#### EB801Gxii



i The	ANA	( Proj	1977 AVER LASS
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0013-Rev1	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend
ARUP	Date: September 2016	Chipping Ongar Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA,	Stage 2 Sites N Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:22,500 @A3	USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	

One Ouna	
Site Reference	: SR-0051
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	12.54
Address:	Land to south of A414 Chelmsford Road, Chipping Ongar, Essex
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Agricultural field
SLAA yield:	375 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

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

### Hertford Harlow Cheshuat Allo Clest

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0051	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and	d database right (2016)		

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, UISGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, SeeBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordanneo Survey, Esri Japan, METL, Esri Chhan (Hong Kong), swisstopo, AgomyIndia, e OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Jource: Esri, Diglaticlobe, Geoley, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrichus DS, USDA, USDA, USGS, AEX, Jetmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: <u>375</u>		Source: Exrl. 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	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 Deciduous Woodland 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Clatterford End Plantation 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	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.	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 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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	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 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 is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
		4	© Arup

Site Reference: SR-0053			
Parish: Chipping Ongar			
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	0.23		
Address:	Land East of Brentwood Road, Marden Ash.		

 Primary use:
 Housing

 SLAA notes:
 Agricultural/unused plot

 SLAA yield:
 7 dwellings

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site None

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on ONG-D 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 Distric	t Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0053	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and		

Sources: Eeri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kataster NL, Ordnance Survey, Eci Japan, METL, Ecir Chana (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyrindia, @OpenStreatMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: EsrL (Digitaliobes, GeoEya, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Ahrbus DS, USDA, USDS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dwellings: 7</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	the second second
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 wholly within a Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zone. The site may indirectly 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.	
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 A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, 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.	Access is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	

Site Reference: SR-0055				
Parish: Chipping Ongar				
Settlement:				
Size (ha):	1.04			
Address:	Land between A414 and High Ongar			

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Agricultural field

SLAA yield: 31 dwellings

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Issue			
P1			
Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestde.gov.uk			

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Internae, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METL, Esri Chhan (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, ® OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri Digatolobe, GeoElye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Air/hus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: <u>31</u>		Source: Earl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	1
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 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.
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 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 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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.	
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 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 is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
			© Arup

Site Reference: SR-0067i				
Parish: Chipping Ongar				
Settlement:				
Size (ha):	21.81			
Address:	Land to the west of Chipping Ongar			

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Land to West of Chipping Ongar. Agriculture

 SLAA yield:
 2,162 dwellings

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site Flood Risk reducing developable area.

Site selection<br/>adjustment:Site split into three parcels as per Call for Sites submission. Yield<br/>based on 30 dph, reduced by 30% due to flood risk.

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on ONG-F 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-0067i	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counc		





Dwellings: 458		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Eanthstar 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	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 is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the west 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 partially within a small area of a Deciduous Woodland priority habitat, and within the relevant buffer zone. 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Ongar Wood LWS and Ongar Oaks LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 40% of the site is in flood zone 2 of which 29% and 24% is also in flood zones 3a and 3b respectively. The location of the flood zones in the western and southern portion of the site means that only the north-eastern portion could be developed.
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		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 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 is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, 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		Development may involve the loss of public open space but there are opportdwellingies for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	Although some public open space aligns with the development site, opportunities for re-configuration may enable the yield of houses to be delivered without any overall 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 could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site comprises a large site located at the edge of the settlement. Whilst part of the site provides an opportunity for intensification within the existing limits of the settlement, should the full site come forward this would likely affect its charact
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.	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.	Access from Epping Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm / In filled Ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
			© Arup

Site Reference	: SR-0067iiA
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	42.53
Address:	Land to the west of Chipping Ongar

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: Land to West of Chipping Ongar. Agriculture

SLAA yield: 2,162 dwellings SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site contraints: Flood Risk reducing developable area.

Site selection<br/>adjustment:Site split into three parcels as per Call for Sites submission. Based<br/>on 30 dph, reduced by 20% due to flood risk. adjustment:

Community feedback:

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

4106 ertf Brentwo Client

Epping Forest District	Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest District	Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0067iiA	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

id database right (2016) increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, urvey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop rs, and the GIS User Community star Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, n and the GIS Lear Community



Dwellings: <u>1021</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	の時間に変更し、
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 10 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed, and may be affected by development. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and 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	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses a Wood Pasture and Parkland and the majority of a BAP priority habitat with no main features. It is within five buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the BAP priority habitats, but effects can be mitigated.
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 encompasses the whole of Ongar Oaks LWS and approximately half of Ongar Wood LWS. The site may directly affect some of the features and species of these LWS but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 15% of the site is in flood zone 2 of which 8% and 9% are in flood zones 3a and 3b respectively. Flood zones 2, 3a and 3b are located along the western site boundary and flood risk can be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	()	Site would result in loss of a heritage asset or significant impact that cannot 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 within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	The majority of the site is within a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel which preserves the setting and special character of the historic Stony Park area of Chipping Ongar. If the site was released it may 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 (Chipping Ongar).
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.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid 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 could detract from the existing settlement character.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
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 Greensted Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (In filled Pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
			e Arup

Site Reference	SR-0067iiB
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	7.66
Address:	Land to the west of Chipping Ongar

Primary use: Housing Land to West of Chipping Ongar. Agriculture SLAA notes:

SLAA yield: 2,162 dwellings SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield: None

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection adjustment: Site split into three parcels as per Call for Sites submission. Based on 30 dph. adjustment:

ertf Brentwo Client Epping Forest District Council

Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No Issue P1 SR-0067iiB Epping Forest District Council UP Al



Qualitative Assessment

feedback: site. Refer to Appendix B1		© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Eerit, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp. GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METT, Eari China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap actoributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri DigitalCobe, GeoCye, Eartistar Geographice, ONES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community			
<u>Dwellings:</u>	<u>230</u>				
Criteria				Score	
1.1 Impact on In	ernationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the combination with other sites).	proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in	
1.2 Impact on Na	ationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones ther development is unlikely to pose a risk to	e is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on A	ncient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to A	ncient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient Woodlar	Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Id	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran tre largely avoided or possible impacts could	es but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be d be mitigated.	There are 2 Ancient trees directly affe affect both trees. Impacts to the A masterplanning.

