EB805Fii SR-0879 SR-0935 SR-0048 SR-0399 2-00 SR-0131 SR-0128 OrearRead

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No.	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 and Stage 6.2	Legend
	EFDC-S2-008-Rev2 Date: March 2018	Assessment in Fyfield	Residential sites asses
ARUP		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:12,500 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	
			This legend shows only key map symbology. A full le

Residential sites assessed at Stage 2 and Stage 6.2

Ν

B342

his legend shows only key map symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

Site Reference:	SR-0048
Parish:	Fyfield
Size (ha):	4.09
Address:	Land North of Ongar Road, Fyfield, Ongar Essex

Primary use: Residential Site notes: Agricultural field

Baseline yield: 123 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>123</u>



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
lssue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0048	Rev 2	
	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk	

right and database right (2016) termap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, ance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto Intibutors, and the GIS User Community , Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, Community Eye, Earths



13 literation berinning species on brance 14 Particular biological constraints on the species could be relationed or due to distance of local widdle also from also. The site is arrised particle and species of the UP 16 limped on Local Videlifie Sites (m) Site is a relieve and species could be relationed or due to distance of local widdle also from also. The site is arrised particle also from the fold set is an interve also for also in Pool 2004. The site is in Pool 2004. The distance of the UP 12 Food res. (m) Site is a relievely addict be brand addict and the site distance of local widdle also for also be brand from the site. Utility to limpad on settings of Globs I or Globs II" Likes Pludifies da to distance. 18 Impact on stratege assets (m) Site is a relievely addict be brand addict be brand at the brand and the brand addict brand particle also addict a			
Interse Interse Interse Interse 12 shows on shallowaky matched also 0 Restriction of the state also 1 13 shows on shallowaky matched also 0 Restriction of the state also on stat	teria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
In Facult And Markader Hondels data Image: Constrained Hondels Hondels Hondels and the additional to Access Hondels Hond			n
Lab input of window instantiantVVV			
Notice the formation of the state	Woodland 0 Site is not	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
14 Fault display() yeter team land 10 Note officed as faults and provide the fault as faults as faults as faults as faults and provide display (or the fault as faults as faults as faults as faults as faults and provide display (or the fault as faults and provide display) Per effect as objects to be followed to be followed to be fault as faults and provide display (or the fault as faults and provide display) 17 Provide fault Per effect as faults as	/Veteran Trees outside of 0 No Ancien	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Is impact in dot / influtions species act in Balance Influence 16 impact on Local Widtle Bies 0 Site is no effect an influence and species could be returned or due to determs of food widtle sites is non. The site a subject to The Moos UKS. The site is unified to affect as it is unified to a defet as it is unified to affect as it is unified to a defet as it is unified to affect as	prest Buffer Land 0 Site is unli	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Initial billing of a least within basis O Initial billing 17 Plood rak. 0************************************	rity Species or Habitats 0 No effect a	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 Semi Improved Grassland habitat and in two buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect th habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
In Protot Intel Intel Interfactor Intellige 16.6. Impact on befage assels (4) Site in cell kerk by a direct heritage assels due to hier distance from the site. Unlikely to impact on settings of Gase I or Gase I I Used Buildings due to distance. 18.8. Impact on schueedogy (4) Site in cell kerk of previous distance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quely 19. Impact on achievedogical assels on the file. (4) Site is schueedogical week on the file. 19. Impact on achievedogical assels on the file. (4) Site is within Genen Bell (4) 31. Detaines to the nearest nullules station (4) Site is within 400m form the nearest null to be station. [1] 32. Detaines to nearest nullules station (4) Site is within 400m of a bus stop. [1] 33. Detaines to encarest nullules station (4) Site is within 400m of a sus stop. [1] 34. Detaines to encarest nullules station (4) Site is within 400m of a sus stop. [1] 35. Detaines to encarest fullur(primary school (4) Site is within 400m form the nearest ioned primary school. [1] 36. Detaines to encarest fullur(primary school (4) Site is more han 4000m from the nearest ioned primary school. [1] 37. Detaines to encarest fullu	dlife Sites 0 Site has no	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 Moors LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
La injuicit in intralge asses LO International control 18b Impact on architectopy CP Exclusing exclusions destroad assets on the set. 118b Impact of air quality O Site is cubicle of areas identified as being arrisk of porvious disturbance inclustes a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality 21 Level of harm to Green Belt O Site is within 400m fbe mearest all to the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none. 3.1 Distance to nearest influtute station GP Site is within 400m of a tox stop. 3.2 Distance to nearest influtute station GP Site is within 400m of a tox stop. 3.3 Distance to nearest influtute station GP Site is writhin 400m of a tox stop. 3.4 Distance to nearest influtute station GP Site is more than 4000m from the nearest tail vibege. 3.5 Distance to nearest influtute station GP Site is more than 4000m from the nearest toxe. large wilage or small vilage. 3.6 Distance to nearest influtute station GP Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. International vilage. 3.7 Distance to nearest influtute influt	(++) Site within	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a, covering 9%, are located on the northern s boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.00 if input (if inf classed) CP archaelobycal assets on the alls. 19. Impad of air quality 0 Stel is custod of arrass identified as being at risk of poor air quality. 2.1 Level of ham to Green Beit 0 Stel is within Green Beit, but the level of ham caused by refease of the land for development would be none. 3.1 Distance to the nearest rai/bube station (i) Bits is writhin 400m of a bus stop. 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop (ii) Bits is writhin 400m of a bus stop. 3.3 Distance to nearest trait/bube station (iv) Bits is writhin 1600m of an employment allefocation. 3.4 Distance to nearest trait/bub station (iv) Bits is writhin 1600m of an employment allefocation. 3.4 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (iv) Bits is best in more than 4000m from the nearest trait/primary school. 3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (iv) Bits is best in more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (iv) Bits is between 1000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (iv) Bits is between 1000m from the nearest Ge augery. 3.8 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (iv) Bits is between 1000m from the nearest Ge augery. 3.4 Distance to nearest in	assets (+) Site is not	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Grade I or Grade II* Listed Buildings due to distance.
1.9 implied of air quarky 0 If if interce to the nearest relation is the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none. 2.1 Level of hum to Green Belt 0 Set is writhin Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none. 3.1 Distance to the nearest relative station (+) Set is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. 3.2 Distance to nearest loss stop (+) Set is writhin 400m of a bus stop. 3.3 Distance to be coal amenities (+) Set is more than 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 3.4 Distance to local amenities (+) Set is the more than 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (+) Set is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest scoondary school (+) Set is a between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network. (+) Mol applicable. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (+) Molontly of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (+) Development on the loss of public open space. 100% greenfield site			у
2.1 Level of haming orient eet 0 International orient eet 0 3.1 Distance to the nearest rai/hube station (-) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rai/or hube station. 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop (+) Site is within 400m of a bus stop. International orient explored explor	0 Site lies ou	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
1. Distance to the finatest rain(up station) (+) 3.2 Distance to nearest bus slop (+) Site is within 400m of a bus stop. 3.3 Distance to employment locations (+) Site is within 1600m of an employment stel/ocation. 3.4 Distance to local amenities (+) Site is writhin 400m from the nearest town, large village or small village. 3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (+) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village. 3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (+) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest excondary school (+) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest QP surgery 0 Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable. 100% greenfield site, adjacant to an existing settlement (Fyfield). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (+) Development of the site sof of bubic open space. 100% greenfield site, adjacant to an existing settlement (Fyfield). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 100% greenfield site, adjacant to an existing settlement (Fyfield).	en Belt OSite is with	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
3.2 Distance to nearest role and existing settlement (bodied and existing settlement (Fyfield). (*) 3.3 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (*) 3.4 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (*) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village. (*) 3.4 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (*) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village. (*) 3.4 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (*) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. (*) 3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (*) 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (*) Main the ise is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. (10% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (*) Development of the site 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.	est rail/tube station (-) Site is mor	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations (+) File and the second	bus stop (+) Site is with	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.4 Distance to local affeitures (+) For an advance of the state of the st	nent locations (+) Site is with	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.5 Distance to nearest secondary school (*) Image: Constraint of primitary school (*) 3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (*) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. Image: Constraint of primitary school 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. Image: Constraint of primitary school 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Constraint of primitary school Image: Constraint of primitary school 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 (Fyfield). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (*) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Image: Constraint of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Image: Constraint open space	ienities (-) Site is mor	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.6 Distance to hearest secondary school (*) Image: Constraint of the set secondary school (*) 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. Image: Constraint of the set secondary school Image: Constraint of the set secondary school 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Constraint of the set secondary school Image: Constraint of the set secondary school Image: Constraint of the set secondary school 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 (Fyfield). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (*) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Image: Constraint of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Image: Constraint of the site would involve the loss of public open space.	infant/primary school (+) Site is less	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.7 Distance to hearest Gristingery 0 Image: Comparison of the stering of the st	secondary school (-) Site is mor	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.6 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Constrategic Road Network Image: Constrategic Road Network 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (-) Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Image: Constrategic Road Network 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	GP surgery 0 Site is betw	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	Road Network Not applica	Not applicable.	
4.2 Impact on agricultural and 0 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	enfield Land (-) Majority of	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield).
4.5 Capacity to improve access to open space	al land () Developme	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
	access to open space 0 Development	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.		Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, or likely to affect the character of the area.	r sensitivity (-) Developm	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development i likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	ints (-) Topograph	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.	d oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil	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.	lines 0 Power line	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.	(+) Suitable a	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	traints 0 No contam	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.	0 Area arour	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B343

Site Reference:	SR-0049
Parish:	Fyfield
Size (ha):	2.65
Address:	Land south-east of Ongar Road, Fyfield, Essex

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Agricultural field

Baseline yield: 80 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:80



Epping Forest District Council	
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0049	Rev 2
ARUF	Epping Forest District Council
	opyright and database right (2016) Intermap increment P.Com, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP

© Jonania US data 9 Jonania VS Sata 9 Jonania VS



<u>bweinings:</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Grade I or Grade II* Listed Buildings due to distance.
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	(-)	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 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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	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.	B344
		1	© Aru

Site Reference:	SR-0050i
Parish:	Fyfield
Size (ha):	3.43
Address:	Land to East of Fyfield, Fyfield
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Agricultural land/paddocks
Baseline yield:	231 dwollings
Daseillie yielu.	231 dwellings
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph
baseline yield:	
Site	None
constraints:	

Site selection
adjustment:Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Capacity of 231
dwellings split proportionally based on sub-site area.

