Ν



		AND AND	and and and
	-1/		
			SADAL
			Share and

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0018-Rev1	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in	Legend	
	Date: September 2016	Waltham Abbey	Stage 2 Sites	
	Scale: 1:30,000 @A3	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	Parish Boundary	

Site Suita Site Reference Parish: Settlement: Size (ha): Address:	bility Assessment : SR-0020 Waltham Abbey 18.38 Land at Paternoster Hill, Waltham Abbey
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Two Glasshouses, derelict nurseries to rear of Pick Hill (masterplanned area) and agricultural/grazing land
SLAA yield:	560 dwellings approx.
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 31 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	Flood risk will restrict potential development to circa half unconstrained capacity for housing.
Site selection	None

adjustment:

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

#### Herrford Harlow Cheshuat Alto Brentwood

Client			
Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0020	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		





Dwellings: 260	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	5. AEA,
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 (a combination with other sites).	lone or in Very small parts of the site are within 2000m of either Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation or Lee Valley Special Protection Area. Impacts likely to be avoidable.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	proposed The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0 Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0 No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0 Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	A very small part of the site is adjacent to the Buffer Land. Development likely to be possible without compromising Buffer Land to the south-east.
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 Deciduous Woodland habitat, and within the relevant buffer zone. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-) Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses a small portion of Cobbin's Brook LWS. The site may directly affect some of the features and species may not be retained entirely, but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(-) Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 46% of the site is in Flood Zone 2, within which 29% and 11% of are in Flood Zones 3a and 3b. The higher risk Flood Zones run through the middle of the site but the impact can be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+) No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-) Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of h archaeological assets on the site.	nigh quality
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 low, low or medium.	Ild be very
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	0 Site is between 1000m and 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.	90% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-) Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	Although some woodland and semi-natural public open space are located within the site, opportunities for re- configuration may enable the proposals to be delivered without loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-) The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	resilient to Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is on the edge of the existing settlement. However, very low density development is not 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	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 ei adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+) Suitable access to site already exists.	Pick Hill/Paternoster Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold whe be expected to affect congestion.	ere it would
	•	urA@

One Ouna		
Site Reference	: SR-0021	H
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.23	
Address:	Land lying to the north of Honey Lane and west of Mason Way, Ninefields, Waltham Abbey, Essex	10 1
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Small area of vacant/amenity open land	1 HOUL
SLAA yield:	11 dwellings	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 46 dph)	E J
SLAA site contraints:	Small area of flood risk may reduce site capacity, but design could respond accordingly.	D
		l: D S
Site selection	None	

Site selection None adjustment:

Community<br/>feedback:Feedback was received on WAL-3 which is within or near to this<br/>site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

#### Hertford Harlow Cheshuar Alto Brentwood

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0021	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		

Colmains Do Stated Colomo Copyright and Galacabae Irgin (2nd Sector) (USSS FAC) NPS, NRCAN, towass: Estin, HERE Delarame, Interment Poch, CET Estin, China (Hong Kong), swisstope lagmyindia, @ OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community uncore: Estin, Digitaliobae, GeosePie, Earthstar Geographics, CMSS/AirVatus DS, USDS, USGS, AEX, ietmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 10		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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 2 and exception test not required.	Approximately 27% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 9% is covered by Flood Zones 3a and 3b. The Flood Risk Zone is located in the northern portion of the site and could be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Preliminary masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. 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 in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Access would need to be achieved either from adjacent development (Mason Close) or from Mason Way which may require culverting.
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).	
	!	1	© Aru

Site Reference: SR-0034			
Parish:	Waltham Abbey		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	21.76		
Address:	Land to east of Waltham Abbey		

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Agricultural fields/grazing land

 SLAA yield:
 655 dwellings

 SLAA source
 Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site Flood Risk will reduce site capacity contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Cilent					
Epping Forest District Council					
Job Title					
Epping Forest District Lo	Epping Forest District Local Plan				
Drawing Status					
Issue					
Drawing No	Issue				
SR-0034	P1				
ARUP 🤅	Epping Forest District Council				

U contains Us data © Lowin copyright and database ngm (2016) Sources: Esin, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Incerement P Corp., CBECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, BeeBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanos Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Edugamylindia, © DeeNsteetMap contributors, and the GIS User Comunity Statistic (Section 2016), GeeEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Setmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, wisstopo, and the GIS User Comunity



<u>Dwellings: 500</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	() <sup>E</sup>	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Very large housing site within 500m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Likely to have urbanisation and recreational pressure impacts alone.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites		Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed levelopment is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0 S	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 argely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 2 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are in the south west of the 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 Epping Forest Buffer Land	0 S	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-) F	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site is partially within around half of a BAP priority habitat, and within three buffer zones. It is adjacent to a BAF priority species. The site is likely to directly affect the BAP priority habitat but mitigation can address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0 S	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Warlies Park LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(-) S	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Approximately 30% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 13% is also within Flood Zones 3a and 3b. The higher Flood Risk Zones are located inside the south-western boundary and through the centre of the site, which can be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+) <sup>N</sup>	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 sould be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt		Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very ow, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-) S	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0 5	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0 8	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0 5	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0 S	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0 5	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0 5	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	Ν	Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Vajority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Existing masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity		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, on the edge of existing settlement and number of houses is at a higher density than neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-) <sup>T</sup>	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines		Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	Majority of the site is in the HSE inner and middle consultation zones. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwelling dwellings. HSE guidance is advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0 F	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	م 0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Potential for access points off Old Shire Lane/Paternoster Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		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 Suita	bility Assessment	Children And
Site Reference	: SR-0044i	Hertford ARTFORDSHIRE 3 770
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	Harlow Harlow
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	3.47	
Address:	The Manor Farm, Mott Street, High Beech, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4AP	Cheshupt
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Paddock land/livery business	Allo
SLAA yield:	24 dwellings and 5,000 sqm commercial	Client
SLAA source for baseline	Indicated in Call for Sites (previous outline application) equivalent to 7 dph. Could accommodate up to 105 dwellings at 30 dph and	Epping Forest District Council
yield:	employment use assumed at plot ratio of 0.4 on remainder of site.	Job Title
		Epping Forest District Local Plan
SLAA site contraints:	None	Drawing Status
contraints.		Issue
		Drawing No Issue
Site selection	Drawn from Baseline, 24 dwellings split proportionally	SR-0044i P1
adjustment:	Drawn norn Dasenne, 24 Gwennigs spir proportionally	



Community feedback:

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

#### 2 4106 ertford Brentwo lient Epping Forest District Council Job Title

GIS

Epping Forest District Council

p., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto

S/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



<u>Dwellings: 13</u> Criteria			A CALL AND A
Criteria			
		Score	Qualitative Assessment Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Specia
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Aldergrove Wood Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portio of the buffer land. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(-)	The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated.	The site directly abuts Epping Forest Buffer Land to the north-west. The proposed development is sufficiently lo density that, with sympathetic site design and landscaping, impacts at fringes could be mitigated through boundar treatment.
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 mitigatic can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for Carroll's Farm Complex LWS, Aldergrove Wood LWS, Lippitts Hill Scrub LWS and Oak Farm Grassland LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	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 more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from 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	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.	90% greenfield site, 500m from existing settlements (High Beech and Sewardstone).
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. Existin masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Key characteristics of the adjacent landscape sensitivity zone assessed as highly sensitive extend to the whole of thi site. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the rural character of the area. Therefore, development is no likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	Small portion in northern part of the site is in HSE inner zone and some 50% is in the middle zone. Sensitivity level 2 HSE guidance don't advise against development
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Mott Street.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Stables). Potential 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).	

Sile Sulla	Dinty Assessment	1
Site Reference	: SR-0044ii	H
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	2
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.68	
Address:	The Manor Farm, Mott Street, High Beech, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4AP	1 1
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Paddock land/livery business	1
		1
SLAA yield:	24 dwellings and 5,000 sqm commercial	C
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (previous outline application) equivalent to 7 dph. Could accommodate up to 105 dwellings at 30 dph and employment use assumed at plot ratio of 0.4 on remainder of site.	E Jo
SLAA site contraints:	None	D
		ls
		Di
Site selection	None	S

adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council					
Job Title					
Epping Forest District Local Plan					
Drawing Status					
Issue					
Drawing No	ls	ssue			
SR-0044ii	F	P1			
ARUP	€	Epping Forest District Council			



<u>Dwellings: 3</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (fly tipping, fires, invasiv species).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would to possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirect affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 site, 200m from an existing settlement (High Beech).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development would result in the loss of poorer quality agricultural land (grade 4-5).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Existin masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the rural character of the area. Therefore, development is n likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	Small portion in the western corner is in the HSE outer consultation zone. Likely impact is considered negligible and does not pose a constraint to development. HSE guidance don't advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care 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 from Mott Street.
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-0060				
Parish:	Waltham Abbey			
Settlement:				
Size (ha):	1.14			
Address:	Land at Patches Farm, Waltham Abbey			

 Primary use:
 Housing

 SLAA notes:
 Residential & Commercial premises and garden/paddocks

SLAA yield:34 dwellingsSLAA source<br/>for baseline<br/>yield:Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

<u>34</u>

Dwellings:

**Community** Feedback was received on WAL-E 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-0060	P1			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council			
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and	i database right (2016)			

Contains Us lated a column Colyright and valatulase (p)(r (2016), 1995). CUISS (FAC, NPS, NRCAN, 2005), CUISS (CUISS), CUISS (CUISS), CUISS (CUISS), CUISS (CUISS), CUISS, CUISS



<u>Dweinings: 34</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).	A very small part of the site are within 2km of Lee Valley Special Protection Area. Impacts likely to be avoidable.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zone for Deciduous Woodland. 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 for the Cobbin's Brook LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	90% greenfield site, 600m from existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. 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	(-)	would require upgrade.	Existing access off Galley Hill Road although Galley Hill Road may need upgrading (currently single lane in places).
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Nursery / Works / Scrapyard). 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 Suita	oility Assessment
Site Reference:	: SR-0061B
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	22.79
Address:	Land adjacent to north and south of A121, south of Waltham Abbey
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Land around Dowding Way (A121). Currently agricultural land
SLAA yield: SLAA source for baseline yield:	758 dwellings 100,000 sqm Employment Assumption based on circa 50:50 housing to employment land. 30 dph housing and 0.4 plot ratio for employment.
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Yield based on baseline and proportionally split between sites based on site size.