I is impact on Allocative Viscolative         0         Rule is in Clobate Within or ediport of Ancient Viscolative         Impact on Allocative Clobate Within or ediport of Ancient Viscolative Lat at a sufficiently leaders of the bits has a clobate of protein management class in ediport of protein management class in	sidered
Addam Woodbalt         Image of a large wordbalt impact on possible impact on coping Forest Buffer Land         Image of a large of a large wordbalt impact on the pring Forest Buffer Land           1.4 Impact on Egying Forest Buffer Land         0.         Site is writely on the prince forest Buffer Land         Prince of a large of	sidered
1.5 Impact on the part retent name Catal       0       No effect as features and species could be retained or due to datance of BAP priority habitats from alter.       The abit is particuly within Dacidious Wooding and the implemented baddees ins.         1.5 Impact on EAP Priority Species or Habitats       0       No effect as features and species could be retained or due to datance of BAP priority habitats from alter.       The abit is particuly within Dacidious Wooding and the implemented baddees ins.         1.7 Flood risk       (ref)       Site within Flood Zare 1.       Implemented as assess       0       Proposed alter located within the setting of a horitoge asset and effects can be migrated.       Implemented asset and approximation and epidemented asset and effects can be migrated.         1.8 Impact on achaeology       (ref)       Site within Flood Zare 1.       Implemented asset and approximation and epidemented asset and effects can be migrated.       Implemented asset and approximation and epidemented asset and effects can be migrated.         1.8 Impact on achaeology       (ref)       Site is within Green Belt, where is level of harm caused by release of the land for davelopment would be very compare ratificate station.       Implemented asset and approximation and epidement and epidemented asset and or davelopment would be very compare ratificate as within Green Belt, where is well of harm caused by release of the land for davelopment would be very compare ratificate as within Green Belt, where is the very of harm caused by release of the land for davelopment would be very compare ratificate as within Green Belt, where is the very of harm caused by release of the land for davelopment would be ve	Jirectly
1.5 Injust of the Printing Species in Hadina       0       See Name of Heating Species in Hadina       offect the SAP priority habitats, but migration can be implemented to address this.         1.6 Impact on Local Wallies Siles       0       See Name offect as features and species could be resined or due to distance of local widdle siles from sile.       Implemented to address this.         1.7 Flood risk       164       See within Flood Zone 1.       Implemented to address this.         1.8. Impact on heritage assets       0       Proposed also bound of a heritage asset and effects on the migrated.       Implemented to address this.         1.8. Impact on archaeology       60       Existing evidence and/or a took of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high qualty archaeological assets and effect the SAP priority abitats.       Implemented to address this.         1.9. Impact of air quality       0       See lies outded of arces denified at being ar risk of poor air quality.       Implemented to address this.         2.1 Lord of hum to Green Beit       60       See lies outded of arces denified at being ar risk of poor air quality.       Implemented to address this.         3.2 Distance to reareat to sugp       0       See lies outded of an engloyment stateboation.       Implemented to address this.         3.3 Distance to neareat fulledue states       60       See lies within 1500m of an engloyment stateboation.       Implemented to address this.         3.4 Distance to local a	
1.5 implies on Local visione sites       0       Implies on Local visione sites       0         1.7 Flood risk       644       Ste within Flood Zone 1.       Implies on Local and vision the setting of a hetilage assets and effects can be milippied.         1.8a Impact on heritage assets       0       Proposed alle located within the setting of a hetilage asset and effects can be milippied.         1.8b Impact on archaeology       0       Exeting evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality         1.9 Impact on archaeology       0       Ste les outbid of arres identified as being at risk of poor air quality.         1.1 Impact on Local vision to Green Belt       00       Ste is writh Green Belt, writh the neares identified as being at risk of poor air quality.         1.1 Distance to the nearest rait/tube station       00       Ste is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.         3.1 Distance to nearest bus stop       0       Ste between 400m and 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.         3.3 Detance to local anentities       0       Ste les whith 1000m of an employment stop/location.         3.4 Distance to local anentities       0       Ste les whith 1000m from the nearest indivity/imary school.         3.4 Distance to local anentities       0       Ste les whith 1000m from the nearest indivity/imary school.         3.5 Distance to local anentides       0       Ste le	
1.7 Hold tak       (1)         1.8a Impact on heritage assets       0       Propeed alle located with the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be miligated.         1.8b Impact on archaeology       (1)       Exclusion packed being addence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality         1.9 Impact of air quality       0       Site lise outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.         2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt       0       Site lise outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.         3.1 Distance to the nearest rabitude station       (1)       Site lise within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.         3.2 Distance to the nearest rabitude station       (1)       Site lise more than 4000m from the nearest rabitude station.         3.3 Distance to local amenilies       0       Site lise within 1600m of a bus stop.       Image: Site lise lises than 1000m of a bus stop.         3.4 Distance to local amenilies       0       Site lise statin 1000m for menerest triant/primary school.       Image: Site lise lises than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenilies       (2)       Site lise lises than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.       Image: Site lises than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenilies       (2)       Site lis between 1000m	
1.5d mipade of inferinging assess       0       Interfact of air quality         1.8b Impact on archaeology       00       Site is writing assess on the size.         1.8b Impact of air quality       00       Site is writing assess on the size.         2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt       00       Site is writing Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very         3.1 Distance to the nearest raik/ube station       (c)       Site is writin Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very         3.2 Distance to the nearest raik/ube station       (c)       Site is writin 1000m of a bus stop.         3.3 Distance to nearest bus stop       0       Site is writin 1000m of a bus stop.         3.4 Distance to local amenties       0       Site is writin 1000m of an employment site/location.         3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school       (c)       Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenties       0       Site is writin 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenties       (c)       Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.5 Distance to local amenties       (c)       Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.7 Distance to local amenties       (c)       Site is brivene than 4000m from th	
1-00 inplat on arthreeoogy       (1) 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 ham to Green Belt       (A)       Site is within Green Belt, where the level of ham caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.         3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station       (A)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.         3.2 Distance to nearest toxi stop       0       Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.         3.3 Distance to employment locations       (A)       Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       0       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (A)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (A)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (A)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to nearest infant/primary school       (A)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to nearest SP surgery       0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest SP surgery.	
1.5 Impact of air quality       0       International quality       0         2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt       (4)       Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very         3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station       (6)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.         3.2 Distance to nearest tail/tube station       (6)       Site is more than 4000m of a bus stop.         3.2 Distance to nearest tous stop       0       Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.         3.3 Distance to local amenities       0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (4)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (4)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (4)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (4)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (4)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.         3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0	
2.1 Level of harm to Green best       (*)       low, low or medium.       i         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       (*)       Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       0       Site is between 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (*)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (*)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (*)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to local amenities       (*)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.         0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.       Image: Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest number station       (+)         3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop       0       Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.         3.3 Distance to employment locations       (+)       Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.         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       (+)       Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (-)       Site is nore than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (-)       Site is nore than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.2 Distance to employment locations       0       Image: Control of the energy	
3.3 Distance to local amenities       0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       0       Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (+)       Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (-)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.4 Distance to nearest infant/primary school       (+)       Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (-)       Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.5 Distance to hearest finant/printary school       (+)         3.4 Distance to local amenities       (-)         Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.         3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0         Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities     (*)       3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery     0       Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable.	
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 circa 100m from an existing settlement (Chipping Ongar).	
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 adverse impact on adjacent landscape character advector of would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character advector of advector	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site has been identified as an intensification opportunity. However, the site is on the settlement edge and the present density is higher than neighbouring developments.	posed
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 Greensted Road.	
6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	
6.6 Traffic impact 0 Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Reference	: SR-0090
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	3.66
Address:	Land to east of Longfields, Chipping Ongar