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellinas:	101

Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0050i	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sourcas: Est, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaset NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METT, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, O'Constituentiago contributors, and the GIS User Comunity Source: Est, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Comunity



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Wood Pasture and Parkland 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Fyfield Mill Meadow LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within setting of Grade I listed Fyfield Hall. Possible mitigation through sensitive layout and good screening.
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	(-)	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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Willingale Road and Fyfield Grange.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm / Industrial Storage). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B345
L			©Arug

Site Reference:	SR-0050ii
Parish:	Fyfield
Size (ha):	4.37
Address:	Land to east of Fyfield, Fyfield

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Agricultural land/paddocks

Baseline yield: 231 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection
adjustment:Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Capacity of 231
dwellings split proportionally based on sub-site area.

Community
feedback:The
nearDwellings:129

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

Hertford reshunt Bishunt Greater London

Epping Forest Di	strict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	Date March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0050ii	Issue Rev 2

Client

© Contains US data V Crown copyright and odadades right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., CBECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Korg), awisstopo, Mapmyridia, © OpenStiteetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibbe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, ArcoGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dweinings.</u> <u>129</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Fyfield Mill Meadow LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within setting of Grade II* church to north-west. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout (reduction in density) and high quality design/materials.
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	(-)	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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Cannons Lane.
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.	B346
	-	-	Carup ©

Site Reference:	SR-0128
Parish:	Fyfield
Size (ha):	1.74
Address:	Herons Farm, Herons Lane, Fyfield, Essex, CM5 0RQ

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Farmhouse, outbuildings and commercial/agricultural buildings

Baseline yield: 10 dwellings

Source for Indicated in Call for Sites baseline yield:

Site Could retain existing Listed Buildings constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:10

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London

Epping Forest District Council		
District Local Plan		
Date		
March 2018		
Issue		
Rev 2		
Epping Forest District Council		

Sources: Earl, HERE, Datomo, Printemap, increment PConp, GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GenBase, IGN, Kataster NL, Ornannos Survey, Earl Japan, MET, Lair China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmynholia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigilalGiobe, Geogrey, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



NumberNumberNumberNumberNumberLique in distance, franktance0Number, franktance, frankt			A	Quellitative Assessment
Number Name Name Name NameNumber NameNumber NameDistance Name NameSet Name NameNumber NameDistance Name NameSet Name NameNumber NameName Name NameNumber NameNumber NameName Name<	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Index and any and the set of	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	with other sites).	
In a field of ControlImage: ControlImage: ControlLandscher GestrammenSinMarken some some kake and statistick someSinLandscher GestrammenSinMarken some some kake and statistick someSinLandscher GestrammenSinMarken some some some some some some some some	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs.	
Balance State	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Control Question Unit Unit Question Unit Q		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Hamman Content Note Handling of Section 2014Use Content Section 2014The Content Handling of Section 201411 Impact of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)12 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)13 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)14 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)14 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)14 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)14 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)14 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)15 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)16 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)17 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)18 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)19 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)10 Handling of Section 2014Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)Restrict 2014 (Section 2014)11 Handling of Section 201420Restrict 2014 (Section 2014) <td< td=""><td>1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land</td><td>0</td><td>Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.</td><td></td></td<>	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Initial and Multis and Interpretation Multis and Construction Multis and Multis and Construction Multis and Multis and Construction Multis and Multis and Multis and Multis a	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Traditional Orchard priority habitat and in the relevant buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
In IndianaInteraction	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.	
100 Minute Min	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
No. Much. Weissburg View Index during weissburg View Index during weissburg View 19 mack during weissburg 10 Sie back during weissburg 10 Sie back during weissburg 10 11 Leve dram blocks beld 10 Sie back during weissburg 10 Sie back during weissburg 10 10 Diarwa the same with a data 10 Sie back during weissburg 10 Sie back during weissburg 10 20 Diarwa the same with a data 60 Sie weissburg Sie back during weissburg 10 20 Diarwa the same with a data 60 Sie backers during weissburg 10 Sie backers during weissburg 10 20 Diarwa the same with a data 60 Sie backers during weissburg 10	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	be mitigated.	considered through appropriate layout and good design. Possible enhancement by removing modern agricultural
1 is in plan during 1 is in point of the marker of hermanical by release of the statistic energy of the less of the constraint of the statistic energy of the less of the constraint of the statistic energy of the less of the constraint of the statistic energy of the less of the energy of the ener	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)		
A Lock data min documental data min documental data data data data data data data d	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		
Control for the method in price method in price method in the method interprice method into a method into method into method into a method into a method into a method in	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	low, low or medium.	
32 Ordered in weeter link sing CP 33 Decree to expery year locations CP 34 Decree to expery year locations CP 35 Decree to expery year locations CP 36 Decree to expery year locations CP 37 Decree to expery year locations CP 38 Decree to expery year locations CP 39 Decree to expery year locations CP 30 Decree to expery year locations CP 31 Decree to expery year locations CP 32 Decree to expery year locations CP 33 Decree to expery year locations CP 34 Decree to expery year locations CP 35 Decree to expery year locations CP 34 Decree to expery year locations CP 35 Decree to expery year locations CP 34 Decree to expery year locations CP 35 Decree to expery year locations CP 34 Decree to expery year locations CP 35 Decree to expery year locations CP 34 Decree to expery year locations CP 35 Decree to expery year locations CP 35 Decree to expery year locations CP	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)		
3.3 District the steppinghet roccom 40 4.1 Detanot to local amerities 0.0 Site is between 100m and 4000m from merrest town, large vilage or anall vilage. Image: Comparison of the comparison of	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
A - Identify those antenting O Interaction is in the relation of the interaction of the relation of t	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3 Justice Breaters (introduction statics) 0 Include the free term (introduction statics) 3 Definition to rearrest secondary school 0 Set in room than 4000m from the nearest descondary school. Include term (introduction statics) 3 Definition to rearrest secondary school 0 Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest QP subjey. Include term (introduction statics) 3 A Defance to rearrest QP support 0 Not splicable. Include term (introduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) 3 A Defance to rearrest QP support 0 Montroduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) 3 A Defance to rearrest QP support 0 Montroduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) 4 Departs to introduction statics) Montroduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) Include term (introduction statics) 4 Departs to introduction statics) One elegement to introduction statics) Include term (introduction statics)<	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
As detailed in freeders sectionary scool (1) Information on the nearest QP surgery (2) 3.7 Detained in nearest QP surgery (2) So is between 1000m nom the nearest QP surgery (3) 3.8 Access to Strategic Read Network (2) No applicable. (3) 4.1 Brownfield and Generified Land (4) Mojority of the site is greanfield und havis neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. (30) ⁶ Generified uite not within or adjacent to an existing settlement. 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (4) Development unlikely to incide the loss of bebits of public open space. Analytic in proceed within or adjacent to an existing settlement. 4.1 Impact on agricultural land (4) Development unlikely to incide the loss of public open space. Analytic in proceed within or adjacent to an existing settlement. 4.1 Capacety to improve access is open space 0 Development is and on a standard contracter settlement. (1) 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settement character. (1) or ensity development is proposed within refers the semi-und character of the ansity adjacent to the analy standard of the ansity adjacent to the	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
A. I channe du literative du ligery 0 And channe du literative du ligery 0 A. Recess to Strategic Road Network M. Net applicable. 100% Greenfield alen of within or adjacent to an existing settlement. A. Report India du Greenfield Land Col Majority of the site is greenfield tand that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% Greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement. 4.1 Expect on agricultural land Col Development of the site vould involve the loss of public open space. Anegigible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensibility Col Set offiss indiverse access to open space. Anegigible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensibility Col Set offiss indiverse access to open space. Anegigible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. 5.2 Settiment character sensibility O Development is unikely to have an effect on settiment character. Low density development is proposed which reflects the seni-ural character of the area. Therefore, development is proposed which reflects the area-in-ural character of the area subject to senial the site. 6.1 Topography constraints O Ret toppen ad on ot pose any constraint to the site.	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
a A Access to strategic Hoad Headwark Image: Constraints	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. In produined and order mediation Image: Contract on agricultural land Image: Contract on agricultural land <td>3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network</td> <td></td> <td>Not applicable.</td> <td></td>	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
** Index of registroning interval Cert Cert </td <td>4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land</td> <td>()</td> <td></td> <td>100% Greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.</td>	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()		100% Greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 International constraints 0 International constraints 0 Set fails within a mee of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Set fails within a mee of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change 0 Set fails within a mee of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to 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 subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Listed Buildings. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No lopography constraints on to pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraints on the rural character of the area subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Listed Buildings. 6.2a Distance to power lines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraints on the site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or Image: Constraints on the site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Contamination (Farmyard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.4 Access to site Site below	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()		
a. I. Lariuscape sensitivity cl ad unable to absorb development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Low density development is proposed which reflects the semi-truat character of the area. Therefore, development is unlikely to have an impact on the rural character of the area subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Listed Buildings. 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 0 Rower lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.1 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 Rever lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint on the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Constraint on the site. Image: Constraint on the site. 6.5 Contamination constraints (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Constraint on the site. 6.6 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Potential contamination (Farmyard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.7 Topic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Image: Contamination on the site is already e	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		
Out Determinent Unification sensitivity O Reference of procession	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
0.1 Holography consumins 0 Set Particular Set Part	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	not likely to have an impact on the rural character of the area subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Listed
6.24 Distance to gas and on pipelines 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 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. 6.5 Contamination constraints (+) Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
0.20 Distance to power lines 0 Image: Comparison of 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 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. 6.5 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact of The Preservation Order (TPO) 0 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. 6.5 Contamination constraints Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site (*) 6.5 Contamination constraints (.) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Farmyard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) 6.6 Troffice impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	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 (Farmyard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
	6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B347

Site Reference: SR-0131		
Parish:	Fyfield	
Size (ha):	4.40	
Address:	Herons Farm, Herons Lane, Fyfield, Essex, CM5 0RQ	

Primary use: Residential Site notes: Agricultural field.

