner Fan 4000m hande zwische of beie date bande.Sie statuer of provide stat	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	archaeological assets on the site.	
21 Letter (name Locker) (and Locker) (and Locker)     31     base, two metuals     11       31     District (and Locker) (and Locker)     40     Set is used base (abover)     11       31     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used base (abover)     11       31     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used base (abover)     11       31     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used base (abover)     11       31     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used base (abover)     11       31     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       32     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       33     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       34     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       34     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       34     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       34     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       34     District (and Locker)     40     Set is used (abover)     11       34     District (and Locker)     40     Set is uset is a set i	1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	could be mitigated or reduced.	
11 Understein Inforder Minders Banden       (a)         12 Datance is negretar lass step       (b)         13 Datance is negretar lass step       (c)         14 Datance is negretar lass step       (c)         15 Datance is negretar lass step       (c)         16 Datance is negretar lass step       (c)         17 Datance is negretar lass step       (c)         18 Datance is negretar lass step       (c)         19 Datance is negretar lass step       (c)         10 Datance is negretar lass step	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)		limited impact upon the setting of the historic Stony Park area of Chipping Ongar as it is physically distant from the
3.2 Usdame is interaction support       0       Not applicable.         3.1 Distance is employment locations       10       Not applicable.       Image: Status is the status in 100m from incoment town, large vilage or enail vilage.         3.4 Distance to local arrentice       10       Not applicable.       Image: Status is the status in 100m from incoment town, large vilage or enail vilage.         3.4 Distance to local arrentice       10       Not applicable.       Image: Status is the status in 100m from incoment town, large vilage or enail vilage.         3.4 Distance to local arrentice       10       Not applicable.       Image: Status is the status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status is the status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.         3.4 Distance to instance:       10       Not applicable.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.         3.4 Distance to instance:       10       Not applicable.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m of the Status get Road Network.       Image: Status in 10m	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.3 Distance to definipution codereds     Image: Content of the set of th	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	·	
1 A basis do to durate minima       (*)       Not applicable.         3 5 Distance to nearest infantprimery school       Not applicable.       Image: Comparison of the school and the school of the school	3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.5 Detailed infrarest interprintly killon       Image: Control of Con	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.4 Usamics to four antenities       Image: Control of the set of the	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.1 Detailed in the integer (C) and (C)	3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
1.1 Brownieki and Greenfeld Land       (r)       Majory of the site is greenfield and adjacent to a settlement.       85% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement.         4.1 Brownieki and Greenfeld Land       (r)       Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).       85% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement.         4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space       0       Development unikkely to involve the loss of public open space.       85%         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       0       The site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodiate development without significant character change.       Site is within River Roding Valley and contains three Grade II Listed Buildings (including Nash Hall) amount of development mutual with grade the character.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (r)       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       Site is within River Roding Valley and contains three Grade II Listed Buildings (including Nash Hall) amount of development mutual with character.         6.1 Topography constraints       (r)       Bographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.       Image: impact.         6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: impact.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of prote	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
1.1 stowmeta and observations       (c)       Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).         4.2 Impact on agricultural land       (c)       Development unikely to involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).         4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space       0       Development unikely to involve the loss of unitors of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development whout significant character character.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       0       The site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development whout significant character.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (c)       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       Site is within River Roding Valley and contains three Grade II Listed Buildings (including Nash Hall) amount of development troposed could negatively impact the character. However, lower density a mitigate impact.         6.1 Topography constraints       (c)       Topographical constraints be but potential for mitigation.       Imitigate impact.         6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.       Imitigate impact.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.       Existing off The Si into Business Estate.	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
**2 inflaction aglicultation       ************************************	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	85% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement.
1.1 Landscape sensitivity       0       The site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (e)       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       Site is within River Roding Valley and contains three Grade II Listed Buildings (including Nash Hall) amount of development proposed could negatively impact the character. However, lower density a mitigate impact.         6.1 Topography constraints       (e)       Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.         6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.2 Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (e)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Existing off The St into Business Estate.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (e)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination or parts of site (Farmyard / electricity sun station / within 250m of landfil adverse impact that could be mitigated.	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
b.1 Euroscape sensitivity       u       accommodate development without significant character change.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (e)       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       Site is within River Roding Valley and contains three Grade II Listed Buildings (including Nash Hell), amount of development proposed could negatively impact the character. However, lower density a nitigate impact.         6.1 Topography constraints       (e)       Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.       Impact and the site impact.         6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.       Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.       Existing off The St into Business Estate.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (e)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination over parts of site (Farmyard / electricity sun station / within 250m of landfil adverse impact that could be mitigated.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (r)       Image: character sensitivity       amount of development proposed could negatively impact the character. However, lower density a mitigate impact.         6.1 Topography constraints       (r)       Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.       Image: character sensitivity         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.       Image: character sensitivity       Image: character sensitivity         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: character sensitivity       Image: character sensitivity         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (ITPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.       Image: character sensitivity         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Existing off The St into Business Estate.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (+)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination over parts of site (Farmyard / electricity sun station / within 250m of landfill	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		
0.1 Hopography Constraints       (*)       Index of the second se	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)		Site is within River Roding Valley and contains three Grade II Listed Buildings (including Nash Hall). The significant amount of development proposed could negatively impact the character. However, lower density and layout could mitigate impact.
0.22 Distance to gas and on pipelines       0       Power lines       0         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: Constraint on pipelines         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Existing off The St into Business Estate.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (-)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination over parts of site (Farmyard / electricity sun station / within 250m of landfill adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.20 Distance to power lines       0       Image: Comparison of the power lines       0         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Existing off The St into Business Estate.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (-)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination over parts of site (Farmyard / electricity sun station / within 250m of landfil adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0		
6.3 Impact on the Preservation Order (1PO)       0       adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Existing off The St into Business Estate.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (-)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination over parts of site (Farmyard / electricity sun station / within 250m of landfil adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site       (*)         6.5 Contamination constraints       (-)         Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination over parts of site (Farmyard / electricity sun station / within 250m of landfil adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	adjacent to the site.	
adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.4 Access to site	(+)		
Net explicable	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)		
6.6 Traffic impact     Not applicable.         Not applicable.	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.