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: Agricultural field

SLAA yield: 114 dwellings

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network

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

Not applicable.

# ertf Brentw

Client	
Epping Forest Distric	t Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0090	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counci



Dwellings: <u>114</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	(-)	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 centre 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 wholly within the buffer zone for a Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat. 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.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zone 2 affects an insignificant proportion of the north-east 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	(-)	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	(-)	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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	

JSGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, China (Hong Kong), swissto

ny s DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,

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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, 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	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 sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

One Ouna		6
Site Reference	: SR-0102	Hertfo
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	2
Settlement:		-
Size (ha):	0.8	
Address:	Land to the south and west (rear) of Nos 57a and 57b Fyfield Road, Chipping Ongar	ch
Primary use:	Housing	Y
SLAA notes:	Small area of scrub/woodland	ATT
SLAA yield:	24 dwellings	Client
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph	Epp Job Tit Epp
SLAA site contraints:	Access to site is significantly constrained, reducing capacity on site to a smaller development of 8-10 homes	Drawin
contraints.		lssu
		Drawin
		SR-0

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.

### Hartrond Harlow Cheshua Alto Brentwood

Epping Forest Distri	ict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distri	ict Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0102	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

, FAO, NPS, NRCAI (Hong Kong), swiss USDA, USGS, AEX



<u>Dwellings: 8</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.	
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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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	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 landscap character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is a green land with dense vegetation. Therefore, development has the potential to adversely 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	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Although the SLAA identified access as a possible constraint, following further consideration it was judged that acces could be provided from Fyfield Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Hospital). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	

Site Suita Site Reference Parish: Settlement: Size (ha): Address:	bility Assessment : SR-0112 Chipping Ongar 31.3 Land to the west of Stanford Rivers Road, Chipping Ongar
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Agricultural fields
SLAA yield: SLAA source for baseline yield:	765 dwellings and 25,500 sqm commercial Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

# 41060 ertford Brentwo Client

Epping Forest Distr	Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0112	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		



Community feedback:	Feedback was received o site. Refer to Appendix B1		www.expiring/ustatuc.gov.uk www.expiring/ustatuc.gov.uk © Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GedBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alhous DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmaping, Aerographic, IGN, IGN, Bisstopo, and the GIS User Community	May 194 1
Dwellings:	<u>765</u>			
	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Inte	ernationally 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 Nat	tionally 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 An	ncient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient Woodland	ncient/Veteran Trees outside of	(-)	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 at the edges of the site. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epp	ping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAF	P 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 Wood Pasture and Parkland priority habitat. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but effects may be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Loc	cal 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 Kettlebury Spring LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS
1.7 Flood risk		(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	

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 Wood Pasture and Parkland priority habitat. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but 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.	The site is adjacent to the Kettlebury Spring 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	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.	Parts of the site are close to the A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	As a result of the site characteristics development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
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	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access can be achieved from Standford Rivers Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over small part of site (infilled ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Reference: SR-0120		
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	3.34	
Address:	Bowes Field, Chipping Ongar	

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Vacant greenfield plot

SLAA yield: 100 dwellings

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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

# Heritord Cheshuat

ouncil
ocal Plan
Issue
P1
Epping Forest District Council

ources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, aceasase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordanneo Survey, Esri Japan, METL, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, lapmyhrida, @ OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community ource: Esri, Diglaricitole, Gocty, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Athus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, letmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 100		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	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 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.	
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.	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 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 is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, 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	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.	Access is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
			© Arup