Baseline yield: 130 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>130</u>

Les Hertford Brentw

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0131	Rev 2

Client

d database right (2016) increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, rvey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop rs, and the GIS User Community star Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, nitv be, GeoEye, Earthstar rce: Esri, D



13 Single for the Private operation for the set of the Se					
I utering investigationIVI view and inclusion1 Summa investigation0Note on the first first sector is to start structure by the back is first sector is to start structure by the back is first sector is to start structure by the back is first sector is to start structure by the back is first sector is to start structure by the back is first sector is to start structure by the back is first sector is to start structure by the back is first sector is to structure by the back is to sto struct	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
International control of the second	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0			
LinkingLinkingLinkingLinkingAllAnnual sector	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 SSSIs.		
Name of the second se	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
International controlIndex <t< td=""><td></td><td>0</td><td>No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.</td><td></td></t<>		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
Number of the strain space of a state of the strain strain space of a strain strain strain space of a strain str	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
International moderations V International moderations 17 Meeting No Betwin Franz Zoos ; 16 inspire or infrance and the sense of the set of and a zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 16 inspire or infrance and the sense of the set of and a zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 17 Meeting 0 Betwin Franz Zoos ; 17 Meeting 0 Betwin Franz Zoos ; 18 inspire or infrance and the set of and a zoos ; Infrance and a zoos ; 19 inspire or infrance and the set of and a zoos ; Infrance and zoos ; 11 Under of the set of and a zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 11 Under of the set of and a zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 11 Under of the set of and a zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 12 Under of the set of and a zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 13 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 14 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 15 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 16 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 17 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 18 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 19 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 10 Under of the set of and zoos ; Betwin Franz Zoos ; 11 Under of the set of and zoos ; </td <td>1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats</td> <td>0</td> <td>No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.</td> <td>The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this</td>	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this	
I minu I minu Linksack 00 Linksack 00 Second 00 Linksack 00 Linksack 00 Second 00 Linksack 00 Linksack <	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.		
Interpretation10InterpretationDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelectionSelectionDelegationSelectionSelectionSelection	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
Induction Information Information Information Information InformationInformation Information<	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Scheduled Monument or Grade I Listed Building due to distance.	
Initial form building C Control Control 21. Lead of hom is Grow build C B is building to the lead of the lead of the lead of the lead of the decoperate sculp be now. Initial Control 31. Dublishing by the needed call box building C B is building to the second that box building Initial Control 32. Dublishing by the needed call box building C B is building to the second that box building to the second that box building Initial Control 33. Dublishing by the needed call box building B is building to the second that box box box box building to the second that box	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)			
2 In Detained interfactorie 30 Interfactorie Interfactorie 31 Detained in there exercise induces state 00 Bite over them 40000m of a bus state. Interfactorie 32 Detained in series? unit due state 00 Bite in over them 4000m from a bus state. Interfactorie 33 Detained is series? unit due state 00 Bite in over them 1000m of a bus state. Interfactorie 34 Detained is series? unit due state 00 Bite in over them 1000m of a bus state. Interfactorie 35 Detained is series? unit due state 00 Bite in over them 4000m from har empaces trainfectories are and 4000m from har empaces trainfectories are and 1000m of a bus state. Interfactories 35 Detained is neared trainfectories 00 Bite in the over that 4000m from har empaces trainfectories are and 1000m of a bus state. Interfactories 36 Detained is neared trainfectories 00 Bite in the over that 4000m from har empaces of hat gety states or another empaces Interfactories 37 Detained is neared trainfectories of bas states of the trainfectories are and 4000m from har empaces of hat gety states or another empaces Interfactories Interfactories 37 Detained is neared trainfectories of the trainfectories are and or the states and or the states of the gety states or another empaces Interfactories Interfactories	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
1 Optimum but in the statust in the status in the statust in the status in the statust in the s	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.		
Initial Number of Statement Col Col Col Col Col Statement Col Statement Col Statement	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
In Second of unpypying sectors Image: Second of unpypying second of uppying second of unpypying seco	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.		
12 Cleanance for the langements 0 Include the langements 1 13 5 Distance to namest infant/pinnary school 0 Set is as than 1000m from the nearest infant/pinnary school. 1 13 6 Distance to namest Verdet/pinnary school 0 Set is between 1000m from the nearest infant/pinnary school. 1 13 7 Distance to namest QP aurgery 0 Set is between 1000m from the nearest infant/pinnary school. 1 13 7 Distance to market QP aurgery 0 Set is between 1000m from the nearest infant/pinnary school. 1 14 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 0 Not applicable. 1 100% greenfield allen not within or adjacent to an estimary school. 14 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 0 Development of the bet would involve the loss of the best and most westelle agricultural land (grades 1-5). 1 14 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 0 Development of the bet would involve the loss of the best and most westelle agricultural land (grades 1-5). 1 14 Brownfield and order agricultural land 0 Development would any when the loss of public open space. 1 14 Landscore kersellvity 0 Development would adrace to the advector dharage esextPhy - manacder/bloc of the advector dharage esextPhy - manacder/bloc of public open space. The proposable are for highele density development would ender to the adv	3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location.		
3.3 Distance to instruct interporting school (*) Set is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (*) Set is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. (*) 3.7 Distance to nearest QP surgery (*) Set is beforen 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. (*) 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network (*) Not applicable. (*) Not applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (*) Development of the alle would move the loss of the best and most wesatle agricultural land (grades 1-3). 10% greenfield alle not within or adjacent to an existing settlement. 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (*) Development of the alle would move the loss of the best and most wesatle agricultural land (grades 1-3). 10% greenfield alle not within or adjacent to an existing settlement. 4.1 Introduce sensitivity (*) Development of the alle would move the loss of the best and most wesatle agricultural land (grades 1-3). 10% greenfield alle not within or adjacent to an existing settlement. 6.1 Landscape sensitivity (*) Overlopment could derive the isole of public open space. 10% 6.1 Landscape sensitivity (*) Development could derive the most of regular bardscape sensitivity - threader. The proposality are for higher density developments. Therefore, development Move of the areas.	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
3.5 Detailed to there is decidinary without (r) Image: Comparison of the set of th	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.		
a. No sealing of the interest of stargery 0 Interest of stargery 0 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network 1 No taplicable: 100% greenfield and 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 0:1 Rejortly 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 0:0 Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Interest of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0:0 Development on the site of the landscape are vulnerable to changer Interest of the proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring development. Therefore, development 6.1 Landscape sensitivity 0:0 Development could deract from the existing settlement chanacter. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring development. Therefore, development 6.1 Inforcape sensitivity 0:0 Development could deract from the existing settlement chanacter. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring development. Therefore, development without agrintCant the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2 Delatore to gas and oll pipelines 0:0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Interest of the area. Interest of the area.	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.6 Address to strategic router herefork Image: Contract of the state of the	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
4.1 browmed and Greenied Land (-) Prevelopment of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Development cultural tand cape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Development would not be site. Image: Comparison of the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Power lines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Comparison of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (-) Sutable access to site aready exists. Image: Comparison of the site. 6.4 Access to site (-) Sutable access to site aready exists. Image: Comparison of the site.	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
12 Index on Agricultation and 10 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) 6.1 Topographic constraints (-) 7.1 Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development likely to affect the character of he area. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. 6.2 b 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. No neterial contamination identified	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.	
1.3. Explainly to initious access to tipe space 0 Initial and scape sensitivity 1 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development likely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: Character of the area. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Character 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 be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. Image: Character of the area. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Character of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		
9.1 Lanuscape sensitivity L* and unable to absorb development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development likely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: Constraint for the site. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraint for the site. 6.2 b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint for 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. Image: Constraint for the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Constraint for the site.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.		
3.2 Seturitient character of the area. ikkely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (•) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. No potential contamination identified on eith to date.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()			
0.1 Hopography constraints (*) Intervention of the state of t	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.	
6.24 Distance to gas and on pipelines 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 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists.	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.		
0.20 Distance to power lines 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on the Preservation Order (1PO) 0 adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. 0 No potential contamination identified on site to date.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
0.4 Addess to site (*)	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0			
6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	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 0 Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time. B348	6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B348	

Site Reference:	SR-0399
Parish:	Fyfield
Size (ha):	2.75
Address:	Houchin Drive Playing Fields

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 83 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. <u>83</u>

Dwellings:



Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0399	Rev 2
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council

), NPS, NRCAN, Kong), swisstop , Esri Japan, martine Id the GIS User Community Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, Maj Sou



<u></u>				
Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Fyfield Mill Meadow LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Grade I or Grade II* Listed Buildings due to distance.	
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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the 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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are 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 existing playing fields. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.		
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.		
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over part of site (Brickworks over east part of site). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B349	
	-		© Aruj	

onto ountai		Rive
Site Reference:	SR-0879	Hertford
Parish:	Fyfield	17
Size (ha):	0.30	12
Address:	Poultry Farm, Norwood End, Fyfield, Ongar, Essex	/1
Primary use:	Residential	eshunt 🙀
Site notes:	Farm buildings in a field. Fenced off possibly for development.	446
Baseline yield:	9 dwellings	ATOSS
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph. The pre-application request is for	Client
baseline yield:	help with the overall design of a scheme so does not propose a set number of dwellings.	Epping F
	number of dwellings.	Job Title
		Epping F
Site constraints:	None	Drawing Statu
constraints.		Issue
		Drawing No
Site selection	None	SR-0879
adjustment:		ΔR