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Lo	ocal Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0061B	P1		
ARUP (	Epping Forest District Council		
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and databaa Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, incremen GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esr MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and th Source: Farthstar Geoc	nt P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, ri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop te GIS User Community		

S/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



Community feedback:

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

#### **Dwellings:** <u>329</u>

Dwellings: 329			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Very large site circa 1km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Could have recreational pressure effect alone which may require bespoke mitigation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Gunpowder Park LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 99% of the site is located within Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a, located on the southern boundary of the site, affect less than 1% of the site and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space			No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. An existing site masterplan identifies opportunities to provide new public open spaces in the development proposal.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Proposed plan 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		Only 4% of the site is in the middle zone. Due to the location/size of the affected area this results in negligible impact and is not considered a constraint to development. HSE guidance could be advise against development for the small affected area.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)		The intensity of site development would 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 A121 and Sewardstone Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm / Infilled Pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

Sile Sulla	Dinty Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0063
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	3.56
Address:	Former Haulage Yard, Sewardstone Hall, Chingford, London, E4 7RH
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Residential, Open and Closed Storage (Former Haulage Yard), Parking and adjacent field
SLAA yield:	150 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 41 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	None

Site selection None adjustment:

<u>150</u>

Dwellings:

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

## Tient

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0063	P1	
ARUP	Epping Fores District Count	



Sources: Eeri, HERE, DeLorme, Internap, Incement P. Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAQ, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordanno Survey, Seri Japan, MET, Eri China (Mong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, @ OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: EEri, Digatalciboe, Geolye, Earthstar Georgaphics, CNES-Kinbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Sewardstone/Osier Marshes LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(++)	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 A1112 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	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	70% greenfield site, 2000m from existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportdwellingy to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Preliminary masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is within a very low density settlement and the proposed number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the semi-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	()	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	A very small portion of the north-eastern corner of the site is in HSE inner consultation zone. Majority of site is in middle and outer zones. Level 3 sensitivity as more than 30 dwelling dwellings. HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sewardstone Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farmyard / Industrial / infilled ground). 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 Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference	: SR-0065	
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	37.7	
Address:	Land south of Honey Lane, north of M25 and west of Junction 26 of M25	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Residential dwellings, primary school, open space (playing fields) and scrub/grassland	
	COE to 1 150 shuellings	
SLAA yield:	685 to 1,150 dwellings.	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 18-30 dph)	
SLAA site contraints:	None	
Cite coloction	Nono	

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:

<u>685</u>

Dwellings:

Feedback was received on WAL-A which is within or near to this 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-0065	P1		
ARUP		bing Forest trict Counci	



gm and database ngm (2016) immap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, nce Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstor tributors, and the GIS User Community Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, isstron, and the GIS User Community ERE, De

<u>swenings.</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Very large site circa 1km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Could have recreational pressure effect alone which may require bespoke mitigation.
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 a higher density of Ancient and/or Veteran trees, or are configured in such a way that direct loss or harm is likely.	There are 11 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed throughout the site, and development may directly affect all of the trees. The position of the dispersed trees is such that direct harm is likely.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	()	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.	The site encompasses the whole of a Deciduous Woodland habitat and Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat. The site is likely to directly affect the priority habitats, and these effects may not be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	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.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is on the edge of the existing settlement. However, very low density development is proposed which is not 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.	Less than 1% of the site is in the HSE middle consultation zone. The affected area is on the site boundary which results in negligible sites and is not considered a constraint to development. HSE guidance is likely to be don't advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	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.	Access off Honey Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination on several parts of the site (Farm/infilled ponds/former sewage works). 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.	

one outdointy Assessment		
Site Reference:	SR-0084	
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	6.36	
Address:	Pendowe and Grange Hill Nursery, Sewardstone Road Daines Nursery, Sewardstone Nursery, Pritchard's Nursery, Mott Street Nursery, Cedar Lodge, Mott Street, London E4	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Existing nurseries and Glasshouses	
SLAA yield:	320 dwellings	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites	



Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0084	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest	

FAO, NPS GS. AEX



Dwellings: <u>320</u>	Source: Esrl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, ONES/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	(-) Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for i combination effects.	<ul> <li>Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.</li> </ul>
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-) Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to I possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-) Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Thompson Wood Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the buffer land, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0 No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0 Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching 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 Traditional Orchard habitat, and is within two buffer zones. The site may directly impact on 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 for the Thompson's Wood LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++) Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+) No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	() Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high qual archaeological assets on the site.	ity
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 very high.	or
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 more than 2400m from 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	0 Site is between 1000m and 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 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.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-) The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	to The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the adjacent highly sensitive landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is within a very low density settlement and the proposed number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the semi-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	(-) Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	ge HP gas line runs through the northern portion of the site and approximately 50% of the site is in the HSE inner consultation zone. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwellings. HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	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 adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+) Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Mott St.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it wou be expected to affect congestion.	
		© Arup

	······································
Site Reference	: SR-0085
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	62.43
Address:	Former Royal Gunpowder Factory Site, Beaulieu Drive, Waltham Abbey, Essex, EN9 1JY
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Former Royal Gunpowder Factory
	100 duallinga
SLAA yield:	100 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council						
Job Title						
Epping Forest Distri	Epping Forest District Local Plan					
Drawing Status						
Issue						
Drawing No	Issue					
SR-0085	P1					
ARUP	Epping F District C					

W Contains US batal & Llowin copyright and oalabade fight (2016) Sources: Est / HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Incement P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN GeoBase, (Chi, Koalaster NL, Ordnanos Survey, Est Japan, NETT, Est China (Hong Kong), swisst Source: Est, Digaldichae, GeoPer, Esthetast Geographics, CNES/Ahrban DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Germapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 100		Source: 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	()	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Although separated by the river, a large site immediately adjacent to Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SPA) on a side of the SPA where there is little such development may have direct effects from urbanisation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	()	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of development proposed it is unlikely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	The site directly affects the Waltham Abbey SSSI and is likely to pose a risk to the features of the SSSI. Consultation with Natural England is required. Furthermore, the effects on the features of the SSSI are unlikely to be possible to mitigate.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	ningdo.
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	(+)	Site may assist in extending the Epping Forest Buffer Land.	The proposed development includes substantial areas of parkland which could provide opportunity to extend the Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	()	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.	The site encompasses the whole of two Semi Improved Grassland, multiple Deciduous Woodland, and multiple Lowland Fens priority habitats. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, and this may not be 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 the Former Royal Gunpowder Factory Site LWS. The site may indirectly affect the features and species of the LWS. These features and species may not be retained in their entirety, but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Approximately 70% of the site is in Flood Zone 3a, within which circa 9% is in Flood Zone 3b. The higher Flood Zone covers the western side of the site. The eastern portion of the site could be developed although it is partially located in flood zone 2.
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.	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	80% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	access to open space which is currently private.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Development will not likely involve any loss. Site adjacent to existing public open space which could provide opportunities for improved access to woodland and semi natural 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 part of Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Factory. It also overlaps with the Conservation Area. Therefore, development could significantly alter the character of the settlement around this site.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	Only 1% of the site is affected by the BPA oil pipeline. The affected area is in the northern corner of the site. This is results is a negligible site and is not considered a constraint to development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Beaulieu Drive and Fishers Green Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential / known contamination (Explosives & Chemical Manufacture, Testing & Research) Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	
			©Arup

Site Suitability Assessment					
Site Reference	Site Reference: SR-0089A				
Parish:	Waltham Abbey				
Settlement:					
Size (ha):	11.28				
Address:	Land Lying to the west side of Galley Hill Road, Northern Portion				
Primary use:	Housing				
SLAA notes:	Agricultural field				
SLAA yield:	341 dwellings				
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph				
SLAA site contraints:	None				

Site selection Based on baseline, 341 dwellings split proportionally between the sites.



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

# Image: construct construc







Dwellings: 206		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk ar consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
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	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 site, 600m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any developmer would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is far away from existing settlements with scattered development around it. 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	(-)	would require upgrade.	Existing access off Galley Hill Road although Galley Hill Road may need upgrading (currently single lane in places).
6.5 Contamination constraints	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 Suitability Assessment Site Reference: SR-0099 Parish: Waltham Abbey

Settlement:	
Size (ha):	16.66
Address:	Lea Valley Nursery, Crooked Mile, Waltham Abbey

Primary use:	Housing							
SLAA notes:	Derelict	agricultural	nursery/garden	centre	with	а	few	small
	warehouses on site and an area of open storage hardstanding							

SLAA yield: 100 dwellings

SLAA source Assumption based on previous planning brief/applications for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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

None

4106 ertf Brentwo Client

Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest Dist	rict Local Plan			
Drawing Status				
Issue				
Drawing No	Issue			
SR-0099	P1			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counc			





ISGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, hina (Hong Kong), swisstop nity us DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,

Dwellings: 100	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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.			
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.			
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.				
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.				
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.				
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within two buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.			
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.				
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.				
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).			
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).				
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.				
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	The key characteristics of the wider landscape character zone extend across the whole site. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.			
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is on the edge of the existing settlement. However, very low density development is not 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.	Existing access off of Crooked Mile.			
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, Scrapyard, Shooting Ground). 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-0104					
Parish:	Waltham Abbey				
Settlement:					
Size (ha):	4.34				
Address:	Land adjoining Parklands, Waltham Abbey				

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Agricultural field

SLAA yield:	150 dwellings comprising 50 market homes and 100 affordable
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites
SLAA site	None

SLAA site

Site selection None adjustment:

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

## Tient

Epping Forest District Council					
Job Title					
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan				
Drawing Status	Drawing Status				
Issue					
Drawing No	Issue				
SR-0104	P1				
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council				



Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GenBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanco Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esir Chana (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MagmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, Digatcloble, GeoSye, Earlbatt Geographics, CHES/Initus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Dwellings: 150		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. 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 could be gained from Parklands.
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-0138
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	5.46
Address:	Northfield Nurseries, Sewardstone Road, E4 7RG

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: Existing Nursery and grounds

SLAA yield: 164 dwellings

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Client	
Epping Forest Distric	ct Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distric	ct Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0138	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

JSGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, China (Hong Kong), swisstop us DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



Dwellings: 164		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (any net gain of dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses a BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site is likely to directly impact the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site is adjacent to the Northfield Marsh LWS. These features and species may not be retained in their entirety, but effects can be mitigated. The site is within the 250m buffer for the Sewardstone/Osier Marshes LWS but is unlikely to affect the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	
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 A1112 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from 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 site, 3,100m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.	No public open space is located in the site and will not involve the loss. Site adjacent to existing public open space which could provide opportunities for improved access, beneficial in an area of identified managed open space deficiency.
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	(-)	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 semi-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	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	Small area of the site is in the HSE middle consultation zone located in the north-western corner of the site. Can be mitigated through layout design. Level 3 sensitivity (30+ dwellings). HSE guidance advise against development for small affected portion.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sewardstone Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	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

One Ountai	
Site Reference	: SR-0162
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	18.11
Address:	Land lying to the east of the Crooked Mile, adjacent to Clapgate Lane/ Eagle Gate
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Agricultural field
SLAA yield:	533 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

<u>Dwellings:</u>

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

<u>533</u>



Epping Forest Distri	ct Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0162	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council



Sources: Est, HREE, DeLorme, Intermay, Increment P Corp., EEBCC, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBara, IGN, KadadST, NND, Charter Sourcey, Est I AG M. H.T., Esrubina (Hong Kong), swisstopo Source: Est, Digital Chok, GeoSy, Estimata Ceorgaphics, CNES/Arbuna 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)		Due to the development type (over 50 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Ancient Woodland 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land		The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated.	Development on this site may have an impact on the Buffer Land, particularly the wooded northern edge of the site,
	(-)	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	however appropriate design and layout could mitigate impacts. The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat and a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and is within
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0		four buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site is adjacent to Galleyhill Wood Complex LWS. The site may indirectly affect a small part of the LWS. These features and species may not be retained in their entirety, but effects can be mitigated.
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	0	Site between 400m and 1000m 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 site, 900m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area on edge of existing settlement and the proposed quantum is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the are
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access can be achieved off of Crooked Mile.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (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.	