Sile Sulla	Sincy Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0183
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	11.21
Address:	Land to the East of Old Chipping Ongar County Secondary School, High Ongar
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Agricultural field
SLAA yield:	336 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on ONG-A 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 I	Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0183	P1	
ARUP © Contains OS data © Crown copyright and data	Epping Forest District Council	

urces: Esti, HERE, DaLorme, Interrings, Incoment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, voldbase, IGN, Kadatest ML, Ortancio Survey, Esti Japan, METL, Esti Crihan (Hong Kong), swisstopo, apmyindia, @OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community urce: Esti, DigHafolobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Anthus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, tmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



OrbitalCatalationCatalationCatalationCatalation11 manufaction12Relation of a location and a locati	Dwellings: <u>336</u>		Source: Earl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
International ProcessionNote and any	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
CalculationSetRestore stating report a fair diffy12 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation13 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation14 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation15 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation16 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation17 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation18 may and with the stating report a fair diffyCalculationCalculation19 may and with the stating report a fair diffy <td< td=""><td>1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
Index and section of the section of	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.	
Name International StateImage Image Image Image ImageImage Image 	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Control optimization of any set of a set	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Uniformation floor product and all and an additional and additional and additional and additional and additional and additional and additional addita additional additional additional additional add	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Initial MathemaVImage: Mathematication of the sector	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.	
Initian         Initian         Initian         Initian         Initian           12 interaction status         01         Initian status         01         Initian status         01         Initian status         01         Initian status	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.	
Instruction relation below body     Instruction relationship below body     Instruction relationship below body       12 hard in a discussion     10     Definition of the state in a discussion in a disc discussion of disc	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Number of weaking         IP         Introduction on the static for s	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
Interfact space       Col       Control Contro Control Control Control Control Contro Control Control	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)		
2 Luter during to use (also)       3P       is, te or metabolic       per a limited impact (app) of the issing 2 for phase and 10 (app) of par due to its (impact app)         3 Distance in the messes (also messes)       3P       is more about the issing 2 for phase and 0 (app) of a limit (ap) limit (ap) of a li	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
1 Defines for the Haster Haviluse state       ct         2 Defines to messet thes stop.       ct         2 Defines to messet thes stop.       ct         3 Defines to messet the stop.       ct         3 Defines to mease Hardbymary stode       ct         3 Defines to mease Hardbymary stop.       ct         4 Defines to mease Hardbymary stop. <td>2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt</td> <td>(-)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)		
12 desire the resert of upp of the desire	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims         A detailed bit prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claims       initial control of the prive to claim	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
A relative to during the field of the	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
A l datacée di latterite interintanti attantiquito y soluti       Image: Construction di latterite interintanti attantiquito y soluti       Image: Construction di latterite interintanti attantiquito y soluti       Image: Construction di latterite interintanti attantiqui di latterite interintanti attanti attantino interintattanti di latterite interintattanti attant	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
A relation of CLU an informa         CV         Current of CLU an informa         Current of CLU an informa           3.7 Datance to nearest OP suggery         60         Bit is the shan 1000m from from from from from from from fro	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
A1 Decende Orientation Constraints       (*)       Performance or explaints       (*)         3.8 Access to Strategic Road Nervork       (*)       Montpoly of the site is greenided land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.       (5) <td< td=""><td>3.4 Distance to local amenities</td><td>(-)</td><td>Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.</td><td></td></td<>	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
A Letters to charge, root relation       Image: Contract relation       Image	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A1 Brownied and Generited Land       (A)       And an advance of the set of the dest of t	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2 Impact On signaturity as into       En       En </td <td>4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land</td> <td>()</td> <td>Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.</td> <td>100% greenfield site, 300m from an existing settlement ( Chipping Ongar).</td>	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, 300m from an existing settlement ( Chipping Ongar).
And Capability of improve access to dpain space       0       Performance in the state of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       (i)       Development without significant character change.       The state of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the predominantly rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.         6.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (i)       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       The scale of the proposed development may contribute to urban sprawl.         6.1 Topography constraints       (i)       Dopographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.       Interface of page and oil pipelines       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.         6.2 Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Interface of protected trees either on or         6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or       Access is sufficient.         6.4 Access to site       (i)       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination identified.         6.5 Contamination constraints       0       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination identified.	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity       CP       development without significant character change.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (+)       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the predominantly rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.         6.1 Topography constraints       (+)       Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.       Image: 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 any constraint to the site.       Image: Constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.         6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: Constraints of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on adjacent to the site.       Image: Constraints of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on adjacent to the site.       Access to site       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination identified.         6.5 Contamination constraints       0       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination identified.       No potential contamination identified.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		
3.2 Settlement drafacter sensitivity       (1)       Image: Constraints of the sensitivity of the	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()		
6.1 Hob/glaphy Constraints       (*)       Index of the site.       Index of the site.         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.       Index of the site.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Index of 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       Index of the site.         6.4 Access to site       (*)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Access is sufficient.         6.5 Contamination constraints       0       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination identified.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)		The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the predominantly rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
0.2.2 Distance to gas and on pipelines       0       Performance in the state of the s	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)		
6.2 Distance to power lines       0       Image: Constance to 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         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Access is sufficient.         6.5 Contamination constraints       0       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination identified.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0		
6.3 impact on ree Preservation Order (FPO)       0       adjacent to the site.       adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Access is sufficient.         6.5 Contamination constraints       0       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination identified.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0		
6.4 Access to site     (+)       6.5 Contamination constraints     0       No contamination expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	adjacent to the site.	
b.5 Contamination constraints U	6.4 Access to site	(+)		
6.6 Traffic impact (-) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	6.5 Contamination constraints	0		No potential contamination identified.
	6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

one ound	
Site Reference	: SR-0184
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.88
Address:	0.96 ha plot of land adjacent to High Ongar Road, High Ongar
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Agricultural field
SLAA yield:	26 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

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

# Teint

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0184	P1		
	Epping Forest District Council		