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	9

Hertford Hertford eshunt Brentwood

te Local Plan
te
10
arch 2018
ue
ue ev 2

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Est. HERE, DeLome, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo. Mapminidia, © OpenStiteeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalCitote, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites 0 with other site 1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites 0 Based on tidevelopment 1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland 0 Site is not to 1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland 0 No Ancient of Ancient of Ancient of Ancient of Ancient Woodland 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land 0 Site is unlike 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0 No effect as	the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed int is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. s or Veteran trees are located within the site. kely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites 0 with other site 1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites 0 Based on the development 1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland 0 Site is not to development 1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland 0 No Ancient of Ancient of Ancient Woodland 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land 0 Site is unlike 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0 No effect as	sites). the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed int is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. is or Veteran trees are located within the site. kely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Is features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites 0 development 1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland 0 Site is not to 1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland 0 No Ancient of 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land 0 Site is unlike 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0 No effect as	In tis unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. Ilocated within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. If or Veteran trees are located within the site. In the site in the site in the site in the site is set of the site is the site is set of the site is set of the site is features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland 0 No Ancient of No Ancient of 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land 0 Site is unlike 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0 No effect as	or Veteran trees are located within the site. kely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Is features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.3 Impact on Andeniv Veterari Trees outside of Ancient Woodland 0 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land 0 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0	xely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Is features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Polest Build Land 0 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0	is features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
T.S Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats		
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites 0 Site has no	o effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk (++) Site within F	Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets 0 Site is locate		Unlikely to impact on settings of GI or GII* Listed Buildings due to distance. Settings of Little Forge and Old Forge Grade II LBs to east of site will be impacted. Possible mitigation through sensitive layout and high quality design/materials.
	idence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality jical assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site lies out	tside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt O Site is within	in Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station (-) Site is more	e than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop 0 Site between	en 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations (+) Site is within	in 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities (-) Site is more	e than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (+) Site is less t	than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (-) Site is more	e than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 0	veen 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicat	able.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (++) Majority of th	the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield)
4.2 Impact on agricultural land () Development	ent of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.5 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.
5. I Lanuscape sensitivity () and unable	<i>i</i> thin an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development	ent could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographic	ical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pi	pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines	s do not pose a constraint to the site.	
adjacent to f		
0.4 ACCess to site (1)	ccess to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints (-)		Potential contamination (Farm / Forge / Works). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact Site below s	site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B350

Site Reference:	SR-0935
Parish:	Fyfield
Size (ha):	0.81
Address:	Gypsy Mead, Ongar Road, Fyfield, Essex, CM5 0RB

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Car park, derelict restaurant, industrial building and vacant field

Baseline yield: 25 dwellings

Source for Indicated in Call for Sites 2016-2017 baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:25



Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest District Local Plan				
Drawing Status	Date			
Issue	March 2018			
Drawing No	Issue			
SR-0935	Rev 1			
	P Epping Forest District Council www.spingforestdc.gov.dk copyright and database right (2016) e. Intermap. increment P Comp. GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS			

© contains US tatal © Lotown copyright and database right (2016) Sources, Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Internet P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geobase, IGA, Matheman, Martinetta, Starty, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), awisstopc Source: Earl, Digital Chine, GeoGrey, Earlthatar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	No requirement to consult with Natural England for residential development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Semi Improved Grassland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation could 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 partially within the Moors LWS 250m buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the Local Wildlife Site, but mitigation could be implemented to address this.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Grade I Listed Building due to distance. Adjacent to Grade II Mill Hatch to south-east of site - impact on setting mitigated through good screening, appropriate density/layout, high quality design materials.
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	(-)	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 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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	60% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Fyfield).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Site characteristics are such that a detailed assessment would likely find high vulnerability, at least in part of the site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not likely 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 townscape.	Proposed development offers potential to bring a vacant site back in to use, subject to sensitive design to reflect adjacent heritage assets and Tree Protection Orders on site.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	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 density of development which could be achieved.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Ongar Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Garage / Works). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B351
			© Arup



Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0010-Rev2	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 and Stage 6.2 Assessment in High Ongar	Legend Residential sites assessed at Stage 2 and Stage 6.2
ARUP	Date: March 2018	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:24,500 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	This legend shows only key map symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

Site Reference: Parish: Size (ha): Address:	SR-0054i High Ongar 1.37 Land Surrounding High Ongar, High Ongar, Essex
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Agricultural fields
Baseline yield:	370 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	Flood risk reducing developable by circa 1/3
Site selection	Assumption based on 20 dph. This portion of split site not subject to flood constraint.

adjustment: to flood constraint.

Community feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>

The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. <u>41</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Dis	strict Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
lssue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0054i	Rev 2	
ARUP © Contains OS data © Crown copyrig	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk ht and database right (2016) man jorgengel RCerp. CEPCO LISCS ECO NDS	

u consums US data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Est. HERE, Pol.come. Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Korg), swisstopo. Mapmi/nida, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digital/Olde. GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



Nome Nome <th< th=""><th><u>Dwennigs.</u></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th<>	<u>Dwennigs.</u>			
Linking<	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Charlow Mondow2Recent AdvancementAdvancementCharlow MondowSecond MondowSecond MondowSecond MondowCharlow MondowSecond Mondow <td>1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
unitant definitionvimage of the second definitionimage of the second definitionLake and approximation0Second definition definitionHere approximation definitionHere approximation definitionLake and approximation0Second definitionHere approximation definitionHere approximation definitionHere approximation definitionLake and approximation0Second definitionHere approximationHere approximationHere approximationLake and approximation0Second definitionHere approximationHere approximationLake and approx	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Adder additional set of performation interviewNoNoNo14 man or Lapse of performation interview111 </td <td>1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland</td> <td>0</td> <td>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.	
Non-Decision Section 2010NoNoNoNo11 space in March Section 2010March Section 2010	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Induction of the field of th	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
on the outward with a set of the set of	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat. There may be effects from this impact but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
unit of unit o	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 contentInitial contentInitial contentInitial content18. Injust or reversity10.Initial content contents shall help and initial part or unity, but in initial contentInitial content19. Injust or reversity10.Initial content contents shall help and initial part or unity, but in initial contentInitial content19. Injust or reversity10.Initial content content shall help and initial part or unity, but in initial contentInitial content10. Initial content10.Initial content content contentInitial contentInitial content10. Initial content10.Initial content contentInitial contentInitial content10. Initial content10.Initial content <td>1.7 Flood risk</td> <td>(++)</td> <td>Site within Flood Zone 1.</td> <td></td>	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Notified method with a set of the second o	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	()	Site would likely result in the loss of a heritage asset or result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated.	and sprawling development outside historic development pattern. Loss of settlement pattern would cause harm to
In Figure 40 studyDisplayControl and an anguad or indust.International and an anguad or indust.21 Look of the Inter the Data International Internationa	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)		
A Lock and in Societ (ed)Set (ed)Notice (ed) <th< td=""><td>1.9 Impact of air quality</td><td>(-)</td><td></td><td>Parts of the site are close to the A414 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.</td></th<>	1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)		Parts of the site are close to the A414 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
a) Control for the indext an indext and indext	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	very high.	
24 Detected transfer to singly 10 Image: Detected transfer to singly 10 33 Detected transfer to singly 14 Re to write to bottom maneted tool. Insight of the terms of ter	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3 Journel despiperior coulding(b)Internet of the set o	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
a classifie for local statistics (*) Image: Classifie for local statistics (*) 3.0 Editations to nearest inferrity/marky school (*) Site is the sub that 1000m from the nearest inferrity/marky school. (*) 3.0 Editations to nearest inferrity/marky school (*) Site is the sub that 4000m from the nearest inferrity/marky school. (*) 3.0 Editations to nearest inferrity/marky school (*) Site is the sub that 4000m from the nearest inferrity/school. (*) 3.0 Editations to nearest inferrity/marky school (*) Site is the sub that 4000m from the nearest inferrity/school. (*) 3.0 Editations to nearest inferrity/marky school (*) Not approximation is the sub that 4000m from the nearest inferrity/school. (*) 3.0 Editations to nearest inferrity/marky school (*) Not approximation is the sub school (*) 3.1 Editation to nearest inferrity/marky school (*) Devicignment inferrity/school (*) 3.1 Editation to nearest inferrity/marky to incole the sole of public copen space. (*) (*) (*) Site infinity/school (*) 3.1 Editation to nearest inferrity/marky to incole the sole of public copen space. (*) (*) (*) (*) 3.1 Editation to sole sole of public copen space. (*) (*) (*) (*) (*) 3.1 Editation to sole sole of public copen space. <	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
a Definition to rearest secondary school (1) 3 Definition to rearest (IP suggery (1) 3 A Definition to rearest (IP suggery (1)	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
a billing is a billing is a price is a constraint of the site. Image: Constraint is a constraint of the site. 3.7 Diatance to price is a constraint of price is a constraint of the site. Image: Constraint is a constraint of the site. Image: Constraint is a constraint of the site. 3.8 Access to Site is get and of price is a constraint of the site. Image: Constraint is a constraint of the site. Image: Constraint is a constraint of the site. 4.1 Brownfield and Greendes Land Or Development unlikely to mole the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Image: Constraint is a constraint of the site. 4.2 Impact on agricultural land Or Development unlikely to mole the loss of public open space. No public open space is located in the site area. Development withinker the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity Or Settement character sensitivity Or Settement character sensitivity Or Development within a site of the site. Settement character sensitivity Or Development sould as constraints are identified in the site. Settement character sensitivity Or Development sould as constraints of the site. Settement character sensitivity Or Development sould as constraints of the site. Settement character sensitivity Or Development sould as constas and prity sensitire setemater character sensitivity	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
a. I channels of interfact or supply 0 Access to Strategic Read Network Not applicable. 3.8 Access to Strategic Read Network 00 Montpol of the site is greenfield and adjacent to a sattlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing sattlement (High Ongar). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 00 Montpol of the site is greenfield to and to sattlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing sattlement (High Ongar). 4.2 Inpact on agricultural land 00 Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Interface and unable to absorb development will not involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 00 Development unikely 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 00 Set adjament character hange. No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 6.2 Settement character sensitivity 00 Set adjament character hange. No topography constraints are identified in the site. 6.2.D Islance to prover lines 0.0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Set comprises narrow site of land between village and Ak14, and to the rear of hurchyber of all development would not be constrained by the presence of protected tress eith	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3 A Access to studiely from the work Image: Constraints Image: Constraint constraints Image: Constra	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. I provinted and creating and creatin	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
*** Insert of algobiality is 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. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Perelopment 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 GC Site fails within an area of high landscape sensitivity - 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 Perelopment is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade I listed for the visual potentials are identified in the site. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade I listed for the visual potential is the site and comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade I listed for the visual potential is the site and comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade I listed for the visual potential is the site and comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade I listed for the site and comprise narrow strip of land between vil	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 (High Ongar).
4.3 Capacity to infinitive access to deel space 0 Infinitive access to the space 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity Site fails within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to 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 area of high landscape sensitivity. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development without significant character. Site comprises narrow strip of land between village and A14, and to the rear of churchward of the Grade I listed function. Site is tightly bounded, and the new development would not be visually obtrusive from within the village. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Infinition and the new development would not be visually obtrusive from within the village. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Ges or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Infinition and advector of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or advector of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or advector of the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Sullable access to site already exists. Access from The Street. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
0.1 Latitus/que selsitivity cl and unable to absorb development without significant character change. site. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade listed church. Site is tightly bounded, and the new development would not be visually obtrusive from within the village. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade listed thurch. Site is tightly bounded, and the new development would not be visually obtrusive from within the village. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade listed 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Resort into the site. Image: Comprises narrow strip of land between village and A41, and to the viele addition the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Access from The Street. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access from The Street. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 <	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
3.2 Setuentient Character Setistivity 0 Character Setistic transmitter ehurch. Site is tightly bounded, and the new development would not be visually obtrusive from within the vilage. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Character Setistic transmitter 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Character Setistic transmitter 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Character Setistic transmitter Image: Character Setistic transmitter 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. Access to site Access to site and the site expected to dete. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access from The Street. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No polential contamination identified.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()		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.
0.1. hppgraphy consumines 0 Personal and constraints 0 Personal and constraints 0 Resonal and constraints Resonal	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site comprises narrow strip of land between village and A414, and to the rear of churchyard of the Grade I listed church. Site is tightly bounded, and the new development would not be visually obtrusive from within the village.
6.2b 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 (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access from The Street. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2 Distance to power lines 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access from The Street. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact of the Preservation Order (FPO) a ajacent 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. 6.5 Traffic impact 0.0 Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site (+) Intervention of the site state of the site	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		
6.5 Contamination constraints 0 6.6 Troffice impact Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from The Street.
	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.	B353