Site Suita	bility Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0219
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.65
Address:	Fire Station, Sewardstone Road, Waltham Abbey, Essex, EN9 1PA
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing None
SLAA yield:	16 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 50 dph on only Fire Station part of site
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	None

adjustment:

<u>16</u>

Dwellings:

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

## Clent

Epping Forest Distri	ict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0219	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council www.capingforcstdc.gov.uk





Dwellings: <u>16</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	90% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 a car park and identified as a potential regeneration area. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Electricity Substation, 3 x 1000 gallon underground fuel tanks, above ground oil tank and within 250m of landfill site). 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 Reference	: SR-0231
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	1.64
Address:	Land at Lippitts Hill (Adjacent Owl PH/ Owl caravan park), High Beach, Loughton, IG10 4AL
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Pub car park and paddock
SLAA yield:	circa 45 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (27 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	Some TPOs on site may reduce site capacity

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-0231	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	
	ight and database right (2016) ermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP	

Sources: Eeri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P COrp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, SoeBsea, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnano Survey, Eeri Japan, METL, Esir China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MagmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl. DigitalGibles, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Betmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 40		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	() Effects of allocating the site for the	proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Residential development within very close proximity to Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation, which could result in urbanisation effects (e.g. from fly tipping, fires etc.).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-) Site falls within an Impact Risk Zor possible to mitigate the effects of the	ne and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be he proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-) Site is adjacent to or contains Anci	ient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the buffer land, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0 No Ancient or Veteran trees are loo	cated within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0 Site is unlikely to impact on Epping	g Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0 No effect as features and species (	could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within Deciduous Woodland, BAP priority habitat with no main features and Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0 Site has no effect as features and	species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++) Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-) Proposed site located within a Construction of the effects can be mitigated.	onservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-) Existing evidence and/or a lack of archaeological assets on the site.	previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality	
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 low, low or medium.	he level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-) Site is more than 4000m from the r	nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-) Site more than a 1000m from a bu	s stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-) Site is more than 2400m from an e	employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-) Site is more than 4000m from the r	nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m	n from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-) Site is more than 4000m from the r	nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-) Site is more than 4000m from the r	nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	() Majority of the site is greenfield lar	nd that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 3,000m from an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-) Development would result in the lo	oss of poorer quality agricultural land (grade 4-5).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0 Development unlikely to involve the	e 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		nedium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to pment without significant character change.	The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0 Development is unlikely to have ar	n effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the semi-rural character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the rural character of the area subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent listed buildings.
6.1 Topography constraints	() Topographical constraints in the sit	te may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose ar	ny constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0 Power lines do not pose a constrai	int to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0 The intensity of site developmen adjacent to the site.	t would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or	Tops on boundary trees would not be likely to significantly restrict site capacity, subject to care in detailed layout.
6.4 Access to site	(+) Suitable access to site already exis	sts.	Existing access off Lippitts Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0 No contamination issues identified	on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	Area around the site expected to be expected to affect congestion.	be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would	
			© Arup

Site Reference	: SR-0236
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	2.02
Address:	Brooklyn Nursery (and other nurseries) off Mott Street, Sewardstone, Chingford
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing None
SLAA yield:	61 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network

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

Not applicable.

#### Hertford Harlow Cheshud Alto Brentwood Clent

Epping Forest District Co	uncil
Job Title	
Epping Forest District Lo	cal Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0236	P1
ARUP 🤅	Epping Forest District Council



<u>Dwellings: 61</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland habitat 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	(+)	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 A1112 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	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	

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

4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site, 2500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Key characteristics of the adjacent landscape sensitivity zone assessed as highly sensitive extend to the whole of this site. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is within a very low density settlement and the proposed number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly semi-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	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	Northern portion of the site is in the HSE middle and outer consultation zones. Due to the location of the affected area mitigation could be possible. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwellings. 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.	Existing access off Mott Street.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	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 Cana	
Site Reference	: SR-0253
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.34
Address:	Land at Woodgreen Farm, Honeypot Lane, Waltham Abbey, Essex, EN9 3SG
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing None
SLAA yield:	5 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

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

#### 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-0253	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk	

database ngmt (2016) crement P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, vey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstor , and the GIS User Community ar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dwellings: 5</u>		Source: Earl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Eanthstar 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within a BAP priority habitat buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to the Oxleys Wood Complex LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of 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	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 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.	Site identified as a potential regeneration area. Low density development is proposed reflecting semi-rural character the area. Development is not likely to impact character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting Conserva Area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Honey Pot Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (within 250m of landfill site). 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 Reference: SR-0291			
Parish:	Waltham Abbey		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	1.7		
Address:	Sewardstone Lane, Rear of Butlers Drive		

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: None

SLAA yield: 51 dwellings SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0291	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		



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

Dwellings: 51		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Northfield Marsh LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A1112 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 more than 2400m from 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	90% greenfield site, 2,100m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 semi-rural character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the 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.	Site is not located in any HSE consultation zone.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sewardstone Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / ironworks / stables and landfill within 250m). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
		•	© Arup

Site Suitebility Assessment					
Site Suita	Site Suitability Assessment				
Site Reference	: SR-0292				
Parish:	Waltham Abbey				
Settlement:					
Size (ha):	2.95				
Address:	Sewardstone Lane (near Chapel Field Nursery)				
Primary use:	Housing				
SLAA notes:	None				
SLAA yield:	89 dwellings				
SLAA source for baseline	Assumption based on 30 dph				

SLAA site TPO's cover circa half of site and flood risk would reduce capacity by circa 1/4

Site selection None adjustment:

yield:

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

#### Hertford Harlow Cheshuat Alto Brentwood

Client	
Epping Forest Distri	ict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0292	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl (HREE, DeLorme, Intermap, Incenter) PCorp. (EBCC), USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geodemic US, HREE, DeLorme, Intermap, Incenter PCorp., (EBCC), USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geodemic US, Constraint, Stranger, Stran



Dwellings: 66		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		f allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- tion effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites		within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (any net gain of dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0 Site is no	ot located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0 No Ancier	ent or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0 Site is un	nlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	() Features	and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.	The site encompasses the majority of a Deciduous Woodland habitat and a portion of a Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, and this impact may not be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0 Site has r	no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Northfield Marsh LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+) Site within	in Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0 Proposed	d site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology		evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality ogical assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0 Site lies of	outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	() Site is wit very high	ithin Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0 Site is be	etween 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+) Site is wit	ithin 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-) Site is mo	ore than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0 Site is be	etween 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0 Site is be	etween 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-) Site is mo	ore than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0 Site is be	etween 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	Not applie	icable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	() Majority d	of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 3,200m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	() Developm	ment 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 Developm	ment unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity		a falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to odate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0 Developm	ment 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 topog	graphy constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	il pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0 Power lin	nes do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-) The inten the site.	nsity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to	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	(+)	access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sewardstone Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		und the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would ted to affect congestion.	
			© Arup

Site Reference: SR-0331		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	46.68	
Address:	Waltham Abbey, north-west area	

 Primary use:
 Housing

 SLAA notes:
 Broad area north-west of Waltham Abbey

SLAA yield:NoneSLAA source<br/>for baseline<br/>yield:Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0331	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

e Contanto So barae C Nomi Copyngin and osadozen ngin (2016) Sources: Eshi (HRER, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Magmi/ndia, O Cynei StreatMapc contributors, and the OIS User Comunity Source: Esri, DgitalGicho, Geodye, Eanthard Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogri, IGN, IGP, wisstopo, and the OIS User Comunity



OrderaFVSomOutput descent previous of the sector of the s	Dwellings: 1400		Source: Exrl. DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Harmonic Marcine SeriesHerein definition of a series	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
MathematicationProceedings of the proceedings	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Although separated by the river, a large site immediately adjacent to Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SPA) on a side of the SPA where there is little such development may have direct effects from urbanisation.
SubscriptionSubscrip	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	()	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of development proposed it is unlikely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Consultation with Natural England is required. The effects on the features of the SSSI are unlikely to be possible to
ManufactorNoNoNoLinear Stream StateNoRelation stream StateRelation stream StateLinear Stream StateNoStream Stream StateNoLinear Stream StateNoStream Stream StateStream Stream	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	ininguo.
Interpretational of a problem of the second of the secon		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
UniformationUniformationUniformationDescentionDescention12 lack and uniformation1000	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
Interpretation of the second	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	()	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.	
Interfact         PI         Precision of the cost is costepid of the cost is costepid           Handra on type starts         PI         Restance on the formation of the forma	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.	
Landback         Landback         Landback         Landback         Landback           Linker to make the landback         See Section (Social access in the Linker of allows information in the landback information information in the landback information informatinformatinform information informatinform information informatinfo	1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	
Identifying the sense of source of said.Identifying the sense of the se	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	()	Site would result in loss of a heritage asset or significant impact that cannot be mitigated.	
Instruction         Image: Control of Control	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)		
All derived below (all in generation in several all in the several all i	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
A lateration from Kinder and Link	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()		
22 deteres in interaction is provided interpretion of the complement attraction.     0	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
A black bet singlified to solution         Vol         Concent of the solution of the	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
A clause is not activities       0       Interaction is not activities in the second by school.         3.5 Disarce to reare it lifety/thinky school.       Second by school information       Second by school information         3.4 Disarce to local information       0.0       Second by school information       Second by school information         3.7 Disarce to reare it lifety/thinky school       Second by school information       Second by school information       Second by school information         3.7 Disarce to reare it lifety/thinky school       Second by school information       Second by school infor	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
Solution to internet interligination scoreControl <td>3.4 Distance to local amenities</td> <td>0</td> <td>Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.</td> <td></td>	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
A - Decarate Documentation         O         Inclusion	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
A. December of mediation o	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
Constrained containing         Constrainind containing         Constrainind containin	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. I provintion a dividence Land       (a)       International formation of the set	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
All match in significant is all of a set of	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)		100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
No Capability to infinitive actions to the site.       Initiation of the site.       Initiation of the site.       Initiation of the site.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       Cell       The site fails within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to aboot development without significant character fampe.       Site is within Lee Valley Regional Park. The proposed development has the potential to adversely affect the character of the park. Sensitive design would be required.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Site is within Lee Valley Regional Park. The proposed development has the potential to adversely affect the character of the park. Sensitive design would be required.         6.2 Settlement character sensitivity       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Site is within Lee Valley Regional Park. The proposed development has the potential to adversely affect the character of the park. Sensitive design would be required.         6.2 Diatance to gas and ol pipelines       0       Site on tippelines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Initiation of the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The interable of site already exists.       Existing access of Abberview (B194).         6.4 Access to site       0       No contamination issues identified on site to date.       No potential contamination issues identified on site to date.         6.5 Traffic impact       Cell       Moderate peak time congestion expected within the v	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.       CP         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       CP       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       Site is within Lee Valley Regional Park. The proposed development has the potential to adversely affect the character of the park. Sensitive design would be required.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       CP         6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.       CP         6.2 a Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       CP       CP         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 diagenet to the site.       Existing access of Abbeyview (B194).         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Suitable access to site already exists.       Existing access of Abbeyview (B194).         6.5 Contamination constraints       0       No contamination size identified on size to date.       No potential contamination identified.         6.6 Traffic impact       (-)       Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the size.       Interview (B194).	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	()		circa 98% of the site, predominantly woodland and semi natural open space), with few opportunities for site re-
3.2 Seturement Character sensitivity(r)Character and the seture of the park. Sensitive design would be required.6.1 Topography constraints0No topography constraints are identified in the site.Image: Character and the seture of the park. Sensitive design would be required.6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines0Gas or oil pipelines do not pose and constraint to the site.Image: Character and the seture of protected trees either on of the park. Sensitive design would be required.6.2 Distance to power lines0Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.Image: Character and the seture of protected trees either on of the preservation Order (TPO)6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)0The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on of the site.Existing access of Abbeyview (B194).6.4 Access to site(+)Suitable access to site already exists.Existing access of Abbeyview (B194).6.5 Contamination constraints0No contamination issues identified on site to date.No potential contamination identified.6.6 Traffic impact(-)Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.Image: Character and the site.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	development without significant character change.	
6.1 Holdgraphy Consulations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations0Consultations	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)		
0.2.2 Distance to gas and on piperines0Contentination to the site.06.2b Distance to power lines0Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.116.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)0The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.116.4 Access to site(+)Suitable access to site already exists.Existing access of Abbeyview (B194).6.5 Contamination constraints0No contamination situes identified on site to date.No potential contamination identified.6.6 Traffic impact(-)Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.I	6.1 Topography constraints	0		
6.2 bistance to power lines06.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)0The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or6.4 Access to site(+)Suitable access to site already exists.Existing access of Abbeyview (B194).6.5 Contamination constraints0No contamination issues identified on site to date.No potential contamination identified.6.6 Traffic impact(-)Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.Image: Contamination constraints of the site.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (FPO)0adjacent to the site.1adjacent to the site.6.4 Access to site(+)Suitable access to site already exists.Existing access off Abbeyview (B194).6.5 Contamination constraints0No contamination issues identified on site to date.No potential contamination identified.6.6 Traffic impact(-)Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.Image: Contamination constraintsImage: Contamination constraints	6.2b Distance to power lines	0		
6.4 Access to site     (*)       6.5 Contamination constraints     0       6.6 Traffic impact     (-)       Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	adjacent to the site.	
6.5 Contamination constraints       0         6.6 Traffic impact       (-)         Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	6.4 Access to site	(+)		
	6.5 Contamination constraints	0		No potential contamination identified.
	6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	© Arup