Esri Japar d the GIS

P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto

S/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,

HERE, De



<u>Dwellings: 26</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNE OWNER OWNE
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	(-)	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	(-)	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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield, 200m from an existing settlement ( Chipping Ongar).
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 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 predominantly rural 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 is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
٤		4	arup © Arup

One Ouna	
Site Reference	: SR-0185
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	3.06
Address:	2.9 ha plot of land adjacent to High Ongar Road, High Ongar
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Agricultural field
SLAA yield:	92 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

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

#### Tiertford Ches hua Alto Ches hua Ches hua

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0185	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestde.gov.uk		
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and Sources: Esri HERE Del orme Interman	d database right (2016)		

Containe US data © Lröwn copyngnt and database ngmt (2016) ouross: Esn, HeRE, DeLurne, Intermane, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, eodasas, IGN, Kadaster ML, Ordnance Survey, Esn'I Japan, NETT, Esn'China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, ouros: Esn', Digatichice, Georgy: Earthstar Georgaphics, CNES/Intwis DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, etmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dwellings: 92</u>		Source: Esri, 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	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	(-)	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 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 is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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 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 neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly semi-rural character of 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 is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

Site Reference	: SR-0186
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.27
Address:	Land adjacent to Chelmsford Road (A414) near the Four Wantz roundabout, High Ongar
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Vacant scrub land plot
SLAA vield:	10 dwellings comprising 2 market homes and 8 affordable homes

SLAA yield:	10 dwellings comprising 2 market homes and 8 affordable homes
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community	Feedback was received on ONG-A which is within or near to the
feedback:	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-0186	P1			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council			



<u>Dwellings: 10</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.	
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	(+)	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 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	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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, 300m from an existing settlement ( Chipping Ongar).
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 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 predominantly rural 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 is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	
			©Ar

		L
Site Reference:	: SR-0255	ł
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	I
Settlement:		l
Size (ha):	6.51	l
Address:	All that land comprising the recreation field and sports club at Love Lane, Chipping Ongar. Including all buildings especially the garage sports club and former Council Offices.	
Primary use:	Housing	l
SLAA notes:	Existing playing fields and amenity open space, with car park and sports club building.	
SLAA yield:	193 dwellings	-
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph	 - 
SLAA site contraints:	None	
Site selection	None	

adjustment:

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



Epping Porest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0255	P1	
ARUP 🤅	Epping Forest District Council	

, FAO, NPS, I USDA, USGS, AEX



Dwellings: 193		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 Deciduous Woodland 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.	
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	(+)	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 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 is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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	(-)	mitigation.	Although informal recreation ground aligns with the development site, opportunities for re-configuration or re-provision could reduce effects.
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 is located on playing fields at the edge of the settlement and north of Chipping Ongar Castle. The proposed development is likely to have a negative affect 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 is sufficient.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
			© Arup

Site Suitability Assessment			
Site Reference	Site Reference: SR-0267A		
Parish:	Chipping Ongar		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	21.97		
Address:	Land to the south-east of Chipping Ongar		
Primary use:	Housing		
SLAA notes:	None		
SLAA yield:	1060 dwellings and 35,000 sqm commercial		
SLAA source	Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and		
for baseline	0.4 plot ratio for commercial		
yield:			
<b></b>	None		
SLAA site contraints:	None		
Site selection	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Yield based on baseline,		
adjustment:	and reduced proportionally based on site size.		

djustment: and reduced proportionally based on site size.

Community feedback: Feedback was received on ONG-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 District	Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0267A	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, BeLorme, Intermay, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METT, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmriyidia, © OpenStreatMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigtalGiobo, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, 169; wisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 751		Souros: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	Construction of the second second
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 is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the centre 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 partially within four 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 Hallsford Bridge Meadow LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this 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, covering circa 7%, are located along a section of the south-eastern site boundary 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	(-)	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 A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 (Chipping Ongar).
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.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to 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 could detract from the existing settlement character.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
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.	Only 3% of site is in HSE middle zone located in southern corner of the site, none in inner zone. Due to location and size of affected area constraint to development considered negligible. HSE guidance advise against development for 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)	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 Brentwood Road and Stondon Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm / Within 250m of Landfill Site). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
	-		© Arup

Site Suital Site Reference Parish: Settlement:	bility Assessment : SR-0267B Chipping Ongar
Size (ha):	16.81
Address:	Land to the south-east of Chipping Ongar
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	None
SLAA yield:	1060 dwellings and 35,000 sqm commercial
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	Based on Baseline, and reduced proportionally for split site.

adjustment:



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

# Hertford Harlow Harlow Brentwood

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0267B	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

IERE, De

GS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN

ty 5 DS, USDA, USGS, AEX



Dwellings: <u>574</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	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 is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the east 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 partially within Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland 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 of Hallsford Bridge Meadow LWS and Kettlebury Spring 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.	
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 A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield, circa 50m from an existing settlement (Chipping Ongar).
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.	As a result of the site characteristics development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rura character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
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.	Some 26% of the site is in HSE middle consultation zone located along southern boundary. None in inner zone. Due to location and size of affected area mitigation is possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise agains development for 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)	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 Brentwood Road and Stanford Rivers Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (In filled Gravel Pit / In filled Ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

	-	
Site Reference: SR-0268		
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	1.47	
Address:	Land to the South of Kettlebury Way, Chipping Ongar	

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:None

SLAA yield: 43 dwellings
SLAA source Assumption based

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on ONG-E 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-0268	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and	d database right (2016)	

v cuniamis uS atta te urown copyingri and database figtir (2016) dources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, BeedBase, IGN, Kadaster ML, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissopo, Alapminfolia, © DenStreetMap contributors; and the IGS User Community Bernapping, Across (GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Bernapping, Editor (Edit La Constance), CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



Dwellings: 43		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	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 is almost wholly within a portion of a Wood Pasture and Parkland priority habitat. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Kettlebury Spring 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	(-)	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	(-)	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 A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, 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	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Access is down pathway/track shared with Hotel/Manor House.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
		•	© Arup