Site Reference:	SR-0054ii
Parish:	High Ongar
Size (ha):	4.56
Address:	Land Surrounding High Ongar, High Ongar, Essex
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Agricultural fields
Baseline yield:	370 dwellings
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph
baseline yield:	
Site	Flood risk reducing developable by circa 1/3
constraints:	
Site selection	Assumption based on 30 dph. Capacity reduced by 50%

ed on 30 dph. Capacity reduced by 50% due to Site selection adjustment: flood risk.

Community feedback: Dwellings: <u>68</u>

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

Lea Hertford Brent

Client	
Epping Forest	District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0054ii	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLom	copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS

Letter opyragen und utenzee right (2110) Delorme, Interment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Ier NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Eari China (Hong Kong), swissloj treetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community obe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, te GIS User Community Source: Esri, Di AeroGRID IGN



<u>Dweinings.</u> <u>60</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 3a where exception test required.	Some 50% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 45% is in Flood Zone 3a. The location of the higher risk Flood Zones covers the eastern half of the site. The western portion of the site could be developed.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Possible impact on setting of High Ongar Conservation Area by altering historic pattern of development. Possible mitigation through high quality design/materials and appropriate layout.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A414 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	The northern part of the site falls within a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel, though if it was released it would have limited impact upon the setting of the historic Stony Park area of Chipping Ongar due to its physical detachment from the settlement.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (High Ongar).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 located between existing settlement and the river, and could impact views to / from Nash Hall and the village. This could be mitigated through lower density, design and layout.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Chelmsford Road and The Street.
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.	B354
		1	© Aru;

Site Reference: Parish: Size (ha): Address:	SR-0054iii High Ongar 6.61 Land Surrounding High Ongar, High Ongar, Essex
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Agricultural fields
Baseline yield:	370 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	Flood risk reducing developable by circa 1/3
Site selection	Assumption based on 30 dph. Capacity reduced by 20%

Capacity reduced by 20% due to 5 flood risk. adjustment:

Community	The Council did not consult on a
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	158

a growth location which covers or is

Lea Hertford Brei

istrict Council
istrict Council
Strict Obulien
istrict Local Plan
Date
March 2018
Issue
Rev 2
Epping Forest District Council

NPS, NRO GIS unity bus DS, USDA, USGS



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Clatterford End Plantation. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 28% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 26% and 10% are in Flood Zones 3a and 3b respectively. Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b are located along the western site boundary and flood risk can be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Partially adjacent to High Ongar CA to north-east. Impact on setting of CA and character of CA by sprawling beyond existing historic development pattern. Possible mitigation by reducing density and appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (High Ongar).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are 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 comprises part of Roding River Valley and part of site is adjacent to Conservation Area. The proposed development has the potential to impact the settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Access from The Street but may require update.
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.	B355
L	ļ	1	©Arug

Site Reference:	SR-0181
Parish:	High Ongar
Size (ha):	0.30
Address:	Mill Lane, High Ongar, CM5 9RQ

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Vacant scrub land

Baseline yield: 10 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:10



Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0181	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBae, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmi/ridia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digital/Globe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Westlands/Thistleland Springs Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the west of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat. There may be effects from this impact but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer of Westlands Spring/Thistlelands Spring LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Conservation Area or Grade I Listed Building due to distance and existing built-up surroundings.
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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (High Ongar).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Protected trees are present, but the tree cover as a whole is not subject to protection. Its likely that the protected trees could be incorporated into the layout, subject to reasonable care, but could significantly impact the suitability of the site.
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access could be achieved from Mill Lane to the site.
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 site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B356

 Site Reference:
 SR-0393

 Parish:
 High Ongar

 Size (ha):
 1.85

 Address:
 Land north of Millfield, Ongar

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 56 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site Reduction in site capacity by 1/2 due to flood risk constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:28



Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue Rev 2

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Lintermap, Increment P Corp., EBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBae, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METT, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmylindia, 90 persitiventing on onitikutors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 3a where exception test required.	Some 64% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 60% is in Flood Zone 3a. The location of the higher risk Flood Zone covers the southern half of the site. The northern portion of the site could be developed.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Scheduled Monument, Conservation Area or Grade I Listed Building due to distance. Grade II Listed Buildings nos.46, 48 and 50 Clatterford End to east of site - setting should be considered.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 site is adjacent to an area of high sensitivity but is well screened by mature hedges. 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 cha
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site comprises part of Roding River Valley. Development of the scale proposed has the potential to impact the settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Access is down lane adjacent to stream - stream may need to be culverted to achieve suitable access road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Land raise / Sewage Treatment Works). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B357
		1	© Arut

Site Reference:	SR-0458
Parish:	High Ongar
Size (ha):	0.22
Address:	Southgate, The Street, High Ongar, Essex, CM5 9NH

Primary use: Residential Site notes: Domestic garden land.

Baseline yield: 7 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
<u>Dwellings:</u>	<u>7</u>

Dwellings:

Lea Hertford Brentw

Client	
Epping Fores	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0458	Rev 2
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council
	District Council

ment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstoj 1 the GIS User Community lser Community , CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, ye, Earth



<u>Dwennings.</u>				
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.		
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Conservation Area or Grade I Listed Building due to distance, scale of site, and position along road (following existing development pattern).	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A414 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	Most of the site falls within a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel, though the proposed development would have limited impact upon the setting of the historic Stony Park area of Chipping Ongar due to its physical detachment from the settlement and small	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.		
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (High Ongar).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 an existing garden, development of which could negatively impact the edge-of-settlement character. Impact could be mitigated through lower density, design and layout.	
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.		
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Access via existing house on site.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.	
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B358	
L		ļ	© Arup	



Site Selection	EFDC-S2-0011-Rev2	Residential Sites for Stage 2 and Stage 6.2	
	Date: March 2018	Assessment in Lambourne	Residential
ARUP		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	Parish Bour
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:16,500 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	
			This legend shows only key map s

al sites assessed at Stage 2 and Stage 6.2

Ν

B359

undary

p symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

	······································	Burd
Site Reference	SR-0012	Her
Parish:	Lambourne	5
Size (ha):	7.52	10
Address:	Land to the south of 62 Hoe Lane, Abridge, Romford, Essex, RM4 1AU	
Primary use:	Residential	esh
Site notes:	Agricultural/Grazing Fields	$\langle \rangle$
Baseline yield:	25 dwellings	
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites	Clier Ep Job
Site constraints:	High pressure gas pipeline runs through southern half of site. Promoted capacity would only need a small amount of site to ensure delivery	Drav
		Draw
Site selection adjustment:	None	SR
aujustinent.		A
•		

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:25

Hertford Reading eshunt Brentwood

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0012	Rev 2

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBae, IGN, Kadaert NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmi/ridia, © OpersitereMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AaroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