Ν



Report on	Drawing No.	Content	Legend	
		我们的人		
(age ) and the start		A REAL MARKEN THE	The Contract of the a loss of the	

 

 Report on Site Selection
 Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0023-Rev1
 Content

 ARUP
 Date: September 2016
 Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in Loughton

 Scale: 1:22,500 @A3
 Scale: 1:22,500 @A3



One Ouna	binty Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0279
Parish:	Loughton
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	4.09
Address:	Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate (East)
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Vehicle yard and vacant land
SLAA yield:	15,480 sqm commercial
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4
SLAA site contraints:	Developable area of site reduced by 1.2 due to Flood Risk

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on LOU-5 which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.



Client				
Epping Forest Distric	Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title				
Epping Forest Distric	ct Local Plan			
Drawing Status				
Issue				
Drawing No	Issue			
SR-0279	P1			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council			

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, Detorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Exit Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyrindia, © OpenStretMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGiobe, GeoEve, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Intrus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 7740</u>		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community		
Criteria Score		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site partially located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyon potential strategic air quality impact.	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses a portion of a BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site is likely directly affect the BA priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		
1.7 Flood risk	0	Site within Flood Zone 3a and exception test not likely to be required.	Flood risk for the 7% portion of the site within Flood Zone 3a could be mitigated during site layout.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.		
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is within an existing settlement (Loughton).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development would result in the loss of poorer quality agricultural land (grade 4-5).		
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.		
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impa- on the adjacent highly sensitive landscape character area.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is located adjacent to Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate, and proposed for employment use. Development is not like to affect the character of the area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.		
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.		
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Land raise). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.	

	bility Assessment	Hertf
Site Reference	: SR-0325	
Parish:	Loughton	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	9.39	
Address:	Loughton, Langston Road North	Ch
Primary use:	Employment	T
SLAA notes:	Broad area north-east of Langston Road for Extension to Oakwood Hills Industrial Estate	AT
SLAA yield:	37,547 sqm	Client
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4 for employment	Ерр <sub>Јор Ті</sub> Ерр
SLAA site	None	Drawi
contraints:		lssu
		Drawi
	Assessed for ampleument use. Commercial square metre baseline	SR-
Site selection adjustment:	Assessed for employment use. Commercial square metre baseline of plot ratio 0.4.	٨



Community	
feedback:	

Feedback was received on LOU-2 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 37547</u>

### Brentwo ping Forest District Council Title oping Forest District Local Plan wing Status sue

41060



base right (2016) sent P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Siri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstor the GIS User Community ographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, the GIS Liee Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 37547</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site partially located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 10,000sq.m. of non-residential), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is almost wholly within the 250m buffer for Broadfield Shaw Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect all of the Ancient Woodland. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses around half of a BAP priority habitat and is adjacent to an additional BAP priority habitat. It has one species recorded within it. The site is likely to directly impact the on-site habitat and species, but this may be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to the Broadfield Shaw Grassland LWS and Broadfield Shaw LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Flood Zones 3a and 3b, located in the south-eastern portion of the site, covers 2% of the site. Flood risk zone 2 covers a further 5%. Higher Flood Risk Zones can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Limited impact from air quality expected as the site is almost 200m from the main road.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics of the wider landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is located adjacent to Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate and proposed for employment use. Development is not likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Would require extension to Langston Road through third party land.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference:	SR-0355A	
Parish:	Loughton	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	27.28	
Address:	Oakwood Hill/Langston Road Industrial Estate	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Industrial Estate/Business Park.	
SLAA yield:	10,000 sqm	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on selective regeneration and modernisation of dwellings	
SLAA site contraints:	None	

Site selection<br/>adjustment:Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed that 10,000<br/>sqm can be provided on each part of the site.

Community Feed feedback: site.

Feedback was received on LOU-3 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 10000</u>

Clert

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0355A	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counce	_

w unitams us quate © trown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopt MapmyIndia, © DepeStretMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGiobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CHS2Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (Sq.m.).</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site partially located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Broadfield Shaw Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the buffer land, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site encompasses a portion of a BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site may directly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for Roding Valley Meadows LWS, Lady Patience Meadow LWS, Broadfield Shaw Grassland LWS and Broadfield Shaw LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b affect 6% of the site. The higher Flood Risk Zones on the boundary of the site can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	Circa 0% of public open space is located in the site area. Development is unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Proposals have the potential to influence the wider landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is located within an existing industrial estate. Intensification is not is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Barrington Green and Langston Road
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

### EB801AC

### Site Suitability Assessment

Site Suita	bility Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0355B
Parish:	Loughton
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	5.95
Address:	Oakwood Hill/Langston Road Industrial Estate
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Industrial Estate/Business Park.
SLAA yield:	10,000 sqm
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on selective regeneration and modernisation of dwellings
SLAA site contraints:	The scale of additional commercial floorspace at this site will be identified through other Epping Forest District Council evidence on employment.
Site selection adjustment:	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed that 10,000 sqm can be provided on each part of the site.

**Community** feedback: Feedback was received on LOU-3 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

# Hertford Harlow Harlow

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0355B	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counci	

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geolbase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Orthanos Survey Esri Japan, MET, Lari China (Hong Kong), swisstop Mapmyindia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigatiGiobe, Geolye, Earthstar Georganhiss, CNS-StArbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 10000</u>

Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site partially located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to the Roding Valley Meadows LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality		Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A1168 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics with the adjacent character. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is located within an existing industrial estate. Existing site is extensively developed and may require more dense development in order to accommodate the proposals. This may adversely affect the settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Oakwood Hill and Oakwood Hill Industrial Estate.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

### EB801AC

Ν



Report on	Drawing No.	Content	Legend
AN PROPERTY		STATE OF STREET	MENTE ALLAS PARK AND
			and the second of the second s
			all interior and a second and a second
	AL AN SARA		
		the first of the second	
		MIST	
		- The	
		The second second	
			and the set of the set

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0024-Rev1	<b>Content</b> Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
ADIID	Date: September 2016	Nazeing	Stage 2 Si
ARUP		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid,	Parish Bou
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:27,500 @A3	IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	



	5
Site Reference	: SR-0151
Parish:	Nazeing
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	1.69
Address:	Land at Birchwood Industrial Estate, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, EN9 2RJ
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Existing yard behind industrial estate
SLAA yield:	6,680 sqm commercial floorspace
•	
SLAA source for baseline	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4
yield:	
SLAA site	None
contraints:	
0:44	Mara
Site selection	None

adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 6680</u>

# Clent

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0151	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	



© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esrl. HRER. DeLorne, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esrl Japan, METI, Esrl Chnal (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmi/dia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esrl, DigitalGibbo, GeoEye, Earthatar Geographics, CMES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 6680</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(-)	The site is 3-10km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	townscape.	Site is a vacant yard among employment areas. Therefore, the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access road from Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Industrial / Waste Site). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.
	-		© Aru

Sile Sulla	Dinty Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0276
Parish:	Nazeing
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.59
Address:	Birchwood Industrial Estate, Hoe Lane, Nazeing
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Industrial dwellings identified in Employment Land Review for long
	term modernisation
	2290
SLAA yield:	2280 sqm
SLAA source	Assumption based on plot ratio 0.4 - not net additional space but modernisation
for baseline yield:	nodemisation
yield.	
SLAA site	None
contraints:	
Site selection	None
adjustment:	

Brentw Epping Forest District Council Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue

A1060

Drawing No	Issue
SR-0276	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

ertfo

Client

Job Title

Community feedback: Feedback was received on NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

### GS, FAO, NPS, M RCAN USDA, USGS, AEX



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 2280</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a portion of a Deciduous Woodland priority habitat, and within two buffer zones. The site may directly and indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b covering 6% are located along the northern site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(-)	The site is 3-10km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	80% brownfield site, 700m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	townscape.	Redevelopment of existing employment uses has potential to improve the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent conservation area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Hoe Lane/Winston Farm Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Mushroom Farm / Kennels / Works). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

One Ountai	
Site Reference	: SR-0580
Parish:	Nazeing
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	4.94
Address:	42 Land at Hoe Lane, Nazeing, EN9 2RG
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Open green field.
SLAA yield:	19,760 sqm employment
SLAA source	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4
for baseline yield:	
SLAA site	10% reduction in capacity to take allow a buffer to overhead power
contraints:	lines.
0.4	Mare

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17784</u>

### A1060 ertford Brentw

Client	
Epping Forest Distri	ict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distri	ict Local Plan
Drawing Status	
lssue	
Drawing No	Issue
	Issue P1