Site Reference: SR-0315		
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	53.87	
Address:	Chipping Ongar, East Area	

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Broad Area East of Chipping Ongar

 SLAA yield:
 1612 dwellings

 SLAA source
 Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA source Ass for baseline yield:

SLAA site Reduction is site capacity due to flood risk (c.20% reduction) contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on ONG-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 Loo	cal Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	



u-un-anns us auta ⊌ - urown copyrignt and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HER, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanoe Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri Chnia (Hong Kong), swisstopo Magmri/ndia, © DenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Comunity Source: Esri, DigitalGibeb, GeeEye, Earthatar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Semapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, wisstopo, and the GIS User Comunity



Dwellings: 1289		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	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 2 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The trees are located in the east and west 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 partially within a small area of a Deciduous Woodland priority habitat, adjacent to a Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and within three buffer zone. The site may directly affect the habitats, but effects are mitigable.
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 adjacent to Clatterford End Plantation LWS. The site may indirectly affect some of the features and species of these LWS but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 19% of the site is in flood zone 2 of which 12% and 13% are in flood zones 3a and 3b respectively. Flood zones 2, 3a and 3b are located along the southern and eastern site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	()	Site would result in loss of a heritage asset or significant impact that cannot 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 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid 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 could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is located adjacent to Chipping Ongar Castle. Considering the scale of the proposed development and its area coverage, it is likely to have a negative affect the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
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 over small parts of the site (farmyard / infilled gravel pit). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
		•	© Arup

Site Reference: SR-0387			
Parish:	Chipping Ongar		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	1.49		
Address:	Land off Great Stoney Park		

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:None

SLAA yield: 45 dwellings SLAA source Assumption based

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



olion	
Epping Forest Distric	t Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0387	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and da	

Sources: Esri, HERE, DaLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBasa, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METL, Esri Chana (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmyrindia, @OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri Digaticidoe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CHES/Ahrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 45		Source: Esri, 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	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	()	Site would result in loss of a heritage asset or significant impact that cannot be mitigated.	
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 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	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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	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 landscap character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	()	Development is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	Site is within the Stoney school conservation area, adjacent to the former school and located at the edge of Chippin Ongar. The proposed development would likely significantly alter the character of the settlement.
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.	Access appears only to be available from a private road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

Site Reference: SR-0390		
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	9.17	
Address:	Greenstead Road, Chipping Ongar	

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:None

SLAA yield: 272 dwellings

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on ONG-F which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:272

### Hertford Harlow Cheshuat Alto

Client		
Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No.		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0390	P1	
0	P1 Epping Forest District Council www.cppingforestdc.gov.uk	





Dwellings: 272		Source: Exrl. 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	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 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 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 within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	The majority of the site lies within a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel which performs relatively strongly in preserving the historic setting and special character of Chipping Ongar. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green B
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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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	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 to have an impact on the character of the area subject to sensitive design close to the listed building.
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 is suitable.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
			© Arup

Sile Sullar	Jiiity Assessment
Site Reference:	SR-0391
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	6.52
Address:	Land between Stanford Rivers Road and Brentwood Road, Chipping Ongar
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	None
SLAA yield:	195 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 10% of the site is covered by SR-0457 (23 dwellings) and as such is omitted from the yield.
Site selection adjustment:	Capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (23 dwellings) to account for overlapping site.

adjustment: apping

Community feedback:

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

## 410 ertf Brentw Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0391	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

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



<u>Dwellings: 195</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 Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zone. The site may indirectly 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 of Kettlebury Spring 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	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.	Parts of the site are close to the A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely thave an impact on the character of the area subject to sensitive design close to the listed building.
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 (Brewery / Farmyards). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Reference:	: SR-0392
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	9.44
Address:	Land north-east of Longfields, Chipping Ongar

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Greenfield open land.

SLAA yield: 288 dwellings

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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

### Hertford Harlow Cheshuat Alto

Client			
Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0392	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		



www.eppingiorestac.gov.uk
© Contains OS data © Crown 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), swisstopo,
MapmyIndia, C OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,
Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Dwellings: 288		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	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 is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the north 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	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site is partially within the majority of a Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh. The site is likely to directly affect the priority habitat, but mitigation may 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 Clatterford End Plantation LWS and Hallsford Bridge Meadow. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	()	Site within Flood Zone 3b and not likely to be suitable for development.	Some 83% of the site is in flood zone 2 of which circa 64% is in flood zones 3a and 3b. The location of the high risk flood zones is such that the site is not likely to be suitable for development.
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.	Majority of the site is far enough away from motorway to not have a significant impact.
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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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 is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	Site located in the Cripsey brook basin, which contributes to the historic character of the site. Site located on the edge of the settlement and given the extent of the site would result in significant urban sprawl and change in the settlement pattern.
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.	Access issues could be overcome with potential for new access creation from Stondon Road or Coopers Hill (and over Cripsey Brook).
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over parts of site (Gasworks on west end / 3 landfills within 250m on east end). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
	1	1	© Aru

Site Reference:	SR-0395B	
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	11.72	
Address:	Land to North of Chipping Ongar	

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: Existing school/leisure centre playing fields and agricultural land

SLAA yield:	382 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site	Reduction in site capacity by 1/2 due to flood risk

**Site selection** Assumption based on 30 dph of area of this part of split site which is not flood constrained.

Community feedback:

contraints:

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



Epping Forest Distr	Ict Council				
Job Title					
Epping Forest Distr	Epping Forest District Local Plan				
Drawing Status					
Issue					
Drawing No	Issue				
SR-0395B	P1				
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counci				



JSGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, us DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,

Dwellings: <u>352</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	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 Deciduous Woodland and Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh buffer zone. The site may indirectly 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.	
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 36% of the site is in flood zone 2 of which 33% and 29% are also in flood zones 3a and 3b respectively. The location of the flood zones in the western portion of the site means that only the eastern portion could be developed.
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 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	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 (Chipping Ongar).
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	(-)	mitigation.	Although allotments align with the development site, opportunities for re-configuration may enable the yield of houses to be delivered without any overall 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 could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. Considering the scale of the proposed development and its area coverage, it is likely to have a negative affect the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
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 Fyfield Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
			© Arup

	•	
Site Reference:	SR-0457	
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.59	
Address:	Dyers, Marden Ash, Chipping Ongar, Essex, CM5 9B	

 Primary use:
 Housing

 SLAA notes:
 Paddock land to the rear of Dyers, a grade II Listed Building.