3.2 Settement character sensitivity 0 Image: sensitivity 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. Image: sensitivity 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines (-) Gas or oil pipelines may constraint of the site but there is potential for mitigation. Southern half of site is in HSE middle zone (25% in the inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less than half site area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Southern half of site is in HSE middle zone (25% in the inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less than half site area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone.	<u>Dweinings.</u> 25			
Initial and wind wind wind wind wind wind wind wi	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Charlow ControlVNote of the intervence of the inte	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
LandicalQ >Q >Q >LandicalQ >Construction status and a Landical Status instatus instatus and a Landical Status instatus and a Landical Stat	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Additional equation of the state of the pack of th	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Number of sector statusNNNN12 inguine statusSNetwork status statusN12 inguine statusSNetwork statusSNetwork status11 inguine ta statusSNetwork statusNetwork statusNetwork status12 inguine ta statusSNetwork statusNetwork statusNetwork status13 inguine ta statusSNetwork statusNetwork statusNetwork status14 inguine ta statusSNetwork statusNetwork statusNetwork status13 inguine ta statusSNetwork statusNetwork statusNetwork status14 inguine ta statusSNetwork statusNetwork statusNetwork status15 inguine ta statusSNetwork statusNetwork statusNetwork status16 inguine ta statusSNetwork status </td <td></td> <td>(-)</td> <td></td> <td>There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the east of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.</td>		(-)		There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the east of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.
Initial controlNoControlControl14 mark and with withRefRefRefRefRef14 mark and with withRefRefRefRefRef14 mark and with with an electron with with with with with with with with	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Number of State StateNNN12 fordation101State State St	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.	
DrateDrateDescription12 marked and addition30Provide and the other sector of a s	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.	
List index density beesCityConstrained information of a first of processing of a subset of s	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
InterfaceImage: Control of a con	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Conservation Area or Grade II* Listed Building due to distance.
International of a second	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0		
A Lordination Control State 10 000000000000000000000000000000000000	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
1 Indication that is all in the relation without subsci in the relation of the analytique tablecation. 1 1 Difference to be relation without subsci in the relation of the analytique tablecation. 1 3.1 Difference to be relation without subsci in the relation of the analytique tablecation. 1 3.1 Difference to be analytic subsci in the relation of the analytique tablecation. 1 3.1 Difference to be analytic subsci in the relation of the related to the subsci in the related to the related in the related of the analytic subsci in the related of the subsci in the subsci in the subsci in the subsci in the related of the subsci in the su	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)		
3.2 Journel to length (30 stor) 40 3.3 Journel to length (30 stor) 40 3.1 Journel to length (30 stor) 40 3.4 Journel to length (30 stor) 40 3.4 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.4 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.6 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.6 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) 3.7 Journel to length (30 stor) 51 se length (30 stor) <	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.1 Detarbane is block merrifies (*) Contract block merrifies (*) 3.1 Detarbane is block merrifies (*) Sie before in tool merrifies willige or small willige. (*) 3.1 Detarbane is block merrifies (*) Sie before in tool merrifies willige or small willige. (*) 3.1 Detarbane is nearest intertifyinning valued (*) Sie before in tool merrifies willige or small willige. (*) 3.1 Detarbane is nearest intertifyinning valued (*) Sie before in tool merrifies willige or small willige. (*) 3.1 Detarbane is nearest intertifyinning valued (*) Sie before intertifying valued (*) Sie before intertifying valued (*) 3.1 Detarbane is nearest if thretifyinning valued (*) Sie before intertifying valued (*) Sie before intertifying valued (*) 3.1 Detarbane is nearest if thretifying valued (*) Sie before intertifying valued (*) Sie before	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
A duration to duration the duration of the second systemImage: Control of the second systemImage: Control of the second system3.5 Durations to rearest (rightly/immay cold)Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest therity/immay schod.Image: Control of the second system3.6 Durations to rearest (Parage)Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)Image: Control of the second system3.7 Durations to rearest (Parage)Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)Image: Control of the second system3.8 Durations to rearest (Parage)Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)Image: Control of the second system3.8 Durations to rearest (Parage)Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)Image: Control of the second system3.8 Durations to rearest (Parage)Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)Image: Control of the set is set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)3.8 Durations to rearest (Parage)Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)Image: Control of the set is set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)4.1 Durations to rearest (Parage)Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest (Parage)Image: Control of the set is set in the set is set is set is set is set in the set is set	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.3 Distance to rearred secondary school 0 Image: Control of the mean interaction of the	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Undiaded in Nativest exclosed y locido CP Information of Nativest exclosed and provide the set of Natives exclosed and provide the set of Nat	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
a) Detained interface of suglery a) a a) Access to Strategic Road Network [2] Not application. for application. a) Access to Strategic Road Network (a) Not application. for application. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (b) Notedimperiod to a constrained sector to a settlement. for application. 4.2 Inpact on agricultural land (b) Development of the site is greenfield tand most versatile agricultural (grodes 1-3). for application. 4.1 Capacity to improve access to open space. (c) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. for and make to absorb development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landacope streativity (c) Stereforment unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Stere could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. 6.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Roographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Stere could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. 6.2 Dotatione to pass and oil publicnes (c) Roographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Stere could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density. reflects the character of the area. 6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Object (reflow) (c) <td>3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school</td> <td>(-)</td> <td>Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.</td> <td></td>	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.3 Access to strategic road velocity Image: Control Cont Control Cont Control Contro Control Control Control Co	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4.1 Bott mind and cheminal chain (a) Definition of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-5). International chain of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-5). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0.0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. International chain of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (c) Set fails within an area of high landscape sensitivity - character change. Set could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development 6.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0.0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Set could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (c) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Set could comprise extension to Abridge zone (25% in the hiner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 divellings requires less fan half faile rea. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance addise against development for inner zone). 6.2 Distance to gas and oll pipelines 0.0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Set constrained by the presence of protected frees either oor adjacent to me site, as a result of ther inclusions it is likely that they could be access to site all exity with a site. 6.1 Topographical constraints on the site. </td <td>3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network</td> <td></td> <td>Not applicable.</td> <td></td>	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2. Injpoc. On agricultula and EV 4.3. Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1. Landscape sensitivity CM Site fails within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change 5.2. Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character . Site could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density 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 (A) Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character . Site could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density 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 (A) Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character . Sottherm hard of site is in HSE middle zone (25% in the inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 development for inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 development for inner zone. 6.2. Distance to gas and oil pipelines (A) Ges or oil pipelines may constraint to the site. Sottherm hard of site is in HSE middle zone (25% in the inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 development for inner zone. 6.3. Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected frees either o	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 (Abridge).
4-3 Capitally of infprove access to type in space 0 Information and capital constraints 0 Information constraints Informating constraints Information constraints	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
0.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 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. Sile could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density 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. Southern half of site is in HSE middle zone (25% in the inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less trans har fit area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less trans har fit area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less trans har half site area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less trans har fit area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less trans har fit area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less trans har fit area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less trans har fit area. Mitigation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees aither on incorporated into the reasonable	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
3.2 Seductivitie 0 Interview is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (c) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for miligation. southern half site is in HSE middle zone (25% in the inner zone). Promoted capacity of 25 dwellings requires less than half site area. Miligation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines (c) Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for miligation. Southern half site area. Miligation possible through layout design. HSE guidance advise against development for inner zone. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (c) Subtable access to site already exists. Access of Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination size identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
C1 Hodginghy Constraints C1 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines C1 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines C1 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines C1 6.2b Distance to power lines C1 6.2b Distance to power lines C1 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) C1 6.4 Access to site C1 6.4 Access to site C1 6.5 Contamination constraints C1 6.6 Tooffic impact No contamination issues identified on site to date. 6.6 Tooffic impact C1	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site could comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
B2a Distance to gas and on pipelines (-) Image: the form of the pipelines (-) Image: the pipelines (-) </td <td>6.1 Topography constraints</td> <td>(-)</td> <td>Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.</td> <td></td>	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2 Distance to power times 0 Image: Constance to power times 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access of Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.	
6.3 Impact on Thee Preservation Order (TPO) 0 adjacent to the site. incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access off Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified. 6.6 Traffic inspect (-) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site. Exect to site.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site (+) International and	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.
6.6 Traffic impact Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access off Hoe Lane.
6.6 Traffic impact (-) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site. B360	6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
	6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B360

	,
Site Reference:	SR-0027
Parish:	Lambourne
Size (ha):	3.50
Address:	Woodgrange Poultry Farm, 52 Ongar Road, Abridge, Essex, RM4 1UH
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Dwelling house, paddocks and adjacent field
Baseline yield:	104 dwellings
Baseline yield: Source for baseline yield:	104 dwellings Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	None

Community	The Council die
feedback:	near to this site
Dwellings:	<u>104</u>

id not consult on a growth location which covers or is <u>104</u>



Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0027	Rev 2	

termap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAt ance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisst ntributors, and the GIS User Community Jser Community s, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS Eye, Earths



<u></u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Apes Grove Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the 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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer for Ape's Grove LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Scheduled Monument or Conservation Area due to distance.
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 A113 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are 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 would comprise extension to Abridge. Proposed density is higher than neighbouring development, and site is of a scale that could negatively impact on the character of the settlement. Sensitive design and layout could mitigate impacts.
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 Chipping Ongar Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Haulage Depot, Gravel Pit, Poultry Farm). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B361
·			© Arup

Site Reference: Parish:	SR-0189 Lambourne
Size (ha):	8.12
Address:	Land at Hoe Lane/New Farm Drive, Abridge, Essex
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Agricultural field
Baseline yield:	244 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	Circa 5% of the site is covered by SR-0505 (1 dwelling) and as such this is omitted from the yield to avoid double counting.
Site selection adjustment:	Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping site).
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is

Community	The Council did not consult on a
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	245

Hertford Hertford Harlow Harlo

Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0189	Rev 2	

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Orthance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 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 partly within the 250m buffer for Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the 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 two areas of Deciduous Woodland and 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 Soapley's Wood LWS and Alder 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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 not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are 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.	Large site located in an area of dispersed, low density settlement pattern along Hoe Lane. Development could impact this settlement character, but could be mitigated through design, particularly along frontage to Hoe Lane.
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 site in the northern corner is in middle zone. No area in inner zone. Due to site size and location of affected area impact is negligible and would not constrain development. HSE guidance advise against development for affected area.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access off Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (within 250m of hazardous industrial and domestic waste 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.	B362

Site Reference:	SR-0329
Parish:	Lambourne
Size (ha):	31.64
Address:	Abridge, North Area

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Broad Area North of Abridge, comprising agricultural land.