#### -. ... -

Site Suita	bility Assessment	CE
Site Reference	: SR-0332	Hertfo
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	37.62	-
Address:	Waltham Abbey, north-east area	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Mix of existing glasshouse nurseries and agricultural/vacant open land including Pick Hill Nursery, Monkwood Nursery, Springfield Nursery, Upshire Nursery and Knolly Nursery	AJI
SLAA yield:	1130 dwellings	Client
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph	Eppi Job Titi Eppi
SLAA site contraints:	Reduction in development capacity by circa 1/4 due to flood risk	Drawin
		Drawin
		SR-0

Site selection None adjustment:

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

### 4106 Brentwo

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0332	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counc	



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

<u>Dwellings: 846</u>	Source: Exrl. DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-) Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in combination effects.	Very large site over 1.5km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Potential for recreational pressure effect in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
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	(-) The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated.	The site abuts Buffer Land to the west. It is of a similar character/typology and currently provides linkage to the wide countryside. There is potential for mitigation through masterplanning and strengthening of existing dense planting o eastern edge.
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 two Traditional Orchards, a BAP priority habitat with no main features, the majority of Deciduous Woodland and is adjacent to two other habitats. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats and may no be 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 encompasses a small portion of Cobbin's Brook LWS. The site may directly affect some of this LWS, bu effects can be mitigated. The site is adjacent to the Warlies Park LWS however is unlikely to affect the features an species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(-) Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 35% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 23% is in Flood Zone 3a. The higher Flood Risk Zone is located the northern portion of the site and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-) 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.	y la
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	0 Site is between 1000m and 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.	90% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-) Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. 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 absord 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. Cobbins Brook Local Wildlife Site covers small area of north of site Therefore, sensitive design could be required adjacent to Cobbins Brook Local Wildlife Site.
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.	Northern portion of the site, totalling some 11%, is affected by the BPA oil pipeline. Due to the location of the affected area mitigation through site layout will be possible.
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 o adjacent to the site.	r
6.4 Access to site	(-) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Existing access Pick Hill/Amesbury Junction. Pick Hill would need to be upgraded, but would provide main estate roa for urban extension.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0 No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	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-0337		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	1.83	
Address:	Hannah Nursery Sewardstone Road	

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: None

SLAA yield: 55 dwellings SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

None

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Lo	cal Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0337	P1	
ARUP 🤅	Epping Forest District Council	



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

Dwellings: 55		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 10 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site is within four buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Sewardstone/Osier Marshes LWS and is adjacent to the Northfield Marsh LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either 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	(+)	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 A1112 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from 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 site, 3,000m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	access to open space which is currently private.	No public open space is located in the site area, and development will not involve any loss. Site adjacent to existing public open space which could provide opportunities for improved access to woodland and semi-natural 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 semi-rural 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	()	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	More than 50% of the site is in the HSE inner and middle consultation zones. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwelling dwellings. HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sewardstone Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery and Landfill within 250m). 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

	5
Site Reference	: SR-0338
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	4.07
Address:	Brookfield Nursery/Sewardstone Road, London E4 7RJ
Primary use:	Housing

SLAA notes: None

SLAA yield: 122 dwellings SLAA source Assumption based of

SLAA source Assumption based on 30 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District C	ouncil
Job Title	
Epping Forest District L	ocal Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0338	P1
	Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and databa	se right (2016)

© Unitation US batal © Lowin copyingin and database right (2016) Sourcas: Esti (HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Incernent P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanos Survey, Esti Japan, METI, Esti China (Hong Kong), swisstopc Source: Esti, Digitalicidae, GeoPer, Estimistar Geographics, CHS-Shirbat DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 122		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and in the relevant buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
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 A1112 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 more than 2400m from 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 site, 2,100m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Key characteristics of the adjacent landscape sensitivity zone assessed as highly sensitive extend to the whole of this site. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the semi-rural 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.	Less than 1% of the site is in the HSE outer consultation zone. Impact is considered negligible and does not pose a constraint to development. HSE guidance don't advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sewardstone Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	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.	
			© Arut

Site Reference	: SR-0339
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	2.03
Address:	Land to rear of The Plough pub, Mott Street, Sewardstone

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:None

 
 SLAA yield:
 61 dwellings

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site None

SLAA site contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Lo	cal Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0339	P1		
ARUP (	Epping Forest District Council		





Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard habitats. 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	(-)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 site, 2,000m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics with the wider adjacent character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the semi-rural character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the housing 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	()	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	Small portion of the site is in the HSE inner consultation zone, with the remainder in the middle and outer zones. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwellings. HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Mott Street.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	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.	

	bility Assessment	Hertford
Site Reference	:: SR-0370	incriticity of
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		÷ ? .
Size (ha):	4.38	10
Address:	Land off Beechfield Walk	Ais
		Cheshuat
Duine and the as		1ª
Primary use:	Housing	9-1-Kis
SLAA notes:	Agricultural land and small copse	ATTO
		RV7/INS
		LLLA.
SLAA yield:	97 dwellings and 5,544 sqm commercial	Client
SLAA source	Assumption based on 70:30 housing to employment at 30 dph and plot ratio of 0.4	Epping F
for baseline yield:		Job Title
yield.		Epping F
SLAA site	None	Drawing Statu
contraints:		Issue
		Drawing No
Site selection	None	SR-0370
adjustment:	NULE	A D

Sit adjustment:

Community feedback:

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

### 41060 DSHIRE Brentwo

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Dist	rict Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0370	P1	
	Epping Forest District Council	

Ight and database right (2016) ermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, ince Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop tributors, and the GIS User Community , Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, anthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Market Coll List Community HERE, DeLorme, Sources: Esr GeoBase, IG



Dwellings: <u>97</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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 landscape character sensitivity context is the wider open countryside. 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 is identified as a potential regeneration area. 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	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Potential access point off of Lodge Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Former sewage works / landfill in the northern half of SR-0370. 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 Suita	Dility Assessment	0
Site Reference	: SR-0372	Her
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	2
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	45.51	
Address:	Land west of Woodgreen Road, including Southend Lane and Skillet Hill Farm	17
Primary use:	Housing	1
SLAA notes:	Mix of low grade industrial uses (with potential for intensification), agricultural fields and vacant scrub land - Skillet Hill Farm is existing Truck stop	Carl A
SLAA yield:	950 dwellings and 54,500 sqm commercial	Clie
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 70:30 housing to employment at 30 dph and plot ratio of 0.4	El Job El
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 10% of the site has potential contamination which may not be suitable for housing development (landfill). As such developable site area reduced to 90%.	Dra Is: Dra
Site selection adjustment:	None	SF

adjustment:

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

### 2 4106 Brentw

Epping Forest Distr	ict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0372	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

ISGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN Sis ommunity S/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX



Dwellings: 855		Source: Exrl. DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	HILL BANGAR
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Very large site within 300m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Likely to have urbanisation an recreational pressure effects alone.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	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 on the south-west of the site and may b 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.	Buffer Land do not directly abut the site but are a short distance to the east, and separated by a dense tree be Sympathetic masterplanning and site design at the eastern edge of site could mitigate impacts.
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 two Deciduous Woodland priority habitats and a Traditional Orchard habitat. It is three buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, 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 for the Warlies Park LWS and is also adjacent to the Oxleys Wood Complex LWS The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of either LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 98% of the site is within Flood Zone 1. The location of the Flood Risk Zone is confined to a small portion on the western site boundary and the southern part of the site. Flood risk could be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	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	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	90% greenfield site, not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics of the wider landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area, on the edge of the existing settlement, within conservation area ar close to the listed buildings. Therefore, development could impact character. Sensitive design and lower density ma be required.
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 pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	More than 60% of the site is in HSE inner and middle consultation zones. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwelling dwellings. HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The Tree Preservation Order trees on and adjacent to the site could be integrated into the layout through caref design.
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Numerous existing and potential access points.
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to be mitigated.	Landfill in south part of site. Subject to investigation, development should be feasible outside 100m buffer zone contaminated area. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery/Farm/Demolition Waste) in north part of site, whic 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-0373
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	2.1
Address:	Upshire Primary School

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: Existing use as a Primary School and Playing Field

SLAA yield: 84 dwellings SLAA source Assumption based on 40 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0373	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	
© Contains OS data © Crown copyr Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Inte	ght and database right (2016) rmap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS	

pyright and database right (2016) Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, dnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop contributors, and the GIS User Community (ye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, swisstopo. and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 84	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNESA/Arbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community			
Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites			Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.	
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.	Site provides little linkage to the wider countryside and the Buffer Land are physically separated to the north. The proposed development is sufficiently small scale that impacts are unlikely.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to the Warlies Park LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	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	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	80% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(-)	Development may involve the loss of public open space but there are opportdwellingies for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	Although some of Epping Forest Buffer Land is located within the site, opportunities for re-configuration may enable the proposals to be delivered without loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics of the wider adjacent landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area, on the edge of existing settlement and number of houses is at a higher density than neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the semi-rural character of the area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	Approximately 50% of the site is in the middle consultation zone. No part of the site is in the inner zone. Potential for mitigation. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwelling dwellings. HSE guidance advise against development	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.		
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Paternoster Hill.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.	
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.		
	1		© Arup	

Site Reference: SR-0377		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.93	
Address:	Parklands/Newteswell Drive amenity open space	

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: Existing amenity open space.