 SLAA yield:
 23 dwellings

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 Assumption based on 30 dph

 SLAA site
 None

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

**Community** feedback: Feedback was received on ONG-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 Distri	ct Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0457	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		
Contains OS data Crown copyright and	database right (2016)		

Sources: Esri, HERE, DaLorme, Internae, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBae, IGN, Kataster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METL, Esri Chana (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyrindia, @ OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri Digalicoloe, GeoEye, Earthetar Geographics, CNES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 23		Source: Esri, DgitalGlobe, 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	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 a BAP priority habitat buffer zone. 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	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 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 (Chipping Ongar).
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.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, 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.	Although protected trees are present, on or adjacent to the site, the tree cover as a whole is not subject to tree protection. It is likely that the protected trees could be incorporated into the layout, subject to reasonable care, without
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.	Current access via residential property.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	
			l © A

one ound		16
Site Reference	: SR-0546	Hertf
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		1
Size (ha):	0.32	
Address:	Chipping Ongar Fire Station, 67 High Street, Chipping Ongar, CM5 9DT	cr
Primary use:	Housing	T
SLAA notes:	Fire station and associated parking.	AT
		4
SLAA yield:	10 dwellings	Client
SLAA source	Assumption based on 30 dph	Epp
for baseline yield:		Job T
,		Epp
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 15% of the site is Flood Zone 3b and the yield is decreased accordingly.	Drawi
contraints:		lssu
		Drawi
		CD.

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.

### Hertford Harlow Cheshuar Alio Brentwood

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distric	ct Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0546	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.u	

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Gorp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Gen8bas, IGN, Kadster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmyindia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGiobe, Geolye, Earthstar Georgraphics, CNES/Aribus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 8	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	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 Traditional Orchard habitat, and is within two buffer zones. The site is likely to 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.	
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 50% of the site is in flood zone 2 of which 27% are in flood zones 3a and 3b. The location of the flood zones in the western halve of the site means that the eastern portion could be developed.
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	(-)	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 A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	60% brownfield site, within an existing settlement ( Chipping Ongar).
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	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	(+)	townscape.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area located within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore, 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. Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to 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	(+)	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date. Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing	
6.6 Traffic impact		site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	

Site Reference:	SR-0673
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.31
Address:	St. Peters Avenue Garages, Nos. 1-30, Chipping Ongar

Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Council owned garages with associated parking and turning area.

SLAA yield:	9 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site Site is an awkward shape.

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.



Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest District Local Plan				
Drawing Status				
Issue				
Drawing No	Issue			
SR-0673	P1			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council			

SGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN hina (Hong Kong), swissto ly s DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



Dwellings:     3	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). Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	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	(-)	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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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	()	Development may involve the loss of public open space with no opportdwellingies for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is largely located in the site area. Development would result in loss of public open space (public open spaces covers 49% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
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	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site comprises existing garages, parking area and grassed public open space to the rear of housing, and is identified as potential regeneration area. Infill development is unlikely to affect 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.	Off St Peter's Avenue.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	
	I	I	urA ©

Site Suita	bility Assessment	Hertford	S 10 410	
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	HPRTI Ha	rlow	
Settlement:			al	
Size (ha):	0.28		The state	
Address:	Car park at The Stag pub, Brentwood Road, Chipping Ongar	Cheshupt		
Primary use:	Housing		X	
SLAA notes:	Public house and car park.	A110	Roding Has	
SLAA yield:	14	Client	12	
SLAA source	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 49 dph)	Epping Forest Distrie	ct Council	
for baseline yield:		Job Title		
yield.		Epping Forest Distrie	ct Local Plan	
SLAA site	There is a singular TPO on site, but sensitive design could avoid	Drawing Status		
contraints:	the need to reduce the yield. Locally listed building (the Stag public house) is located on-site; yield not amended since a scheme has	Issue		
	not been worked up and potential impact unknown.	Drawing No	Issue	
Site selection	None	SR-0842	P1	
adjustment:	Note	ARUP	Epping F District C	
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, in GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Sur MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthst	database right (2016) increment P Corp., GEBCO, US vey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri Chi , and the GIS User Community	

6	Y	B.L.	(		
A	de la		The state	, He	-
A	55	Sole		R.A.	1
Chesh	The second	A Real		1	
4-4	in o	and and	in /	V	R
A110	10 . 7	No.	1		1
YII	er.		- 502	a )	Brer
t the		11	.11	X	
Client					
		District C			

Epping Forest District Council

abase right (2016) ment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto d the GIS User Community

inty IS DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,

41060



Dwellings: 14	Source: Esri, DigtaidGlobe, GeoEye, Eanthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community		All and the second and		
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 wholly within a Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priori 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	(-)	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	(+)	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 A128 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 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.			
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.			
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.			
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.			
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.			
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 ( Chipping Ongar).		
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 landscap 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 within the settlement area. It is an existing car park along Brentwood Road. Redevelopment coul enhance the character of the area by improving street scene.		
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	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.			
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (In filled Pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.		
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).			

Site Suita	bility Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0843
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.36
Address:	Industrial site south 'The Borough', Chipping Ongar, Essex.
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Builders merchant and yard
SLAA yield:	18
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 50 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network

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

Not applicable.