GS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN DS, USDA, USGS, AEX



1 in functional mathematication       2 of       Performation in the implementation sockes area         1 despect on Local Mathematication       6 of       Sinteening socket and balances and species could be related of risks to differe that have       Implementation sockets area         1 Friend risk       6 of       Sinteening socket and balances and species could be related of risks to differe that have       Implementation sockets area         1 Being and on being as asses       6 of       Performation and species or adjuster in a lated and function and species or adjuster in a lated and function and species or adjuster in a socket in installator.       Implementation sockets area         1 Being and on being as asses       6 of       Performation of method and installators.       Implementation sockets area         1 Being and on being as asses       6 of       Performation of method species of method and installators.       Implementation sockets area       Implementation sockets area         1 Being and on and species of method set and the one for adjuster in a lated and provide and theorematication in the lated provide and theorematication in theorematication in theorematication in the lated provide and theor	<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17784</u>			
11 Monotony Procession2Constant of disk factor12 marker status (frightenession2Constant of disk factor (frightenession)22 marker status (frightenession)2Constant factor (frightenession)22 marker status (frightenession)2Constant factor (frightenession)22 marker status (frightenession)2Constant factor (frightenession)22 marker status (frightenession)2Monoton (frightenession)22 marker status (frightenession)2 <th>Criteria</th> <th></th> <th>Score</th> <th>Qualitative Assessment</th>	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
International control of the instrumental statusImage: Image:	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
International controlImage: Control <th< td=""><td>1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites</td><td>0</td><td>Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.</td><td></td></th<>	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
Interfacient         Image: Section of the sectio	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
International production of all		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Initial and one of the state	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
N Matchel Andream     No.     No.       1 Production     No.     No.     No.       1 Production     No.     No.     No.       1 Allergance intege seek     No.     No.     No.       <	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
Internation     Internation       1 in signal on buildy availed     0     Reconstruction from second of the second when a sequence the a latest faulting or the recense set set of the second when a sequence the a latest faulting or the recense set set of the second of the second when a sequence the a latest faulting or the recense set set of the second of	1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
Initial initial data and initial data data and data data data and data data	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Ital magnetic stretcher (International Control as a reality operational of an explore of statute)     International Control (International Control (Internata	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	effects can be mitigated.	
11 units of a data       0       Internation of a data       0         21 load affinition for a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       9         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       8         31 data with find end load affinition of a data       0       80 sec are find load affinition of a data       8         31 dat	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
12.1 Central for densities       01       No. to or median.       100         13.1 Optimize the ensemption the second in a face statute.       100       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption that statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption that statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption that statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption that statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption face statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption face statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption face statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption face statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         13.2 Defause the ensemption face statute.       00       No statute.       10.0 Ensemption the second in a face statute.         14.1 Defause	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		
1.1 Urdance to the resert induct stand	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	low, low or medium.	
3.1 bitaling in genetic side side of and integration of any section of any sectin of any section of any section of any sectio	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
33 Defautor is lead arcented.       Image: Image Image: Imag	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
A1 Detailed to Use an initiation       0       Initiation of the anticipant of the antici	3.3 Distance to employment locations			
3.5 Detailed in Prefexts instriguting study       Image: Control (Image: Contro) (Image: Control (Image: Control (Image: Control (Imag	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3-1 Classifie drived a leftiline       Image: Classifie drived a leftiline       Image: Classifie drived a leftiline         3.7 Definition to nested GP surgery       Image: Classifie drived a leftiline       Image: Classifie drived a leftiline         3.8 Access to Stategic Read Network       Image: Classifie drived a leftiline       Image: Classifie drived a leftiline         4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land       Image: Classifie drived mode a leftiline       Image: Classifie drived mode a leftiline         4.2 Impact na gricultural land       Image: Classifie drived mode a leftiline       Image: Classifie drived mode a leftiline         4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space       Image: Classifie drived mode mode mode mode mode mode mode mo	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.7 Detailed bit for table of readers OF subject       C       C         3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network       (a)       The sile is 3-10km from the Strategic Road Network.       100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).         4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land       (c)       Mojority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.       100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).         4.2 Impact on agricultural land       (c)       Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).       Image: Comparity of the site fails within an area of medium landscape senselity/, -characteristics of the landscape are realised to character senselity/       Image: Comparity of the site fails within an area of medium landscape senselity/, -characteristics of the landscape are realised to character senselity/       Image: Comparity of the site within an area of medium landscape senselity/, -characteristics of the landscape are realised to character senselity/       Image: Comparity of the site within an area of medium landscape senselity/, -characteristics of the landscape are realised to character senselity/       Image: Comparity of the site within a comparity of the site within a comparity of the site with an area of medium landscape area realised to character senselity/       Image: Comparity of the site within a com	3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
Concess to statight read methods       CP       Mainty of the sile is greenfield land that is nefter within nor adjacent to a settlement.       00% greenfield sile, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).         4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land       CP       Mainty of the sile is greenfield land that is nefter within nor adjacent to a settlement.       00% greenfield sile, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).         4.2 Impact on agricultural land       CP       Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space.       Image: CP and able to about development whord significant character charge.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       CP       The field field within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - character and able to about development whord significant character charge.       Proposed employment development is adjacent to oxisting employment uses and is not likely to field the character.         6.2 Settlement character sensitivity       OP       Development a unikely to involve the site.       Proposed employment development is adjacent to oxisting employment uses and is not likely to field the character.         6.1 Topography constraints       OP       Ges or of pipelines do not pose any constraint or migation.       Proposed employment development is adjacent to oxisting employment uses and is not likely to field the site.         6.2 Distance to power lines       OP       Ges or of pipelines do not pose any constraint or the site.       Proposed employment development uses and is not likely to field and agreent would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adj	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownieus and determined Land       1.1         4.2 Impact on agricultural land       1.0         4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space       0         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       0         6.1 Landscape sensitivity       0         7.1 Topography constraints       0         6.2 Settlement character sensitivity       0         0       Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character.         7.1 Topography constraints       0         6.1 Topography constraints       0         6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0         0       Power lines do not pose an constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0         0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on The Preservation Order (TPO)       0         0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.4 Access to site       0         0.1       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on education and require an upgrade.         6.4 Access to site       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tr	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(-)	The site is 3-10km from the Strategic Road Network.	
**2 impact on agricultual and       CP         4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space       0       Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       CP       The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to character change.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       0       Development is unlikely to be flect the character.       Proposed employment development is adjacent to existing employment uses and is not likely to effect the character.         6.1 Topography constraints       CP       Topographical constraints exist in the sile but potential for mitigation.       Entensity of a constraints exist in the sile but potential for mitigation.         6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the sile.       Entensity of a digacent to the sile.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       Intensity of sile development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or would require an upgrade.         6.4 Access to sile       CP       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Shooling Ground). Potential adverse impact.         6.5 Contamination constraints       CP       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Shooling Ground). Potential adverse impact.	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
1.1 Landscape sensitivity       (e)       The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to character change.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       (e)       The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to character change.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       0       Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.       Proposed employment development is adjacent to existing employment uses and is not likely to affect the character.         6.1 Topography constraints       (e)       Topographical constraints exist in the sile but potential for mitigation.         6.2 Distance to power lines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or would require an upgrade.         6.4 Access to site       (e)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Off track style road. Would require an upgrade.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (f)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Shooting Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
5.1 Latitude gest setistivity       (1)       change and able to absorb development without significant character change.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       0       Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.       Proposed employment development is adjacent to existing employment uses and is not likely to effect the character the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the location of the site within a Conservation Area.         6.1 Topography constraints       (2)       Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.         6.2.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.         6.2.2 Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (4)       Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access       Off track style road. Would require an upgrade.         8.5 Contamination constraints       (4)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Shooting Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		
D2 Setuentient characteristic design reflecting the location of the site within a Conservation Area.         6.1 Topography constraints       (A)         6.1 Topography constraints       (A)         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0         6.2b Distance to power lines       0         0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0         The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (A)         6.5 Contamination constraints       (C)         Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)		
0.1 http://graphy.constraints       (*)       Index and one of the state	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0		Proposed employment development is adjacent to existing employment uses and is not likely to effect the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the location of the site within a Conservation Area.
0.2 Distance to gas and diriptientines       0       Additional problem in the street of the	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)		
6.20 Distance to power lines       0       Image: constrained by over lines       0         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (-)       Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access       Off track style road. Would require an upgrade.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (-)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Shooting Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0		
6.3 impact on the Preservation Order (FPO)       0       adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (-)       Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access       Off track style road. Would require an upgrade.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (-)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Shooting Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0		
0.4 Access to site       (*)       would require upgrade.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (*)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.         Not applicable       Not applicable	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)		adjacent to the site.	
0.5 Containination constraints     (-)       Not applicable     Not applicable	6.4 Access to site	(-)	would require upgrade.	
6.6 Traffic impact Not applicable.	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)		
	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

EB801AC



Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0025-Rev1	Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in North Weald Bassett	Legend
ARUP	Date: September 2016		Stage 2 Sites N Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:27,500 @A3	Source: Esri, DiglalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	

	-
Site Reference	SR-0006
Parish:	North Weald Bassett
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	2.36
Address:	Dorrington Farm, Rye Hill Road, Harlow, Essex, CM18 7JF
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Existing farm building, warehouse and adjacent field.

SLAA yield:	9,400 sqm commercial
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Plot Ratio of 0.4 for Employment
SLAA site	None

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on HAR-C which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.