37 dwellings SLAA yield: SLAA source Assumption based on 40 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

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

### 41060 ertford Brentwo Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0377	P1	
ARUP 🤅	Epping Forest District Council	
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database		

, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto bus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,



Dwellings: <u>37</u>		Source: Exrl. DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 within a settlement.	90% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Site shares characteristics with the adjacent landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is amenity open space identified as a potential regeneration area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development may impact upon 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.	Existing access off Newteswell Drive (through existing car park areas).
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over small parts of site (Horticultural Nursery / Electric Substation). 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.	
			© Aruț

Site Reference: SR-0378			
Parish:	Waltham Abbey		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	18.04		
Address:	Crooked Mile Allotments and adjacent land		

Primary use: Housing Agricultural field, grazing land and allotments SLAA notes:

SLAA yield: 734 dwellings SLAA source Assumption based on 40 dph for baseline yield:

SLAA site contraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:

Feedback was received on WAL-F which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details. Dwellings: <u>734</u>

### 47060 ertfo Brentwo

Client	
Epping Forest Distric	et Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0378	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council



© 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, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX,
Getmanning Aerogrid IGN IGP swisstong and the GIS User Community

Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Galleyhill Wood Complex LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	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	0	Site between 400m and 1000m 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 site, 600m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(-)	Development may involve the loss of public open space but there are opportdwellingies for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	Although allotments are located with the site, opportunities for re-configuration or re-provision within the site may enable the proposals to be delivered without loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is far away from existing settlements with scattered developments around it. 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 off Crooked Mile.
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-0379
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	0.16
Address:	Land off Town Mead Road

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Large residential garden

 
 SLAA yield:
 6 dwellings

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 Assumption based on 40 dph

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0379	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		

Sources: Exri, HERE, Dukorme, Intermap, increment P corp., GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GooBase, IGN, Kataster NL, Ordnano, Survey, Esri Japan, METL, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmyndia, e OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: EsrU DigalGlobe, GeoEve, Earthstar Geographics, CHES/Mirbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Name         Note         Note <th< th=""><th><u>Dwellings: 6</u></th><th>Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community</th><th></th></th<>	<u>Dwellings: 6</u>	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
UniversityUniversityUniversityUniversityUniversitySpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinor Maximum Constraints and Maximum ConstraintsSpinorSpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinorSpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinorSpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinorSpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinorSpinorSpinorSpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinor Maximum ConstraintsSpinor <t< th=""><th>Criteria</th><th>Score</th><th>Qualitative Assessment</th></t<>	Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
Charlange and the second sec	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites		n- Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
An inclusionImage and the set of the set	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposidevelopment is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	ad
Balance State         Col         Cold State         Cold State           14 reprint Project State         Col         Review State         State <td>1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland</td> <td>0 Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.</td> <td></td>	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0 Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
ControlControlControlControl12 InstructionInstructionInstructionInstructionInstruction12 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction12 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction12 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction13 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction13 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction13 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction13 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction14 InstructionInstructionInstructionInstructionInstruction15 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction16 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction17 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction18 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction18 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction18 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction18 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction18 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction18 InstructionControlInstructionInstructionInstruction18 In		0 No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
United Water W	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0 Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
unified and with a singlevunified12 hand a definition of the single s	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.	
In IndianIndiaIndia16 lings: chick gradeschick diversion and divers	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.	
Lak markan kan kan kan kan kan kan kan kan kan	1.7 Flood risk	(++) Site within Flood Zone 1.	
ControlControlControlControl1 Singura di qualyControlSingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy2 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy3 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy3 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy3 Singura di qualySingura di qualySingura di qualy <td< td=""><td>1.8a Impact on heritage assets</td><td>(+) No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.</td><td></td></td<>	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+) No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1 a lengt englow2111 and a lengt begin with the constraint of the lengt englow1111 and a lengt begin with the constraint of the lengt englow1112 above the lengt englow21112 above the lengt englow21112 above the lengt englow21112 above the lengt englow21113 above the lengt englow21114 above the lengt englow21115 above the lengt englow21116 above the lengt englow21117 above the lengt englow21118 above the lengt englow21119 above the lengt englow21111 above the lengt englow21112 above the lengt englow21113 above the lengt englow21114 above the lengt englow11115 above the lengt englow11116 above the lengt englow11116 above the lengt englow <td>1.8b Impact on archaeology</td> <td>(+) There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.</td> <td></td>	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+) There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1 Laked (a) min located (a)     10       21 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       21 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       23 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       23 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       24 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       25 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       25 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       26 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       27 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       28 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       28 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       28 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       29 Detack (m) noted (a)     0       20 Detack (m)	1.9 Impact of air quality	0 Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
A Lotace (in present (in which at this of the Addition at a bus data).         A contract (in present (in which at this of the Addition at a bus data).           32 Detarce (in every) (in event (in which at a bus data).         Gets with (1000 at at a bus data).         Contract (in event	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+) Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
a Control of streets of streps     10       a Decrements on streps     10       a Decrements on streps     10       b Decrements on streps     10       b Decrements on streps     10       b Decrements     10	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.3 Standard on quegning of a standard       QP       Performance of the standard of quegning of a standard of quegning of queen quegning of queen queen quegning of queen qu	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+) Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
14 detected back and minima     10     Image: Control of Contro Control of Control of Control of Contro Control of Cont	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+) Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
ad location in relations       ad       additional information       additional information         34 Definition to local information       additional information       additional information       additional information       additional information         37 Detine to the name of QP suggery       (e)       Between 1000m from the netered QP suggery.       additional information       additional information         38 Accord to Strategic Road Network       (f)       Notify of the site is greenfield and within a settlement.       Strategic Road Network       (fi)         41 Boundheld and Greenfield Load       (fi)       Notify of the site is greenfield and within a settlement.       Strategic Road Network       (fi)         42 Impact on agreent/wall and       (fi)       Overlappment unitable to indigo adgreenfield and within a settlement.       Strategic Road Network       (fi)         43 Opticable to interpret work the loss of agricultural lend.       (fi)       Overlappment unitable to indigo adgreenfield and within a settlement.       The metery the indicategic and table to indind	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+) Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
A closation to local attentions       0       Introduction of local attentions         3.7 Dutations to reareed; OP suggery       (e)       Site is less, than 1000m from the nearees; CP suggery.         3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network.       10       Mojority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.       Site is greenfield at and, within an existing settlement (Malitann Abbey).         4.1 Brownelidd and Generifield Land       (e)       Development unlikely to income the loss of apicultural land.       Site is less, than 1000m from the nearees of public open space.         4.2 Impact on agricultural land       0       Development unlikely to income the loss of public open space.       Interesting the existence of the soft open space.         5.1 Londscape sensitivity       0       The existence of the soft open space.       Interesting the existence or may improve onterneer character frough rodewidgment of a run down site or improvement of the fundscape.         5.1 Londscape sensitivity       0       The existence or the soft open space.       Interesting the soft open space.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       Development may improve onterneer character frough rodewidgment of a run down site or improvement of the soft approvement of the soft open space.       Interesting the soft approvement open space.         6.1 Topography constraints are identified in the site.       0       Development may improve onterneer character frough rodewidgment of a run down site or improvement of the soft approvement of the sonte. <t< td=""><td>3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school</td><td>0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.</td><td></td></t<>	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
A. I clarified in feature of Fullyey       (*)       Control of the set of Fullyey       (*)         A. A clarified of feature of Fullyey       (*)       Not applicable.       50% growthied status of Fullyey         1.1 Brownheld and Greenfied Land       (*)       Montry of the site is growthied land       50% growthied status, within an oxisting softwarm Abboy).         1.2 Inpact on agricultural land       (*)       Development would not read: in the loss of agricultural land.       50% growthied status, within an oxisting softwarm Abboy).         1.3 Landscape sensitivity       (*)       Development unlikely to involve the loss of agricultural land.       The site faile within an array of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to the relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape are able to the areadom status of advance character and advector character integree sensitivity.         2.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (*)       Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement is list leastlead and the durance of the asset.         3.2 Distance to power lines       (*)       Despapity constraints are identified in the site.       Set is identified and agreenter in provides and provides are potential the durance of the asset.         6.2 Distance to power lines       (*)       Despapity constraints are identified in the site.       Set is identified and agreenter in place, or adsign acoess is between twoo laddiges and not very wide. Naty imit develo	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
A Consist of datage, food reduction       Image: Constraints       Image: Constraint       Image: Constraints	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. Brownied and steemed Lind       (f)       Deferment would not result in the loss of agricultural land.         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 winkely to involve the loss of public open space.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       0       The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - chancebristics of the landscape are able to the acceler context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape for intervision.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (f)       Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down sile or improvement in the ideation. Therefore fedevelopment could enhance the character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.         6.2 Destance to power lines       0       Rever lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       Rever lines do not pose a constraint to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (f)       Development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or incorporating an adjacent poersymmet. Was first development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or incorporating an adjacent poersymmet. Was first development capacity or alternative access in the site is between two buildings and not very wide. May timit development capacity or alternative access in	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	Not applicable.	
*** Indect of agricultation and       o       For end of a control in the set of public open space.         4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space       o       Pevelopment unikely to involve the loss of public open space.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       o       Ine site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to the access.       The relevant site character context is urban and development is unikely to adversely affect the wider landscape         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (+)       Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in the isi identified as a potential regeneration area. It is located within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       (+)       Development may improve settlement of a run down site or improvement in fire intensification. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.         6.2 Distance to gas and all pipelines       (-)       Ges or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: constraint on the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       (-)       adaccess to the site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent property may be necessary.       Existing access is between two buildings and not very wide. May timt development capacity or alternative access in corporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.4 Access to sile       (-	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+) Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	95% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.3. Capacity to infinite access to their space       0       Capacity to infinite access to the step       0         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       0       The site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to faracter.       The relevant site character context is urban and development is unkkely to adversely affect the wider landscape         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       0+       Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in for intensification. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Image: Capacity of the site identified as a potential regeneration area. It is 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.       Image: Capacity of site development would not pose any constraint to the site.         6.2a Distance to power lines       0       Revelopment mould not pose a constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.       Image: Capacity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       The intensity of site development would not site or reated through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access is between two buildings and	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
3.1 Landscape sensitivity       0       accommodate development whout significant character change.       character.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (+)       Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down sile or improvement in provement in provides an opportunity for intensitication. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Improvement in the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensitication. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       No topography constraints to the site.       Improvement in the site.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Improvement in provement in glagoem to the site.         6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0       Adjacent to the site.       Improvement in place, or existing access is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         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 is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.4 Access to site       (+)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
3.2. Selection Character selection of years       the twoscape.       twoscape.       the twoscape.       for intensification. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Image: Constraints are identified in the site.         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       0       Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: Constraint to the site.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: 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.       Existing access is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.4 Access to site       (f)       Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (f)       Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing         6.8 Totific insord       Image: Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing	5.1 Landscape sensitivity		
6.1 Holography Consumits       0       Constraints       0       Constraints       0       Constraints       0       Constraints       0       Constraints       0       Constraints       Constraints       0       Constraints       Constanting ton constraints       Cons	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity		in Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is located within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.22 Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a 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 is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (+)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.         6.5 Traffic impact       Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing       Potential contamination (Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.1 Topography constraints	0 No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2 Distance to power lines       0         6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)       0         7.4 Access to site       (*)         Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (*)         Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.         6.5 Traffic impact       Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on The Preservation Order (TPO)       0       adjacent to the site.         6.4 Access to site       (•)       Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (•)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.         6.5 Traffic impact       Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing)       Existing access is between two buildings and not very wide. May limit development capacity or alternative access incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site       (*)       would require upgrade.       incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.         6.5 Contamination constraints       (*)       Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.       Potential contamination (Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.         6.5 Traffic impact       Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	adjacent to the site.	
6.5 Containing up of the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing	6.4 Access to site	(*) would require upgrade.	incorporating an adjacent property may be necessary.
	6.5 Contamination constraints		
	6.6 Traffic impact		ng