# ertf Brentwo Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0843	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	



Dwellings: <u>18</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 within Traditional Orchard and Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh 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	(+)	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	(-)	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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
	i		

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

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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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 relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity			Site is identified as a rundown industrial area as a potential regeneration area. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the area by improving street scene.
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 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 (Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	

Site Suita	bility Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0844
Parish:	Chipping Ongar
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.11
Address:	Chipping Ongar Bridge Car Dealership, High Street, Chipping Ongar, Essex
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Car dealership and associated car parking.
SLAA yield:	17
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 155 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	SLAA reduced the capacity of this site based on flood risk. Based



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



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0844	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METT, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopc OpenStreetMap contributions, and the GIS User Community Gerapping, Across (GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Gerapping, Across (GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Gerapping, Across (GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



Dwellings: <u>17</u>		Source: Esr, 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	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 Traditional Orchard habitat and within the relevant and Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh 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.	Some 35% of the site is in flood zone 2. Flood zone 2 is located in the south-western portion of the site and flood risk can be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(++)	Opportunity to enhance significance of the historical asset/ further reveal its significance / enhance the setting.	
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 A128 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site comprises car dealership. Redevelopment could improve the street scene. The proposed density is significantly higher than neighbouring developments so sensitive design may be required.
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 (Garage). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	
	ī	I	© Arup

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference	: SR-0845	
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.2	
Address:	Car Park east of High Street, Chipping Ongar, Essex	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Pay and Display car park adjacent to Chipping Ongar Library	
SLAA yield:	27	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 134 dph)	
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 30% of the site is located within the Chipping Ongar Castle Scheduled Ancient Monument which reduces the site yield.	
Site selection	None	

adjustment:



# 11, ertf Brentwo Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		_
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		_
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0845	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counci	-

FAO, NPS,



TEEDDACK: Theat to this site.		Source: Exit, DigitalClobe, Geoty, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	a state of a state of the state
Dwellings: <u>19</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 small area of Deciduous Woodland, and within three buffer zones. The site may directly 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	(-)	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	(-)	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 A128 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 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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	

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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)		Site is a surface parking within a Conservation Area and adjacent to Chipping Ongar Castle. The proposed density is very high compared to the neighbouring developments. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely affect the character of the ar
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 (Car Park / Stables). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	

#### **•** • . . . . .

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference	: SR-0846	
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.11	
Address:	Green space at Walter Mead Close, Chipping Ongar, Essex	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Small area of green space within residential estate	
SLAA yield:	6	
SLAA source	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 52 dph)	
for baseline		
yield:		
	None	
SLAA site contraints:	None	
0.4	News	

Site selection None adjustment:

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

# 4106 ertford Brentwo Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0846	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright an	d database right (2016)	

P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstoj GIS User Community ERE, D urvey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisst ors, and the GIS User Community ustar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, o, and the GIS User Community e, Earth



<u>Dwellings: 6</u>		Source: Ext, 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	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	(-)	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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	100% greenfield site, within an existing settlement ( Chipping Ongar).
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 could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is within the settlement area and low density development proposed. However, it is located on open space and its loss could impact 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 contamination (Depots / In filled Ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	
		1	©Arup

one ouna		LAS
Site Reference	: SR-0848	Hertford
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	
Settlement:		0
Size (ha):	0.54	A
Address:	Chipping Ongar Leisure Centre, The Gables, Chipping Ongar, Essex	Chest
Primary use:	Housing	The second secon
SLAA notes:	Chipping Ongar Leisure Centre and car park	A110,
SLAA yield:	26	Client
SLAA source for baseline	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 48 dph)	Eppin
yield:		Eppin
SLAA site	There are two TPO's and a small area of blanket TPO coverage	Drawing \$
contraints:	along the northern boundary of the site but impact could likely be mitigated by design layout.	Issue
		Drawing N
Site selection	None	SR-08
adjustment:		AI

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

## Hertford Cheshurt Al10 Brentwood

# Epping Forest District Council Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No SR-0848 P1 Issue P1 Epping Forest Epping Forest Exercepting Exercepting Forest Exercepting Fores

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmri/dnä, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the IGI User Community Source: Esri. DgitalGiobe, GeoEye, Earltstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Semapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, wisstopo, and the IGI User Community



Dwellings: <u>26</u>		Souroe: Ext, 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	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	(-)	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	(-)	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	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 ( Chipping Ongar).
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.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is Chipping Ongar leisure centre. Redevelopment could enhance the area character. However, proposed housing number is at a higher density than the adjacent developments. Therefore, sensitive design would be required to minimise effect on character of
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 contamination (Car Park / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
			Q Aru

Site Suita	bility Assessment	CAL
Site Reference	: SR-0866	Hertford
Parish:	Chipping Ongar	)
Settlement:		6
Size (ha):	0.29	A
Address:	Smiths Brasserie and site of former bowls green at the rear, Fyfield Road, Chipping Ongar, Essex, CM5 0AL	Chesh
Primary use:	Housing	1
SLAA notes:	Car park for Smiths Brasserie restaurant, immediately adjacent to the site, and area of private green space.	ATTO
SLAA yield:	14	Client
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Planning Application Form (equivalent to 48 dph)	Epping Job Title
		Epping
SLAA site	Blanket TPO coverage touches the north of the site but impact	Drawing S
contraints:	could be mitigated by design. A application was refused for 14 flats due to insufficient off-street parking. Assumed dwellings on site is	Issue
	reduced to take this into account.	Drawing N
Site selection	None	SR-086
adjustment:		AF
		© Containa C



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0866	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	



Community feedback: <u>10</u>

Dwellings:

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

FAO, NPS, NRCAN unity bus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX

<u>Dweilings.</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	(+)	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	(-)	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	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	70% greenfield site, within an existing settlement ( Chipping Ongar).
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 within the settlement area. Part of it is an existing car park along Fyfield road. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the area by improving street scene.
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 contamination (Car Park / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	