Baseline yield: 939 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:939

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater Landon

Client Epping Forest District Council		
District Local Plan		
Date		
March 2018		
Issue		
Rev 2		
P Epping Forest District Council		

Sources Et al, HEFE, Diskum opyrigin an Assause per Conr. GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GosBase, IGN, Kidsater NH, Intermop, Incerement PConr., METI, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Maganyindia, & OpenSith Map cantinibation and the GIS User Community. Source Etri, DigitalGlobe, GeGE;e Estatisar Geographics, CNES/Aibus SS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



<u>bweininger</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses a portion of a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and a portion of Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat. The site is likely to directly 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 3b and not likely to be suitable for development.	Some 94% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 82% and 81% are in Flood Zones 3a and 3b respectively. The location of the high risk flood zones is such that the site is not likely to be suitable for development.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	()	Site would likely result in the loss of a heritage asset or result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated.	Harm caused to the setting and character of Abridge CA, and the setting of GII listed bridge, by obscuring the historic development pattern by sprawling development to the north. Historically open land because of flood plain - part of character of CA.
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 A113 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	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Abridge).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are 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 located within the Roding River Valley, and development of this scale could have a negative impact on historic field patterns, and the setting of historic Abridge.
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	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B363
•	-	•	© Arup

Sile Suila	Dinty Assessment	River
Site Reference:	SR-0330	Hertf
Parish:	Lambourne	
Size (ha):	21.57	1
Address:	Land east and west of New Farm Drive, South Abridge	
Primary use:	Residential	eshur
Site notes:	Broad Area South and East of Abridge comprising agricultural fields	74
		7
Baseline yield:	641 dwellings	
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph	Client
baseline yield:		Epp Job Tit
		Ерр
Site	Gas pipeline runs through site, reducing potential capacity by 1/3	Drawin
constraints:		lssu
		Drawin
Site selection	None	SR-0

Site selection adjustment:

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	427

we Lea ford Brent

Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0330	Rev 2	
ARUI		
πιυι	District Counc	

), NPS, NRCAN g Kong), swissto d the GIS L Ma unity bus DS, USDA, USGS rce: Esri, e, Earti



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is adjacent to Apes Grove Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portion of the Ancient Woodland, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning or compensation Woodland planting.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the west of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.
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 areas of Deciduous Woodland and Wet Woodland, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is adjacent to Alder Wood LWS and Ape's Grove 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Scheduled Monument, Conservation Area or Grade II* Listed Building due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Abridge).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	()	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	Some 74% of the site in HSE middle zone and inner zone runs through middle of entire site. Due to size and location of inner zone mitigation will be difficult. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development for middle and inner zones.
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 New Farm Drive.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over small parts of site (Infilled Ponds 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.	B364

	-
Site Reference:	SR-0447
Parish:	Lambourne
Size (ha):	0.74
Address:	Land adjoining 110 London Road, Abridge and to rear of 110-118 London Road, Abridge
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Open site adjoining and to the rear of dwellings on London Road.
Baseline yield:	61 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	Circa 1/3 of the site covers the same area as SR-0461 (17 dwellings). This is omitted from the yield to avoid double counting.
Site selection adjustment:	Capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (17 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.
Dwellings :	<u>61</u>

Client

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0447	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council
AILUI	UISTRCT COUNCIL

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Internap, Increment P.Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeeBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Orthance Survey, Earl Japan, MET, LER Orbina (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MagmyIndia, @ OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digitalchole, GeoGeye, Earltstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 three 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
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 A113 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	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Abridge).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development of the site would result in the loss of poorer quality agricultural land (grade 4-5).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are 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 majority of the site. Development would likely adversely affect wider landscape character, unless confined to the area adjacent to the settlement.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site could would constitute infill on London Road. However, the proposed density is significantly higher than surrounding development, and could impact on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access off London Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B365
			© An

		80
Site Reference:	SR-0461	н
Parish:	Lambourne	-
Size (ha):	2.04	
Address:	Part of land adjoining 110 London Road, Abridge and to rear of 110-118 London Road, Abridge	1 1111
Primary use:	Residential	es
Site notes:	Open site to the rear of dwellings on London Road.	1
		f
		Y
		4
Baseline yield:		5
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph	Cli
baseline yield:		E
		Jo
		E
Site constraints:	None	Dr
constraints.		ls
		Dr
Site selection		s
adjustment:		ŀ

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	17

Hertford Bird Statt Harlow eshunt Brentwood

Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0461	Rev 2
ARUI	

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Evir Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and within the relevant and Deciduous Woodland 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the 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 A113 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	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Abridge).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development of the site would result in the loss of poorer quality agricultural land (grade 4-5).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are 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 majority of the site. Development would likely adversely affect wider landscape character, unless confined to the area adjacent to the settlement.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site would constitute infill on London Road. The proposed density accords with surrounding development, and is unlikely to impact on settlement character.
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.	Access off London Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B366

EB805Fii



White hallinger	Palmerston Roa	ad Buckhurst Hill Roding Lane	Chigwell Rise Chigwell Rise
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0025-Rev2	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 and 6.2 Assessment in Loughton	Legend
ARUP	Date: March 2018	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	Residential sites assessed at Stage 2 and Stage 6.2 N Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:22,500 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	This legend shows only key map symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

Site Reference:	SR-0058
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	2.53
Address:	Land to North of Clay's Lane, Loughton, Essex, IG10 2RZ
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Agricultural field/stable paddocks
Baseline yield:	78 dwellings
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph

Source for Assumption based on 30 d baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community Feedback feedback: site. Refer

Feedback was received on LOU-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details. 78

<u>Dwellings:</u>

Hertford Hertford Harlow eshunt Creater London

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
	Rev 2

Sources: Esti, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P. Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadatster NL, Orthannes Survey, Esti Agan, METL, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, & OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esti, UpitalCitohe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Dwellings: 78	AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community		and the second	
Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.	
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	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	()	Site is likely to result in harm to Epping Forest Buffer Land which cannot be mitigated.	33% of site is within Epping Forest Buffer Land, which would significantly reduce the proposed yield. No mitigation is likely.	
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 a Deciduous Woodland habitat. 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.		
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be 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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 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, located on the edge of the settlement, adjacent to Epping Forest. Development could detract from the character that the forest setting provides, however could be mitigated through design and layout.	
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)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.		
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B368	

		Rover
Site Reference:	SR-0134-N	Hertfo
Parish:	Loughton	
Size (ha):	1.38	
Address:	Beech Farm, High Road, Loughton, Essex IG10 4JJ	
		eshun
Primary use:	Residential	- F
Site notes:	Agricultural fields	27
		1)
		1 13
Baseline yield:	41 dwellings	
Dasenne yielu.	+ r dwellings	Client
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph	
baseline yield:		Eppi
		Job Title
		Eppi
Site	HSE Inner Zone affects the north-western and southern parts of the site (6%). Capacity adjusted proportionally to account for the	Drawing
constraints:	constrained part of site to remove it from the developable area.	lssue
		Drawing
Site selection	None	SR-0
adjustment:		Α.
		A
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is	© Contain

Community T feedback: n Dwellings: 3

The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. <u>38</u>

Hertford Break eshunt Creater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0134-N	Rev 1
ARUI	D Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HERE, Datume, Pringing, Incentee Borg, CEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeeBase, IGN, Kodatskr HJ, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, WET, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Magminidai, C OperStreetMap contributors, and the GS User Community Source: Earl, Digilalicitos, exoderys, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



			STEPHEN AND AND AND AND
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.).
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all development except householder applications), 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 adjacent to the Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site would likely indirectly affect a small area of the Ancient Woodland but it is likely that potential effects can be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(+)	Site may assist in extending Epping Forest Buffer Land.	South-eastern corner of site is adjacent to Buffer Land. Submitted plans show that land to the south-east, under same ownership, is not proposed for development. Potential for improved connections to existing Buffer Land and extension of 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 Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation could 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	The site is close to the A121 and therefore mitigation measures may be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	(-)	and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Proposals have the potential to influence the wider landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the site's landscape context.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the existing 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.	Approximately 20% of site is in HSE middle consultation zone and 6% is in inner zone. Potential for mitigation due to size of site, through site layout. HSE guidance is 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 from High Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Infilled Pond). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B369
			© Arup

	,	Por C
Site Reference:	SR-0226	Hertfo
Parish:	Loughton	1
Size (ha):	1.00	1200
Address:	Loughton London Underground car park, adjacent to station, off Old Station Road, IG10 4	
Primary use:	Residential	eshunt
Site notes:	Existing use as London Underground car park.	J-
Baseline yield:	160 dwellings	Africe
Source for	Indicated in Call for Sites	Client
baseline yield:		Eppir
		Job Title
		Eppiı
Site	None	Drawing
constraints:		lssue
		Drawing
Site selection	None	SR-02
adjustment:		Λ 1

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>160</u>

aver Lea Brent

Enning Equat D	
Epping Forest D	istrict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0226	Rev 2

database fight (2016) iccrement P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, N vey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), s , and the GIS User Community ar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS reetMap contributors, a be, GeoEye, Earthstar



Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-	Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	combination effects. Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of development proposed it is likely to be	Due to the development type (over 100 dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with	
		possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0			
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.		
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings. Loughton Station Grade II Listed Building so setting should be considered. Mitigation through appropriate high quality design/materials.	
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 station arrival area, subject to appropriate design for the re-provision of parking close to station.	
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Old Station Road. There is potential to provide further points of access from Meadow Road and Algers Road.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Railway Goods and Coal Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B370	
			© Arut	

Site Reference: Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha): Address:	1.62 Loughton London Underground Car Park, Station Road, Loughton,
Autress.	Essex, IG10 4NZ
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Car park

Baseline yield: 114 dwellings

Source for Indicated in representation to Draft Local Plan consultation baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellinas:	114

Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0226-N	Rev 1
ARUI	District Council

Sources: Est, HERE, DeLome, Internap, increment P Corp., GBCO, USS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmyindia, CopenStreeMap contributors, and the GS User Community Source: Est, DiglialClobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, RN, and the GS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all development except householder applications), 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	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Loughton Station GII LB and LLB signal box - settings should be considered. Demolition of signal box would be resisted. Mitigation through appropriate high quality design/materials and retention of LLB. Unlikely to impact on CA setting due to distance.
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 station arrival area, subject to appropriate design for the re-provision of parking close to station.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing Access from Old Station Road. There is potential to provide further points of access from Meadow Road and Algers Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Railway Goods and Coal Yard). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B371