Site Suitability Assessment		
Parish:		
Settlement:	Waltham Abbey	
Size (ha):	0.51	
Address:	Green Yard Car Park	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Pay and Display Car park	
SLAA yield:	41 dwellings and 3,000 sqm town centre	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 80 dph and ground floor retail	
SLAA site contraints:	None	
Site selection	None	

adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0380	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		







Dwellings: 41		Souroe: 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirect affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 96% of the site is in Flood Zone 2. Within this 57% overlaps with Flood Zone 3a and 4% with Flood Zone 3l Flood Zones 3a and 3b are located in the western portion of the site and mitigation could be achieved through sit layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	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	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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, adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 identified as a potential regeneration area. It is a existing car park within the settlement area and provides a 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.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Greenyard.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Gunpowder Works). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	
	1		© Aru

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference	: SR-0381	
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.97	
Address:	Darby Drive / Abbey Gardens Car Park	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Pay and Display Car park	
SLAA yield:	15 dwellings and 1,700m town centre (retail/ commercial)	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 80 dph and ground floor retail	
SLAA site contraints:	Capacity significantly reduced due to only 0.17ha of site being developable	

Site selection None adjustment:

Community None feedback:

## Client

Job Title		
Epping Forest D	istrict Local Pla	In
Drawing Status		
Issue		
	Issue	
Drawing No	Issue	



u-unnams up oara e urown copyngnt and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, Deturme, Intermap, Incernent P Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyrindia, @ OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: EsrU EgitalGibbe, GeoRye, Eanthstaf Georganhics, CNESA/Inius DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dwellings: 15</u>		Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
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.	Below IRZ consultation threshold
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 part of site identified for development does not cover the BAP priority habitat, therefore no impact likely.
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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	40% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	The part of the site identified for development (car park) would not lead to 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.	Part of the site (car park) is identified as a potential regeneration area. Site is adjacent to the Abbey and Lea Valley Regional Park and has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Darby Drive.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Graveyard / Abattoir / Works / Smithy). 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).	
Sile Sulla	Dinty Assessment		
---------------------------------------	--		
Site Reference	: SR-0384		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	6.89		
Address:	King Harold School (Business & Enterprise Academy)		
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Existing School and Playing Fields		
SLAA yield:	276 dwellings		
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 40 dph		
SLAA site contraints:	Flood Risk reducing developable area by circa 1/5. Also circa 10% of the site is covered by SR-0482 (21 dwellings) and as such the yield is reduced.		
Site selection	Capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (21 dwellings) to		

 Site selection
 Capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (21 dwellings) to account for overlapping site.

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

# Client

Local Plan
Issue
P1
Epping Forest District Council

e contains US blate — Oriom Cophylin and odadader high (2016) Sources: Ech (HRE, DeLorme, Internate, Incentered H Corp., CEEDCU USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Mapmyhola, d'OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Nacre: EsrL OpenStalGlobe, GeoRey, Eartheat Geographics, CHES/Mirkus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 220		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is not within any BAP priority habitat buffer zones. There is a habitat species recorded within site, which may be directly affected. Additionally, Giant hogweed has been recorded approx. 20m to the west of 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 2 and exception test not required.	Some 30% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 9% is in Flood Zone 3a. Flood Zone 3a is located along the eastern and northern site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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 less than 1000m 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.	60% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 identified as a potential regeneration area. However, part of it is school playing fields and open space. Therefore, redevelopment is likely 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	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Broomstick Hall 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.	
·		•	© Arup

Sile Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference: SR-0385		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	9.45	
Address:	Ninefields, Land at Hillhouse Drive inc. Abbey Youth Football Ground and Stoney Bridge Drive Allotments	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Existing playing fields and amenity open space.	
SLAA yield:	378 dwellings	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 40 dph	
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 40% of the site is covered by SR-0481 (88 dwellings) and as such the yield is reduced.	
Site selection adjustment:	Capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (88 dwellings) to account for overlapping site.	

Community feedback:

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

### 4105 ertf Brentw Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0385	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

JSGS, FAO, NPS,



Dwellings: <u>378</u>		Source: Ext, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
		<b>0</b>	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination with other housing sites within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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 partially within around half of a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and within the related buffer zone. The site is likely to directly affect the BAP priority habitat but mitigation can 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 70% of the site is within Flood Zone 2, of which 26% is within Flood Zone 3a and 19% in Flood Zone 3b. Flood Zones 3a and 3b are located along the southern site boundary and flood risk can be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 within a settlement.	90% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	()	Development may involve the loss of public open space with no opportdwellingies for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	35% of open land is within the development site. Given the narrow shape of the site, there may be few opportunities to reconfigure the development and re-provide the public open space elsewhere.
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 identified as a potential regeneration area. However, parts of the site are existing playing fields, allotments and open space. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely 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	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Numerous existing and potential access points.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries / Electricity Sub Station). 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	© Arup

Site Suita Site Reference Parish:	bility Assessment SR-0439 Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	12.33
Address:	Picks Farm, Sewardstone Road, E4 7RA
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Agricultural grazing land including fishing lakes, associated farm and outbuildings, holiday chalets and equestrian uses.
SLAA yield:	125 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 10 dph).
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0439	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

Sources: Esh, HERE, DeLormi, Cuyhighi and Galause ngin (coho) Sources: Esh, HERE, DeLormi, Lintemap, incernent P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esh Japan, METI, Esh China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmylindia, O'ponStirentAlex, contributors, and the GIS User Comunity Sources: Esh, DigitalGlobo, Geoßye, Earhtstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, 167, wisstopo, and the GIS User Comunity



Dwellings: <u>125</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	() Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.	Residential development within very close proximity to Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation, which could result in urbanisation effects (e.g. from fly tipping, fires etc.).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-) Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	be Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	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 Deciduous Woodland and Semi Improved Grassland habitats. It is within four buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0 Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to Gilwell Park South LWS and within the 250m buffer for Woodlands Farm Meadow LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++) Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+) No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+) Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high qual archaeological assets on the site.	ity
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 ri could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A1112 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 very high.	or
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0 Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-) Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	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 more than 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.	90% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	() Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+) Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provi access to open space which is currently private.	de No public open space is located in the site area and development will not involve any loss. Site adjacent to existing public open space which could provide opportunities for improved access, beneficial in an area of identified public open space deficiency
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-) The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absordevelopment without significant character change.	brb
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is far away from existing settlements with scattered housing around it. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	Gas or oil pipelines 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 the site.	to 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 from Sewardstone Road and Davis Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm). Potential adverse impact, but could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	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.	uld
L		© Arup

Site Reference: SR-0453		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	3.12	
Address:	Dallance Farm, Breach Barns Lane, Waltham Abbey, Essex, EN9 2AD	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Agricultural land/pasture.	
SLAA yield:	94 dwellings	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph	
SLAA site contraints:	None	

Site selection None adjustment:

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

# Teint

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Lo	Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0453	P1		
	Epping Forest District Council		

© Contains US data © Crown copyright and database ng/m (2016) Sources: Est, HRER, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., CBECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METL, Est Chna (Hong Kong), swisstopo. Mapmylicitas, Depositione, doeg-tachos, and Hargense, CHCS-Burnaly, Depositione, doeg-tachos, and Hargense, CHCS-Burnaly, Germapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: <u>94</u>		Source: Exrl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	el ha
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.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Cobbin's Brook LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 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	0	Site between 400m and 1000m 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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, 800m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is far away from existing settlements with scattered housing around it. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Off Galley Hill 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.	
L		1	© Arup

one ounability Assessment		
Site Reference: SR-0481		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	3.28	
Address:	Land to the South of Hillhouse Primary School, Waltham Abbey	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Half overgrown scrub land and half open space with children's play area.	
SLAA yield:	98 dwellings	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph	
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 10% reduction in capacity which lies in Flood Zone 3a.	

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.

#### Cheshua Che

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Dist	rict Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0481	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		

© Containe OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEDCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NN, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METT, Esri China (Hong Kong), swistor Mapmrindia, © CopenStreatMap Contributors; and the IGS User Community Source: Fain, DataBiolice, Goley, E Cathata Geographics, CNESN/thous DB, USDA, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGF, swistorp, and the IGS User Community



Dwellings: 88		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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 partially within around half of a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and within the related buffer zone. The site is likely to directly affect the BAP priority habitat but mitigation can 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 84% of the site is within Flood Zone 2 of which 43% is also within Flood Zones 3a (the majority) and 3b. Flood Zones 3a and 3b run along the middle of the site and careful site layout will be required to mitigate flood risk.
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	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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 within a settlement.	100% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	()	mitigation.	60% of open land is within the development site. Given the narrow shape of the site, there may be few opportunities to reconfigure the development and re-provide the public open space elsewhere.
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.	Part of the site is a public open space. Therefore, redevelopment is likely to adversely 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.	Off Hill 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-0482		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.71	
Address:	Land adjoining Mason Way, Waltham Abbey	

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:Open amenity space.

 SLAA yield:
 21 dwellings

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site None contraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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

### Hertford Harlow Cheshuat Alto Brentwood

Client	
Epping Forest Distri	ct Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0482	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council



© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, Detorme, Internage, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto Mapmyinda, © OpenStreatMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigtalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogril, (GN, IGP, swisstop, and the GIS User Community

Dwellings: 21	Source: Earl, DigtalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AE Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-) Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checke combination effects.	or in- Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the pr development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	osed
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 sit	
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	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0 Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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	(+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0 Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0 Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0 The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are accommodate development without significant character change.	le to 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 improve townscape.	ent in Site is 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	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 eithe adjacent to the site.	on or
6.4 Access to site	(+) Suitable access to site already exists.	Off Mason Way.
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 site with capacity of <25 dwellings).	using
	•	© Arut

	•	
Site Reference: SR-0541		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.41	
Address:	Waltham Abbey community Centre, Saxon Way	

 Primary use:
 Housing

 SLAA notes:
 Single storey school building with substantial open space.