Epping Forest District Council		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0006	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk	
© Contains OS data © Crown convright and da	atabase right (2016)	

© Contains US data © Crown copyingt and database right (2016) Sources: Est / HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, ICN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Est Chriat (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Source: Est.) (DiglialCobe, CaeeV) e Earthstar Geographics, CHES/Mirkub DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 9400</u>		Source: Exrl. DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 1,000sq.m. of non-residential), development of the site is likely to pose a risk ar consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly impact the BAP priority habita but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	The site is visually and functionally linked with a very high sensitivity Green Belt parcel to the north which prevents th sprawl of Harlow. If the site was released it is likely it would harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(-)	The site is 3-10km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	60% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement (Harlow).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Key characteristics of the adjacent landscape sensitivity zone assessed as highly sensitive extend to the whole of the site. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is existing employment use, however further intensification may impact negatively on agricultural character of th site.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm / industrial warehousing / builders yard). Potential adverse impact that could b mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference	: SR-0066
Parish:	North Weald Bassett
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	7.14
Address:	Harlow Park Nursery, London Road, North Weald Bassett
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Agricultural and Contractor's compound
SLAA yield:	28,760 sqm employment (B2) floorspace
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site colection	Nono

Site selection None adjustment:

**Community** Feedback was received on HAR-D which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

# Clert

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0066	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and	database right (2016)	





<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 28760</u>		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is wholly within the 250m buffer for Harlow Park Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portion of the Ancient Woodland buffer zone. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to two BAP priority habitats, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats. There may be effects but mitigation can be implemented.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to Harlow Park LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportdwellingy to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.	No public open space is located in the site area. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities for improved access, beneficial in an area of identified public open space deficiency.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Key characteristics of the adjacent landscape sensitivity zone assessed as highly sensitive extend to the whole of this site. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is adjacent to an existing employment use within ribbon development along A414 and is away from the built area. Therefore the proposals are unlikely to have an impact on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Site access achievable from A414.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, Depot and infilled ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference: SR-0092		
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	17.93	
Address:	Latton Park, London Road, Harlow	
Primary use:	Employment	

SLAA notes: Agricultural fields

SLAA yield: 71,240 sqm employment

SLAA source Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4 for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on HAR-C which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0092	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council www.cppingforcstdc.gov.uk		
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and	d database right (2016)		

© Lontains US data © Lowin copyright and database rigin (2016) Sources: Edin, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Napmriloritä, O DenStreetMap contributors, and the IGS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGiobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNESiAirbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Setmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, wisstopo, and the IGS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 71240</u>		Source: Earl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is almost wholly within the 250m buffer for Mark Bushes/Latton Park Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portion of the Ancient Woodland buffer zone. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to two BAP priority habitats, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats. There may be effects but mitigation can be implemented.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to Mark Bushes Complex LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	Almost the entirety of the site is located in a moderate sensitivity Green Belt parcel. Subject to the provision of robus planting along the site boundaries, the site would have limited harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Key characteristics of the adjacent landscape sensitivity zone assessed as highly sensitive extend to the whole of this site. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. Site is adjacent to Ancient Woodlands constituting area of high character sensitivity and would require mitigation through design and layout.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Site access achievable from A414.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Sewage Sludge). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Sile Sulla	Dinty Assessment	LA
Site Reference	: SR-0119	Hertfo
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	154.14	1.1.1
Address:	North Weald Airfield, Merlin Way, North Weald Essex, CM16 6AA	Che
Primary use:	Employment	A
SLAA notes:	North Weald Airfield	Tall
		24
SLAA yield:	42,000 business, and 735 dwellings	Client
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on East Side of main runway releasing 35ha for development (as per Halcrow EFDC Aviation Intensification Study) c.70:30 housing to employment land. 30 dph housing and 0.4 plot ratio for employment.	Eppi Job Title Eppi
SLAA site	None	Drawing
contraints:		Issue
		Drawing
Site selection	None	SR-0
adjustment:		A

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on NWB-AF which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

### Hertford Harlow Cheshual Al100 Brentwood

### Epping Forest District Council Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No SR-0119 ARCUP Epping Forest Epping Forest Strict Council Weiter Provide Status (Strict Council) Strict Council (Strict Council)

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esni, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBEDO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri Chnia (Hong Kong), swisstopo Magmri/ndia, © OpenStreetMago contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGiobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Setmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 42000</u>		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is partly the 250m buffer for Roughtalley's Wood Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small part of the buffer land, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland BAP priority habitat, and the related buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat. There may be effects but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Roughtalley's Wood LNR LWS, Church Lane Flood Meadow LNR LWS and St. Andrew's Churchyard, North Weald LWS. The site may indirectly affect the features and species of these LWS but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	More than 99% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. The portion affected by Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b totals less than 1% is located along the northern most boundary of the site and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	access to open space which is currently private.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. An existing site masterplan identifies opportunities to provide new public open spaces in the development proposal.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant landscape character sensitivity context for the site as a whole is the wider open countryside to the north. Development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Airfield contributes significantly to settlement character through land use and historic assets. The Masterplan identifies opportunities for development of land to the east of the airfield where it does not compromise the airfield for aviation.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	There are protected trees on and adjacent to the site, but the percentage of the site area affected is limited, and they would not be a significant constraint.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Adjacent to major roads.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Military Airfield). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference: SR-0274		
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	6.49	
Address:	Hurricane Way Industrial Estate, North Weald Bassett	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Industrial Estate Inc. 0.76 vacant plot on East part of site	
SLAA yield:	3,000 sqm commercial	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4 to vacant area	

SLAA site contraints:

None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on NWB-1 which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

### Hertford Ches hunt drage grad by gra

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0274	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HER, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., CEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri Chnia (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmi/ndia, © OpenStreetMago contributors, and the GIS User Comunity Source: Esri, DigitalGibeb, GeeEye, Eanthatar Geographics, CMES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Semapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Comunity



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 3000</u>		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is party within the 250m buffer for Roughtalley's Wood Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a smal area of the buffer zone. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the south of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is almost wholly within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat. There may be effects but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Roughtalley's Wood LNR LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	90% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (North Weald Basset).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Redevelopment or intensification of existing employment site could contribute positively to settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	From main roads.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Military Airfield). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference	: SR-0275	
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	1	
Address:	High Road, North Weald, Industrial Estate, CM16 6EG	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment None	
SLAA yield:	2,400 sqm commercial	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on development of open areas of estate for employment dwellings	
SLAA site contraints:	None	
Site selection	None	

adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### Comm. (sq.m.): 2400

# Clent

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0275	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and	database right (2016)		

Couraes Esri, HER, Delorme, Indrima, Increment P Corp., GEOC, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Cardonas Esri, HER, Delorme, Indrima, Increment P Corp., GEOC, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Magnyindia, O perStreteMap contributors, and it eol Si User Community User Contribution, and the GIS User Community Setting and Contribution and the GIS User Community Setting and Contribution and the GIS User Community Setting and Contribution and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 2400</u>				
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).		
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Wood Pasture and Parkland BAP priority habitat and within three buffer zones. The site may affect a small area of the BAP priority habitat, but this can be addressed through mitigation.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within 250m buffer of Tylers Green Grasslands LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.		
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A414 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	95% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (North Weald Basset).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.		
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.		
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Redevelopment or intensification of existing employment site could contribute positively to settlement character.	
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.		
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Telephone Exchange / Works). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.	
		•	© Arup	