 SLAA yield:
 12 dwellings

 SLAA source for baseline yield:
 Assumption based on 30 dph

 SLAA site contraints:
 None

Site selection None adjustment:

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

# Clert

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0541	P1		
ARUP © Contains OS data © Crown copyright and o	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestde.gov.uk		



www.cppingtorestdc.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), swisstop
MapmyIndia, © 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: 12		Source: Exr, 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitats with no main features. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 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.	
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 Crooked Mile.
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).	
			© Arup

Site Suital Site Reference Parish: Settlement:	bility Assessment : SR-0566 Waltham Abbey
Size (ha):	0.32
Address:	40/46 Sewardstone Street
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing A corner plot on an existing housing estate comprising two storey buildings (flats) on three sides.
SLAA yield:	10 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	Circa 50% of the site is covered by SR-0699 (initial site) and as such the yield is reduced to avoid double counting. The redevelopment of the site would not likely increase the current quantity of residential dwellings.
Site selection adjustment:	For the purposes of assessment, it is assumed that this site can accommodate net additional dwellings at 30 dph on a site size of 0.32 ha.
•	

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

# Teint

## Epping Forest District Council Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No SR-0566 P1 SR-0566 Epping Forest District Council District Council



Sources: Est, IHRE, DeLorme, Informan, Incoment P Corp., GEDCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBae, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanes Survey, Esri Japan, METT, Esri China (Hong Kong), swistoy Mapmrindia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DgitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Dwellings: 10		Source: 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within the buffer zone for BAP priority habitats with no main features. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 99% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Less than 1% of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3a. The development could be configured to avoid this area.
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 not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 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.	
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	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).	
	-	•	© Arup

Site Suita Site Reference Parish: Settlement: Size (ha): Address:	bility Assessment SR-0578A Waltham Abbey 0.16 Shernbrook Hostel, Shernbrook Road
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Hostel, including parking.
SLAA yield:	6 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 40 dph due to the more urban location
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection	None

adjustment:

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

## Teint

Council
Local Plan
Issue
P1
Epping Forest District Council



Sources: Eurl, HERE, Dukumne, Jingiang and unatabaset P Gury, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeeBass, IGN, Kadatster ML, Ordhanos Survey, Ever Jiagan, MET, ISAT Chara, Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, Digatclobe, GeoSye, Earthstaf Geographics, CNES-Kirkus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

<u>Dwellings: 6</u>		Source: Earl, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Preliminary masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	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 in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). 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).	
	-	•	© Aruj

Site Suita	Dinty Assessment
Site Reference	: SR-0589
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	1.79
Address:	Land to the rear of The Plough public house, Sewardstone Road, Chingford, E4 7RJ
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing A parade of local shops with residential flats above and associated parking and access. Access also used for adjacent block of flats.
SLAA yield:	46
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 152 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	None



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0589	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	

AO, NPS USGS, AEX



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

Calculation         Control in the control of the	eedback: near to this site.	Napmyndaia, or Openstreetwaip commonitoris, and ne is is user Community Source: Exit, Digitalicolice, Geodyen, Earthstar, Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Link         Number of the state of the state of the lege	<u>Dwellings: 46</u>		
DistrictNo.<	Criteria		
Characterization         Componential Section         Componential Section         Componential Section           Six additional Section         Componential Section	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites		
Contract of ControlControlControlSile Single Signed Signed Single Sin	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the propos development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	ed
Name of sector         Note         Inclusion         Inclusion           10 sector         32         Inclusion Birls from Sector Sector         32         Sector Sector Sector         32         Sector Sector Sector         32         Sector Sector Sector Sector         32         Sector	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0 Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Like Name AnswerUP<		0 No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Interfact of the field of the fiel	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0 Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
Initial controlIII17 BudiaIII17 BudiaIII18 International controlII18 International controlII18 International controlII18 International controlII19 International controlII <tr< td=""><td>1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats</td><td>0 No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.</td><td>The site is within Traditional Orchard and Deciduous Woodland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.</td></tr<>	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 Deciduous Woodland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
17 Jointh10110113 JointMain and section of the sec	1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0 Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
Initial Instantion Constraints1011	1.7 Flood risk	(++) Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Index dividual statusImage: Control statusImage: Control statusImage: Control status11 Image: Control statusControl statusControl statusControl statusControl status12 Image: Control statusControl statusControl statusControl statusControl status13 Datasets the reases: statusControl statusControl statusControl statusControl status14 Dataset the rease statusControl statusControl statusControl statusControl status15 Datasets the reases: statusControl statusControl statusControl statusControl status16 Datasets the rease statusControl statusControl statusControl statusControl status17 Dataset the rease statusControl statusControl statusControl statusControl status18 Datasets the rease of statusControl statusControl statusControl status19 Datasets the rease of statusControl statusControl statusControl status19 Datasets the rease of statusControl statusControl statusControl status19 Dataset the rease of statusControl statusControl statusControl status19 Dataset the rease of statusControl sta	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+) No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
14 integrate in pairs16 <t< td=""><td>1.8b Impact on archaeology</td><td></td><td>ity</td></t<>	1.8b Impact on archaeology		ity
21 Determinant of usered bed       7.0       wynys.         31 Determinant of usered bed       7.0       Wynys.       Second bed bed bed bed bed bed bed bed bed be	1.9 Impact of air quality	0 Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
3.1 Districts for the related fullique from       10         3.2 Districts for the related fullique from of a los state;       10         3.2 Districts for earch fullication       0         3.1 Districts for earch fullication       0         3.2 District for earch fullication       0         3.3 District for earch fullication       0         3.3 District for earch fullication       0         3.4 District for earch fullication       0	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt		or
Al Database is taken at the heap       (*)       Interact of the data state is the product of the rest of the data state 200% of an employment stateboakin.       Image: Comparison of the data state 200% of an employment stateboakin.         3.3 Data note is employment focultors       0.0       Sie between 1000m and 4000m from free resters infortyment stateboakin.       Image: Comparison of the data state 1000m and 4000m from free resters infortyment stateboakin.         3.4 Data note is call arrentizes       0.0       Sie is between 1000m and 4000m from free resters infortyment stateboakin.       Image: Comparison of the data state 1000m and 4000m from free resters infortyment stateboakin.         3.4 Data note is call arrentizes       0.0       Sie is between 1000m and 4000m from free resters infortyment stateboakin.       Image: Comparison of the data state is comparison of the data sta	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.3 Defaulted unitylyment dualing       0       Interaction of the set o	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+) Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
SN brance to local attentine       0       Information of the set of the	3.3 Distance to employment locations	0 Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.1 Detailed to indetect interprinting school       0       Interpret interpr	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.4 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0       Including and dotted in the nearest GP surgery.         3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery       0       Is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.         3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network       1       Not applicable.         4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land       0       Molify of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.       Strategic Road Network       0         4.2 Inpact on agricultural land       0       Development would invoke the loss of the best and most versatel agricultural land (grades 1-3).       Including and and and be aboord dovelopment without significant character shares.         3.1 Andscape sensitivity       0       Development unlikely to invoke the loss of public gen space.       Including and able to aboord dovelopment without significant character shares.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       0       Development unlikely to invoke the loss of gavic generication character shares.       Ste within a very low density welloment and the number of houses is at a higher density than the assess development, without significant character shares.         5.2 Selement character sensitivity       0       No topography constraints are identified in the sile.       Ste with a very low density welloment and the number of houses is at a higher density than the assess development.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the sile.       Ste with a very low density atellement and the usent very low density atellement an	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.7 Josaice in Particle On Particle       0       For experiment of a singley       0         3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network       1       Not applicable.       0% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Sewardstone).         4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land       (e)       Najority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.       0% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Sewardstone).         4.2 Impact on agricultural land       (e)       Development would involve the loss of he best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).       Image: Comparity of the site falls within an area of medium landscape sense.         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       (f)       Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.       Site is within a very low density settlement and the number of houses is at a higher density than the need of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to evelopment without significant character.       Site is within a very low density settlement and the number of houses is at a higher density than the need Sevelopment without significant character.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       0       No topgraphy constraints are identified in the site.       Site is within a very low density settlement and the number of houses is at a higher density than the need Sevelopment is likely to affect the semi-rural character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topgraphy constraints to development. They will be difficul to overcome and affect a large baracter development.       Site is within a xeey low de	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.6 Access to Subargie Acad Network       Image: Acad Network       Image: Acad Network       Image: Acad Network         4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land       Image: Acad Network       Set Set Subargie Acad Network       Set	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4.1 Brownie and Greenhand Land       (+)       Final end of the set of the best of the be	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network	Not applicable.	
12 Impact of agricultural and       CP       Performance       Performance       Performance         4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space       0       Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space.       Performance         5.1 Landscape sensitivity       Ch       The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to character change.       Performance       Performance         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       Ch       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       Site is within a very low density settlement and the number of houses is at a higher density than the neige development is likely to affect the semi-rural character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Performance         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       Ch       Sas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large of 40dph. HSE guidance advise against development.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Performance         6.2 Interstormance       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or       Performance	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+) Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	90% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Sewardstone).
1.1 Constraints       0       Final and the stee       0       Final and the stee       0       Final and the stee	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	() Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
3.1 Landscape sensitivity       (*)       change and able to absorb development without significant character change.         5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (*)       Development could detract from the existing settlement character.       Site is within a very low density settlement and the number of houses is at a higher density than the neigher development is likely to affect the semi-rural character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Image: Constraint of the site.         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       (*)       Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large density in excess of 40dph. HSE guidance advise against development.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: Constraint development.         6.2 Image: to power lines       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or       Image: Constraint of the site.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity       (*)       If a character of the area.         6.1 Topography constraints       0       No topography constraints are identified in the site.       Image: character of the area.         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       (*)       Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large density in excess of 40dph. HSE guidance advise against development.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: character of protected trees either on or	5.1 Landscape sensitivity		to
6.1 Hopography constraints       0       Intervention of the state       Intervention of the state         6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines       (-)       Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large density in excess of 40dph. HSE guidance advise against development.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Intervention of the site of the site of the site.         6.3 Impact on Tree Resonancies Order (TRO)       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is within a very low density settlement and the number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the semi-rural character of the area.
0.22 Distance to gas and on pipelines       C/2       part of the site.       density in excess of 40dph. HSE guidance advise against development.         6.2b Distance to power lines       0       Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.       Image: Constraint of the site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or         6.3 Image: top Tree Presence for CTPO       0       The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or	6.1 Topography constraints	0 No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2 Distance to power lines D Transition Order (TPO) The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	() Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a lar part of the site.	ge More than 70% of the site is in the HSE middle consultation zone. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwellings at a density in excess of 40dph. HSE guidance advise against development.
	6.2b Distance to power lines	0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)		or
6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists.	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 (Tank / Horticultural Nursery / Farm). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Tank / Horticultural Nursery / Farm). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact 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.	6.6 Traffic impact		ıld

one ouna	
Site Reference:	SR-0594
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Settlement:	
Size (ha):	2.42
Address:	Land being the site of the former nursery at Wood Green Road, Waltham Abbey (Identified as land at Warlies Estate, Lot 15 and 16)
Primary use:	Housing
SLAA notes:	Open amenity space to the rear of Boleyn Court, including a pond and tennis courts. Site has quite a dense tree boundary.
	111
SLAA yield:	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 69 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	None



Epping Forest Distric	Council	
Job Title		
Epping Forest Distric	t Local Plan	
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0594	P1	
ARUP	Epping Fores	



<u>Dwellings: 111</u>		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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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 Ancient Woodland	of O	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site encompasses a portion of Deciduous Woodland habitat. It is within the relevant buffer zone and partia within the buffer for Wood Pasture and Parkland. The site may directly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can 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 Warlies Park LWS and Oxleys Wood Complex LWS. The site is unlikely to affer the features and species of these 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	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 site, 250m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of 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	()	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	Total site area is in the HSE inner and outer consultation zones. Sensitivity level 3 as more than 30 dwelling dwelling HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access via farm gate.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	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.	

Hert
oad,
site. tree
Clier
h) Ep Job
Drav
lss
Drav
SR



41060

Brentwo

adjustment:

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

#### Drawing No SR-0598 ARUP

ertford

auase rigmt (2016) ment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Esri Japan, METT, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop d the GIS User Community eographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, the GIS User Community



Criteria 1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites		Score	Our-liteting Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites			Qualitative Assessment
		Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland 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 A1112 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	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	80% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Sewardstone).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the semi-rural 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.	Small portion in the northern corner of the site is within the HSE Outer Consultation zone. This is considered negligible and is not a constraint to development. HSE guidance don't advise against development
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Tank / Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

Site Suita Site Reference Parish: Settlement:	bility Assessment : SR-0600 Waltham Abbey	
Size (ha):	1.25	
Address:	22 Woodgreen Road, Waltham Abbey, EN9 3SD	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Existing car dealership which is in use.	
SLAA yield:	24	L
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 153 dph)	 -
SLAA site contraints:	The density could potentially be achieved through sensitive design due to its corner plot in an urban area.	-     
Site selection adjustment:	None	



Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest Distri	ct Local Plan			
Drawing Status				
Issue				
Drawing No	Issue			
SR-0600	P1			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counc			

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



Community	F
feedback:	S

Dwellings:     24		Source: Est, DigialGlobe, 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
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	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Ancient Woodland 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland. The site may
	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this. The site is within the 250m buffer of Warlies Park LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites		Site within Flood Zone 1.	LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)		
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	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	95% greenfield site, 100m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	The site falls within an area of 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 within a very low density settlement and the number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the semi-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	()	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	Approximately 98% of the site is in the HSE middle consultation zone. Sensitivity level 3 as density of more than 40 dph. HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access	Access via existing house on site.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	would require upgrade. No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
	0	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).	© Arup

Site Suitability Assessment				
Site Reference	Site Reference: SR-0688			
Parish:	Waltham Abbey			
Settlement:				
Size (ha):	0.12			
Address:	Grant Court Garages, Nos. 99-126, Waltham Abbey			
Primary use:	Housing			
SLAA notes:	Council owned garages with associated parking and turning area.			
SLAA yield:	4 dwellings			

SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
SLAA site contraints:	Could accommodate terraced properties as seen elsewhere on the estate, including the conversion of five garages underneath existing flats.

Site selection None adjustment:

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

### 4106 ertfo Brentwo

Client	
Epping Forest Distr	ict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0688	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council

JSGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN ty 5 DS, USDA, USGS, AEX



Dwellings: <u>11</u>		Souroe: 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Small site within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Potential for in combination recreational effects with other developments.
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 two BAP priority habitat buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 identified as a potential regeneration area and is existing garages which provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore, redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Off Gant Court.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		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).	

#### . . : 4 . . . . . \_ 5

Site Suita	bility Assessment	
Site Reference	: SR-0690	-
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.12	
Address:	Mallon Court Garages, Nos. 220-256, Waltham Abbey	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Council owned garages with associated parking and turning area.	
SLAA yield:	4 dwellings	-
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph	 - 
SLAA site contraints:	Could accommodate terraced properties as seen elsewhere on estate at higher density, including the conversion of four garages underneath existing flats.	- ( - (
Site selection	None	\$

9 adjustment:

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

### 410 Hertford Brentwo

Epping Forest Dist	rict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Dist	rict Local Plan
Drawing Status	
Issue	
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0690	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counc





Dwellings: 12			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Small site within 2km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Potential for in combination recreational effects with other developments.
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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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 less than 1000m 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 and is existing garages which provides an opportunity fo intensification. Therefore, redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Off Mallion Court.
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 Suita	Dility Assessment	CF
Site Reference	: SR-0850	Hertfo
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	1.34	
Address:	Commercial site south of Highbridge Street, Waltham Abbey, Essex	ch
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Existing out of centre retail park and associated parking	AT
SLAA yield:	92	Client
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 69 dph)	Epp Job Tir Epp
SLAA site contraints:	Circa one third of the site is taken up by buffer area for underground and over ground electricity and the site is 100% covered by Flood Zone 3a which reduces the yield.	Drawir <b>Issu</b> Drawir
Site selection adjustment:	None	sr-i



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0850	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council		

AO, NPS



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

Dwellings:         61           Criteria           1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected           1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected site           1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland           1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees           Ancient Woodland		Score Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Qualitative Assessment           Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lee Valley Special Protection Area.
<ul> <li>1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected</li> <li>1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected site</li> <li>1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland</li> <li>1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Tree</li> </ul>		Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected site 1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland 1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Tree			Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lee Valley Special Protection Area.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	tes (-)		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Tree		Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 10 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Tree Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
	es outside of 0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	No Ancient or Veteran Trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer La	and 0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Lands
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or	r 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 two BAP priority habitat buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, bu 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 not within any Local Wildlife Sites or 250m buffer zones.
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	The whole site is in flood zone 2, with a substantial amount also falling in flood zone 3a across the whole area Development would be significantly constrained.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A121 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 st	station 0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	s (+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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	k	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 in an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey)
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to ope	en 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 landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Redevelopment of existing retail park could provide an opportunity to enhance settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	s 0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	(-)	Power lines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Orde	er (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 A121.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential for contamination. 100% of site. Potential adverse impact but could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

Site Suitak Site Reference: Parish: Settlement: Size (ha):	Dility Assessment SR-0851 Waltham Abbey
Address:	Car park at Green Yard, Waltham Abbey, Essex
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Public car park (pay and display)
SLAA yield:	30
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 150 dph)
SLAA site contraints:	Site is 100% covered by a combination of SR-380 and SR-0578. As such the yield is omitted for this site to avoid double counting.
Site selection adjustment:	Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping site).



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distrie	ct Local Plan		
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0851	P1		
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council www.cppingforestdc.gov.uk		

, FAO, NPS

ERE,



Community	The
feedback	nea

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

#### Dwellings: 30

Dwellings: <u>30</u>				
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.	
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 three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.		
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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 (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity		townscape.	Part of site is an existing car park within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore, redevelopment could enhance the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the sites location in a conservat
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 / Within 250m of Landfill / Unknown Victorian Development). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	

#### - Suitability Accore 0:4

Site Suitability Assessment			
Site Reference: SR-0853			
Parish:	Waltham Abbey		
Settlement:			
Size (ha):	1.04		
Address:	Playing fields at Waltham Holy Cross School grounds, Monkwood Ave, Waltham Abbey, Essex		
Primary use:	Housing		
SLAA notes:	Playing fields at Waltham Holy Cross Primary School		
SLAA yield:	72		
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 69 dph)		
SLAA site contraints:	None		

Site selection None

adi	ustn	nent:	
,			

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

### 4106 ertf Brentw Client

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest Distr	ict Local	Plan	
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Iss	ue	
SR-0853	P	1	
ARUP	€	pping Forest District Counci	



FAO, NPS, M USDA, USGS, AEX

<u>Dwellings: 72</u>		Source: Exrl. DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zone for BAP priority habitats with no main features. 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	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	95% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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 identified as potential regeneration area. It has existing playing fields and open space. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely 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	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	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 Suitebility Accessment

Site Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference: SR-0854		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	1.25	
Address:	Land at Leverton Infant School and Nursery, Honey Lane, Waltham Abbey, Essex	
Primary use:	Housing	
SLAA notes:	Scrublands (overgrown open space) with fencing at boundaries. No existing public access.	
SLAA yield:	20+19 (from SR-0854 and SR-0855) equates to a total of 39	
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 31 dph)	
SLAA site contraints:	Site is 100% covered by a SR-0065. As such the yield is omitted for this site to avoid double counting.	
Site selection adjustment:	Capacity reinstated from overlapping site.	



Brentw

410

ertf

Client

Job Title

Drawing Status Issue Drawing No

Community feedback:

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

#### **Dwellings:**

SR-0854	P1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council
	crement P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, rey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo

Source: Esri, Dig Getmapping, Aer



Dwellings: <u>39</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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and within the relevant and Wood pasture and Parkland buffe 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	80% greenfield site within 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 may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is located within the settlement area and provides an opportunit 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.	
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.	Pedestrian access via footpath. No existing vehicular access. This could potentially be overcome as the same landowner owns the school next door and could provide more land for access (EFDC input from KT email April 19 2016 10:17 ).
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Infilled Pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

One Outdomity Assessment		
Site Reference	: SR-0901	
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	1.18	
Address:	Langley Nursery, Crooked Mile, Waltham Abbey	
Primary use: SLAA notes:	Housing Existing use as glasshouse and market gardening.	

SLAA yield:	Capacity not indicated by promoter, and has been estimated.
SLAA source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph.
SLAA site	None

Site selection None adjustment:

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

### 4106 ertf Brentw Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status		
Issue		
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0901	P1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	



ISGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN hina (Hong Kong), swissto DS, USDA, USGS, AEX

Dwellings: 35		Source: Exr. 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development between 400m and 2km from Lee Valley Ramsar. In-combination effects from recreationa pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 10 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultatic with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and wholly within three buffer zones. The site main indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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.	90% greenfield, 10% brownfield adjacent to Waltham Abbey
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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.	Small site in existing use. Proposed amount of development is not likely to impact 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.	Existing access off B194 Crooked Mile.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Horticultural Nursery.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

	-	
Site Reference: SR-0902		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Settlement:		
Size (ha):	0.46	
Address:	Mile Nursery, Crooked Mile, Waltham Abbey	

Primary use:HousingSLAA notes:In existing use as nursery, and mostly hard standing.

SLAA yield: SLAA source for baseline yield:	Capacity not indicated by promoter, and has been estimated. Assumption based on 30 dph.
SLAA site contraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is

feedback: near to this site.

# Client

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0902	P1		
ARUP (	Epping Forest District Council		



© Lomains US data © Lorwin copyingnt and database ingnt (2016) Sources: Esht, HERE, Deturmer, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swestopo Mapmyindia, CoperStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, Digita/Globe, GeoEye, Eanthatar Geographics, CNES/Alrous DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geimapping, Aurorgini, IGN, IGP, winstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria			
		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development between 400m and 2km from Lee Valley Ramsar. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 10 rural dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site 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	0	Site is between 1000m and 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% brownfield, adjacent to Waltham Abbey)
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is in use as glasshouse. Proposed amount of development is not likely to impact 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.	Existing access off B194 Crooked Mile.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Horticultural Nursery and Works.
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-0903		
Waltham Abbey		
0.6		
Waltham Abbey Swimming Pool, Roundhills, EN9 1UP		
Housing		
Existing swimming pool and car park		
None		
None		
None		
NOTE		

Site selection None adjustment:

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



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status			
Issue			
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0903	P1		
ARUP 🤅	Epping Forest District Council		



which covers or is



Dwellings: 18		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).	Site on very edge of 2km zone for Lee Valley Special Protection Area. Impacts likely to be avoidable.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 50 residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The 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.	No Ancient or Veteran Trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Lands
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 not within any BAP priority habitats or buffer zones.
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 not within any Local Wildlife Sites or 250m buffer zones.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	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.	75% Brownfield site adjacent to an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey)
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	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 landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development on swimming pool site not likely to impact existing suburban character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Roundhills.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Records indicate that the sites are located on a former historic landfill. Mitigation possible, but developer should be required to show evidence of viability for site remediation in order to redevelop.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	
		• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	© Aru