	·····,
Site Reference:	SR-0409
Parish:	North Weald Bassett
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	7.18
Address:	Land at J7 of M11
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Agricultural field
SLAA yield:	28,680 sqm commercial

SLAA source Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4 for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### Comm. (sq.m.): 28680

### Hartford Harlow Cheshual Allo

Epping Forest District Council		
t Local Plan		
Issue		
P1		
Epping Forest District Council		



e Contains US data e Lotown copyingit and database ngt (2010) Sources: Esin (HERE, Det Umer (Intermap, increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Orchance Survey, Esi Japan, METI, Esir Chnai, (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyindia, 20 pons/treeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esir, DiglialGiboe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbas DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geimappin, Aerogrid, IGN, (GP, wisistop), and the GIS User Community

Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Harlow Park Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portion of the Ancient Woodland buffer zone. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to BAP priority habitats with no main features, and is wholly within two buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats. There may be effects but mitigation can be implemented.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to Harlow Park LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M11 and A414 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportdwellingy to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities for improved access, beneficial in an area of identified public open space deficiency.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site located alongside A414 and M11 motorway junction, some distance from Harlow, and adjacent to Harlow Park ancient woodland. Development here may contribute to sprawl / ribbon development.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Site access achievable from A414.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over very small parts of site (infilled ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference	: SR-0412	
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	2	
Address:	Woodside Business Estate, Thornwood	
Primary use:	Employment	
SLAA notes:	Existing low density business estate	
	8,000 sgm commercial	
SLAA yield:	8,000 sqm commercial	
SLAA source	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4	
for baseline yield:		
<i></i>		
SLAA site	Regeneration of existing trading estate	
contraints:	regeneration of existing trading estate	

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 8000</u>

### 4106 ertf Brentw

Client		
Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distri	ict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0412	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

JSGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, China (Hong Kong), swissto bus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



<u>Comm. (sq.m.):</u> 8000			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is wholly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Wintry Wood Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the buffer zone. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Traditional Orchard BAP priority habitat, and within three BAP priority habitat buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats. There may be effects but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is the adjacent open countryside. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location, including to the highly sensitivity area adjacent, to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider la
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Intensification of existing employment uses on the Woodside Trading Estate is not likely to impact settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Adjacent to main roads.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Military Camp / Industrial Estate). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference:	: SR-0415	
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	3.75	
Address:	Weald Hall Farm Industrial Estate	
Primary use:	Employment	
SLAA notes:	Existing Industrial Estate	
	2 000	
SLAA yield:	3,000	
SLAA source	Regeneration of existing trading estate - development of any	
for baseline	vacant plots	
yield:		

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

None

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 3000</u>

### Hertford Cheshuat A/1/0 Brentwood

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0415	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

Client

© Uontanis US data © Lifown copyingit and ostatoase rigit (2016) Sources: Esti, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Esti China (Hong Kong), swisslopo, Mapmylndia, © OpenStretMap contributors, and the GISU set Comunity Source: Esti, DigitalGibo, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Gethapping, Aerogri, IGN, IGP, ewisslop, and the GIS User Comunity



Criteria1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites1.7 Flood risk1.8a Impact on heritage assets1.8b Impact on archaeology		Score Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Qualitative Assessment
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites         1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites         1.7 Flood risk         1.8a Impact on heritage assets			
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites         1.7 Flood risk         1.8a Impact on heritage assets		contoination with other sites).	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites         1.7 Flood risk         1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
Ancient Woodland         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites         1.7 Flood risk         1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites         1.7 Flood risk         1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites       1.7 Flood risk       1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.7 Flood risk       1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(++)	Opportunity to enhance significance of the historical asset/ further reveal its significance / enhance the setting.	
	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	U	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt		Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	90% brownfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Intensification of existing employment uses at Weald Hall Farm not likely to impact historic assets at the farm, or the character of the airfield or the settlement.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)		The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Adjacent to main roads.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farmyard / Industrial Estate / In filled Ponds / Electricity Sub Station). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference:	SR-0418	
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	8.32	
Address:	Chase Farm and Redricks Nursery and North Weald Nursery	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Existing Industrial Estate, Nursery and Agricultural Field	
SLAA yield:	16,640 sqm commercial and 125 dwellings	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 50:50 housing to employment at 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for employment	
SLAA site contraints:	None	

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on NWB-A which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

# Cleent

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Issue		
P1		
Epping Forest District Council		

© Uontaine US batta © Litowin copyingit and ostatoase rigit (2016) Sources: Esti / HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NJ, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Esti China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapyrilotta, C OpenStrateMapc contributors, and Ho ISI User Comunity Source: Esti, DgitalGiboo, George, Eanthair Geographiss, CHES/Mirbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Arengdi, IGN, KGP, wisstopo, and the GIS User Comunity



<u> Comm. (sq.m.): 16640</u>		Source: Earl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 4 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are located at the edges of the site and may affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zones. The may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer of St. Andrew's Churchyard, North Weald LWS. The site is unlikely to affect features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the A614 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Existing glasshouses in area of predominantly rural, dispersed settlement along Vicarage Lane near to historic chu Proposed floorspace is not considered in keeping with the surrounding area and could negatively impact settlen character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access is suitable.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Military Gun Site / Industrial Estate / Horticultural Nursery / Piggeries / In filled Pond landfill within 250m). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

One Ouna		6
Site Reference	: SR-0570	Hertfo
Parish:	North Weald Bassett	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.73	
Address:	Land adjoining dwelling 1, Horseshoe Farm, London road, Harlow, CM17 9LH	Che
Primary use:	Employment	H
SLAA notes:	Appears to be a quarry site.	ATT
SLAA yield:	722sam	LI
•	•	Client
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Pre-Application Form	Eppi Job Titl Eppi
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 20% of the site is covered by the buffer zone for a high pressure gas pipeline. As such the yield has been reduced accordingly.	Drawing
		Drawing
Site selection adjustment:	None	SR-0

Community feedback: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

### Comm. (sq.m.): 578

### Hertford Cheshuat Al10 Brentwood

### Epping Forest District Council Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No SR-0570



© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadater NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, Digitalicibles, Geeye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Intrus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within the Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	()	could be mitigated.	Site is very close to a major motorway junction and significant levels of mitigation are likely to be required to address air quality impacts.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	development without significant character change.	The site characteristics are consistent with it being assessed as highly sensitive to the impact of development. Development would be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Proposed development on a previously developed site, adjacent to retail use and motorway junction. Development not likely to have an impact on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	Although some 65% of the site is in the HSE middle consultation zone, none of it is in the inner zone. Sensitivity level 1 and HSE guidance for employment sites in level 1 and 2 is don't advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	would require upgrade.	Access could be provided but from London Road but would require an extension to the road through third party land.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

### EB801AC



Report on Site Selection     Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0026-Rev1     Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in Chipping Ongar     Legend       ARUP Epping Forest District Council     Date: September 2016     Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Abus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, ISN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.     Legend				
ARUP Date: September 2016 N Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid,	Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0026-Rev1	Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid,	ARUP	Date: September 2016		IN IN
	Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:22,500 @A3	<ul> <li>CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.</li> </ul>	

Z

one ountai	Sincy Assessment
Site Reference:	: SR-0173
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	9.47
Address:	Fyfield Research and Business Park, Fyfield Road, Chipping Ongar, CM5 0GZ
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Existing use a research and business park.
SLAA yield:	17,000 sqm commercial
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Composite of previous refused planning applications (Refused primarily due to impact on Green Belt)
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17000</u>

# Clert

Epping Forest Distri	ict Co	uncil
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distri	ict Loo	cal Plan
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No		Issue
SR-0173		P1
ARUP	•	Epping Forest District Council

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Edn.; HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NN, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METT, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Maymylindia, © OpenSiteetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community GeoBanapping, Aerografi, GN, GP, wisstopo, and the GIS User Community GeoBanapping, Aerografi, GN, GP, wisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17000</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a portion of a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site may directly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is located in a existing business park. Proposed employment intensification is not likely have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Junction with B184 would need to be improved.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farmyard / Agricultural Research / Industrial / infilled Ponds). Potential adverse impact tha could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

### EB801AC



Report on	Drawing No.	Content	Legend
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0027-Rev1	Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0027-Rev1 Date: September 2016	Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in Roydon	Legend Stage 2 Sites N
	EFDC-S2-0027-Rev1	Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Stage 2 Sites

onto ountu	
Site Reference	: SR-0483
Parish:	Roydon
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.21
Address:	Southfield Nursery, Old House Lane, Roydon, CM195DH
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Vacant plot in an existing nursery development, to the rear of residential gardens.
SLAA yield:	840sqm of employment.
SLAA source	Assumption based on 0.4 plot ratio for employment.
for baseline yield:	
yield.	
SLAA site	None
contraints:	
Site selection	None
adjustment:	NOTE



Epping Forest District Co	Junch
Job Title	
Epping Forest District Lo	cal Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0483	P1
ARUP 🤅	Epping Forest District Council

GS, FAO, NPS,

CAN USGS, AEX



**Community** feedback: Feedback was received on HAR-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

### Comm. (sq.m.): 840

CriteriaScoreQualitative Assessment1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites0Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).12 Impact on Nationally Protected sites0Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites0Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed1.3 Impact on Ancient Woodland0Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.11.3 Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient WoodlandNo Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.11.4 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats0No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.The site is wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats. I implemented to address this.1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites0No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.The site is wholly within three buffer Zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats. I implemented to address this.1.7 Flood risk(***)Site while Flood Zone 1.The site is wholly within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features1.7 Flood risk(***)Site within Flood Zone 1. </th <th></th>	
1.1 Impact on Nationally Protected sites       0       combination with other sites).         1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites       0       Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSS's.         1.3a Impact on Ancient/Woodland       0       Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Voodland       0       No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land       0       Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats       0       No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.       The site is wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats. I implemented to address this.         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites       0       Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features.         1.7 Flood risk       (++)       Site within Flood Zone 1.       The one prime forest can be militable.	
1.2 Impact on Nacient Woodland       0       Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.         1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland       0       Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.         1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.       No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land       0       Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats       0       No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.       The site is wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats. If implemented to address this.         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites       0       Site within Flood Zone 1.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.         1.7 Flood risk <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	
1.3a Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Veteran trees are located within the site.       Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Veteran trees are located within the site.         1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land       0       Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.       Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land       0         1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats       0       No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.       The site is wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats. If implemented to address this.         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites       0       Site within Flood Zone 1.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the new indirectly aff	
1.3 impact on Andemiveteran Trees outside of Andemisers outside Andemisers Trees outside of Andemisers Tr	
1.4 Impact on Epping Poils's build Land       0       Instruction Expine Candidate Cand	
1.3 Impact on BAP Photicy Species of Habitats       0       implemented to address this.         1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites       0       Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.       The site is within the 250m buffer for Brickfields Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features are and effects can be priticated.         1.7 Flood risk       (++)       Site within Flood Zone 1.       Implemented to address this.	
1.5 Impact on Local winnersites     0     Impact on Local winnersites     I	out mitigation can be
1.7 FIGOD TISK     (++)       Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	atures and species of
1.8a Impact on heritage assets Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology       There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality     0     Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt (-) Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities Distance to local amenities Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network (-) The site is 3-10km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (+) Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 100% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Harlow).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land () Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (+) Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in Site is a vacant land. The proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development development could enhance the character of the proposed employment development de	e area.
6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
6.4 Access to site Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Through an existing nursery site off Epping Road.	
6.5 Contamination constraints (·) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (sewage works/nursery). Potential adverse impact, but could be mitigate	d.
6.6 Traffic impact Not applicable. Not applicable.	



Ν

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0028-Rev1	Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
ARUP	Date: September 2016	Theydon Bois Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics,	Stage 2 Sites Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:17,500 @A3	CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	

One Ounta				
Site Reference: SR-0552				
Parish:	Theydon Bois			
Settlement:				
Size (ha):	0.82			
Address:	Blunts Farm Motorway Maintenance Compound, Coopersale Lane			
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Employment Warehouse buildings, appear to be used by the Highways Agency.			
SLAA yield:	3,280 sqm employment			
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4			
SLAA site contraints:	None			

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 3280</u>

# Territoria de la construcción de la constru

Epping Forest District Council					
Job Title					
Epping Forest Distri	Epping Forest District Local Plan				
Drawing Status					
Issue					
Drawing No	Issue				
SR-0552	P1				
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council				

U Johanis US data Johan Jophysina and database fight (2016) Success. Ecs. I. HERE, Dalom Confirmenta, increment I. Conv., ETE Ecs. Chao, NPS, NRCAM, Magnay India, e. OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Suror: Exit, Digital Clobe, GeoEy, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/AI/Max DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Seemapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 3280</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Employment site located between 400m and 2km from the Special Area of Conservation. No impact beyond potential strategic air quality impact.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main features. Th site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	The proposed use is not a sensitive receptor. However, the site is close to the motorway and mitigation may be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield Site, 1,000m from an existing settlement (Theydon Bois).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Proposals have the potential to affect the wider landscape zone. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is located adjacent the M11 Motorway, and provides opportunity for employment intensification. The proposed development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential for contamination on whole of site (Depot). Potential adverse impact, but could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

### EB801AC

Ν



		6 The	Street Set

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0029-Rev1	Content Employment Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
ARUP	Date: September 2016	Waltham Abbey Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics,	Stage 2 Sites Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:30,000 @A3	CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	

Site Suita Site Reference Parish: Settlement:	bility Assessment : SR-0375 Waltham Abbey
Size (ha):	4.17
Address:	Galley Hill Road Industrial Estate
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Existing industrial estate with range of vehicle/motor repair activities. Northern part is scrub land.
SLAA yield:	17,760 sqm commercial
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on plot ratio of 0.4 for employment
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	None

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on WAL-E which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

# Clent

Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest District Local Plan				
Drawing Status				
Issue				
Drawing No	Issue			
SR-0375	P1			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council			

louroes: Exi, HERE, DeLorme, Internae, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, AceAsas, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Exi Japan, METL Exir Chana (Hong Kong), swisstopo, lagmyindia, e: OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community urore: Exir. Digitaliciole, GecRy: Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Jetmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 17760</u>		Source: Exrl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Site on very edge of 2km zone for Lee Valley Special Protection Area. Impacts likely to be avoidable.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 10,000sq.m. of non-residential), development of the site is likely to pose a risk consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possib
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zone for Deciduous Woodland. The site may indirectly affect the habitat mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Cobbin's Brook LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and specie the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Approximately 38% of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 with circa 2% in Flood Zones 3a and 3b. The location the Flood Risk Zone is confined to the southern portion of the site. Flood risk could be mitigated through site layout
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	90% brownfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is located on a brownfield site within existing develop including car servicing and car scrap. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Existing access off Galley Hill Road although Galley Hill Road may need upgrading (currently single lane in places
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Scrapyard / Horticultural Nursery / Industrial Works). Potential adverse impact that coul mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference Parish: Settlement:	: SR-0376 Waltham Abbey
Size (ha):	2.7
Address:	Abbeyview Nursery, Parklands
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Existing nursery and Glasshouses

SLAA yield: 10,880 sqm commercial

None

SLAA source Assumption based plot ratio of 0.4 for employment for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on WAL-F which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

# Hertford Harow Harow Brentwood

Epping Forest District Council						
Job Title	Job Title					
Epping Forest Distri	Epping Forest District Local Plan					
Drawing Status	Drawing Status					
Issue						
Drawing No	Issue					
SR-0376	P1					
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council					

SGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN ina (Hong Kong), swissto y DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



<u>Comm. (sq.m.): 10880</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Given the distance from Lee Valley Special Protect Area and proposed employment use for the site, there is unlikely be an effect.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 10,000sq.m. of non-residential), development of the site is likely to pose a risk ar consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Cobbin's Brook LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	0	The site is 1-3km from the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics with the adjacent character area. The form and extent of any development would have to b sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area, on edge of the existing settlement and the proposed development at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of th area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Parklands.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference: SR-0382B		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	9.9	
Address:	Brooker Road Industrial Estate and Town Mead Sports Complex, Waltham Abbey	
Primary use:	Employment	
SLAA notes:	Existing Brooker Road Industrial Estate and Town Mead Playing Fields Complex.	
	10.000 sem commercial	
SLAA yield:	10,000 sqm commercial	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumed Intensification of existing Industrial Estate	
SLAA site contraints:	Flood risk area/Playing Fields assumed not developable. Eastern part of site could be redeveloped for managed employment use due to contamination. Not considered that redevelopment would increase yield, therefore there is no net increase on this site.	
Site selection adjustment:	Following review of SLAA Site Constraints, it is assumed that Baseline yield could be delivered through Intensification of existing industrial estate.	

Community feedback: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 10000</u>

Hertford
Harlow Total
Cheshuat
A110
Client

### Epping Forest District Council Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No Issue P1



USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, China (Hong Kong), swisstor us DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, So Ge



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Given the distance from Lee Valley Special Protect Area and proposed employment use for the site, there is unlikely to be an effect.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and within the relevant buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 93% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Within this the higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a total 7% of the site and are located on the north and western boundary of the site. These areas can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	

4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity			The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0		Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. Intensification of the existing employment uses is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Cartersfield Road and Brooker Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Household Waste / Sewage Sludge / Industrial / Landfill Site within 250m). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Site Reference	: SR-0571
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	1.78
Address:	Tesco Stores Limited, Denney Avenue, Sewardstone Road
Primary use:	Employment
SLAA notes:	Tesco car park.
SLAA yield:	3300 sqm
OLAA yield.	0000 04111
SLAA source for baseline	Indicated in Pre-Application Form
yield:	
SLAA site	None
contraints:	

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is<br/>near to this site.

### <u>Comm. (sq.m.): 3300</u>

# Territorio de la construcción de la constru

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Lo	ocal Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0571	P1		
ARUP (	Epping Forest District Council		





<u>comm. (sq.m.).</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	Given the distance from Lee Valley Special Protect Area and proposed employment use for the site, there is unlikely to be an effect.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitats with no main features The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school		Not applicable.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities		Not applicable.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery		Not applicable.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	(+)	The site is within 1km of the Strategic Road Network.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Existing masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is an existing car park within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
	1	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential for contamination on whole of site (Explosives/Pesticide and fertiliser works). Potential adverse impact, bu
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)		could be mitigated.