		P
Site Reference:	SR-0227	н
Parish:	Loughton	1
Size (ha):	1.66	
Address:	Debden London Underground Car Park and land adjacent to station, off Chigwell Lane, IG10 3	1 11 3
Primary use:	Residential	es
Site notes:	Existing use as London underground car park and vehicle yard	7
		Z
Baseline yield:	244 dwellings	
Source for	Indicated in Call for Sites	Cli
baseline yield:		E
		Jo
		E
Site constraints:	None	Dr
constraints:		ls
		Dra
Site selection	None	S
adjustment:		

adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellinas:	244



Epping Forest D	istrict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest D	istrict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0227	Rev 2
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crown cop	pyright and database right (2016)

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Internap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, & OpenStneetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, Upital/Globe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USOS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 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 Deciduous Woodland. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m for the Roding Valley Meadows LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A1168 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 a car park and identified as a potential regeneration area. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the station arrival area, subject to appropriate design for the re-provision of parking close to station.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Railway Station & Coal Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B372
L		N	© Arup

Site Reference:	SR-0284-N
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.20
	Chigwell Lane Service Station, Loughton Broadway, Loughton, Essex, IG10 3SZ
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Service station

Baseline yield: 30 dwellings

Source for Indicated in Call for Sites 2016-2017 baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on LOU-8 which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:30



Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Issue Drawing No Issue SR-0284-N Rev 1	ate
Issue March 2018	^{ate} Iarch 2018
Drawing No Issue	larch 2018
Drawing No Issue	
CD 0094 N David	sue
SR-0284-N Rev 1	Rev 1
ARUP	

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermeng, Increment Port, Edo Colus SS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster ML, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri Chria (Hong Kong), avisistopo Magmylindia, CoperStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl. DigitalCiote, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In- combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the A1168 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 in the Development Brief. Low density housing development proposed above retail which improves the mixed-use 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 from Rectory Lane and Loughton Broadway.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Repair and Refuelling Garage). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Site Reference:	SR-0286
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	1.38
Address:	Burton Road, Loughton Broadway
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Urban site comprising three plots along Burton Road identified in Loughton Broadway Development Brief as opportunity Sites 5, 6 and 7. Adjacent land (car park and green area) - current uses as garages/retail service area/car parking.
Baseline yield:	53 dwellings (Dev Brief) + 27 Dwellings (remaining land)
Source for baseline yield:	Development Brief for three plots (opportunity sites 5, 6, and 7). Additional land at 40 dph, plus some retail/commercial floorspace at ground floor
Site constraints:	Planning permission (EPF/1007/15) was granted for 51 affordable homes. EFDC has asked that the 27 dwellings on 'remaining land' are maintained in the assessment.
Site selection adjustment:	None
Community feedback:	Feedback was received on LOU-9 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

<u>Dwellings:</u>

<u>27</u>

Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0286	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Est / HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEDCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopd Mapmylridia, ⁶OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, ICN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the 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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Existing masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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 in Development Brief. It comprises surface car park, garages and open space. Re-development could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over very small part of site (Electric 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.	B374

SR-0289
Loughton
0.86
Vere Road, Loughton Broadway

Primary use: Residential Site notes: Car parking and garages to the rear of Loughton Broadway

Baseline yield: 41 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Development Brief

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:

Feedback was received on LOU-6 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details. <u>41</u>

Dwellings:

Le Hertford Brent Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0289	Rev 2

Jown copyright and database right (2016) Lorme, Interman, Incernent P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, r NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop eeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community e, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, GISI User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Schedule Monument due to distance (very edge of 1km buffer).
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.	Site is likely to be far enough away from M11 to not have a significant impact.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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 in Development Brief. It comprises surface car park, garages and open space. Re-development could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over part of site (Brickworks). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B375
			l © Aru

	-
Site Reference:	SR-0323
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	139.61
Address:	Loughton, south-east area
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Broad area east of Loughton between settlement and M11. Includes a stream running through the site, woodland and playing fields to the rear of existing dwellings.
Baseline yield:	4,182 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	None

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>4,182</u>

Hertford Bren Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0323	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council

, NPS, NRC Kong), swis Eye, Earth A, USGS



<u>Dwellings:</u> 4,182		AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Residential development located just over 500m from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Recreational pressure likely and given scale of site bespoke mitigation may be required.
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 Roding Valley Meadows 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.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 28 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed within the site, and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.
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.	A number of BAP species have been recorded at periphery of site, which also includes four BAP priority habitats. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats and species, 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.	A small part of the overall site encompasses part of the Roding Valley Meadows LWS. The site may directly affect some of the features and species of the LWS. The features and species may not be retained in their entirety, but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	()	Site within Flood Zone 3b and not likely to be suitable for development.	Approximately 90% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which more than 71% is in Flood Zones 3a and 3b. Due to the location of the flood zones the site is not likely to be suitable for development.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the 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.	Only northern tip of the site is located within the buffer zone and therefore majority of site is away from main roads so is not likely to 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.	In the Stage 1 assessment, the site was assessed as contributing strongly to maintaining the gap between Buckhurst Hill and Chigwell. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider 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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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, adjoining existing settlements (Loughton and Buckhurst Hill).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development of the site would result in the loss of poorer quality agricultural land (grade 4-5).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(-)	Development may involve the loss of public open space but there are opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	Public open space is located in 35% of the site area. Development may involve the loss of some public open space, but there may be opportunities for some on-site re-provision or re-orientation of development.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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.	The River Roding basin and historic water meadows contribute to historic character of the area, which development could negatively effect. Some unconstrained parts of the site adjacent to the settlement area could be developed in a sensitive manner.
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.	Area affected NG pipeline is less than 1%. 30+ dwellings is classified as level 3 sensitivity. HSE guidance may be advise against development for small area. Pipeline runs through middle of the site, mitigation is possible due to the overall site size.
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.	There is limited direct access to the site at Chigwell Lane, Oakwood Hill, Marlescroft Way, Highwood Lane, Roding Lane, The Windsor's, Lower Queens Road and Cascade Road.
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.	B376
			oup @

0.00 0.000	····· ·	
Site Reference:	SR-0326A	
Parish:	Loughton	
Size (ha):	51.90	
Address:	Loughton North Area, Including Debden Green, Debden House Camping Site	
Primary use:	Residential	
Site notes:	Broad Area North and north-east of Loughton, comprising Epping Forest.	
Baseline yield:	3,548 dwellings	
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph	
Site constraints:	TPOs reduce capacity by circa 20%. Circa 5% of the site is covered by SR-0436 (4 dwellings) and as such is discounted from the yield.	
Site selection adjustment:	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Capacity is based on revised yield of 1996 for entire site, minus 20 dwellings on site SR-0326C, and split proportionally based on site size.	
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is	



Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0326A	Rev 2
sr-0326a ARUI	

© Contains US data © Lotown copyright and database physic (2016) Sources: Esh: HERE, Det Comer, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esn China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, CoperStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalClobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRU, GN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria 1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites 1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site abuts Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is partly in the Epping-Ambresbury and Gaunts/Redoak Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the Ancient Woodland but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 6 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are largely in the south of the site. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or translocation.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	()	Site is likely to result in harm to Epping Forest Buffer Land which cannot be mitigated.	Site directly abuts Buffer Land to north-east and south-west, which are a constraint on site layout. Even accounting for revised yield, the proposed scale of development is likely to impact upon Buffer Land and no potential mitigation is identified.
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 multiple BAP priority habitats with no main features, a small area of a Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat and a Deciduous Woodland habitat. The site is likely to directly impact the habitats, and effects 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.	A small part of the site encompasses Home Mead LNR LWS. The site may directly affect the LWS, but effects can be mitigated. Site is also within 250m of Birch Hall Pastures LWS, Theydon Bois Deer Park West and East LWS however is unlikely to affect these.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Several LBs within site so potential harm to their settings. Possible mitigation through high quality design/materials and appropriate layout - away from LBs.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	The site is mostly located within a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel, which is important for preventing coalescence between Loughton and Theydon Bois. If the site was released it would harm the purposes of the wider 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 more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is adjacent to an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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.	Development can be located in parts of the site not covered by limited areas of Epping Forest and woodland. Site adjacent to existing public open space which could be made more accessible.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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 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.	Debden Green has a strong historic character, and the development could have detrimental impact on the village, woodland areas and links to Epping Forest.
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)	(-)		The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would 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 Debden Road, Debden Lane and Debden Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Infilled Ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B377
0.00 0.000	······		
-------------------------------	---	--	--
Site Reference:	SR-0326B		
Parish:	Loughton		
Size (ha):	54.39		
Address:	Loughton north area, Including Debden Green, Debden House Camping Site		
Primary use:	Residential		
Site notes:	Broad Area north and north-east of Loughton, comprising Epping Forest.		
Baseline yield:	3,548 dwellings		
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph		
Site constraints:	TPOs reduce capacity by circa 20%. Circa 5% of the site is covered by SR-0436 (4 dwellings) and as such is discounted from the yield.		
Site selection adjustment:	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Capacity is based on revised yield of 1,996 for entire site, minus 20 dwellings on site SR-0326C, and split proportionally based on site size.		
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is		



Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest Di	istrict Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
lssue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0326B	Rev 2	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Counci	
© Contains OS data © Crown copyr	www.eppingforestdc.go	

© Contains US data © Lorown copyright and database nght (2010) Sources: Esht PERE, Det Come, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadpenst NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esht China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, OporStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri. Digitatione, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, Chai and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Large housing site within 1km of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Recreational pressure effect is possible and 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 SSSIs.	The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site wholly encompasses the Ancient Woodland, which forms a small part of the overall site. Potential impacts may be mitigated through considered masterplanning.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 2 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed in the west of the site. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or translocation.
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 the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority 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.	Part of the site encompasses a portion of Long Shaw LWS and may directly affect the LWS, but effects can be mitigated. Site is within 250m of Theydon Bois Deer Park East LWS, Broadfield Shaw Grassland LWS and Broadfield Shaw LWS but no effects likely.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	The majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering 3%, are located in the western portion of the site and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Partial development of the site possible. Roman Villa Scheduled Monument within site so significant archaeological implications. Possible mitigation of development located away from Scheduled Monument.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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.	Tree Preservation Orders have already been considered in the yield. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as regeneration area. Debden Green has a strong historic character. Proposals could negatively impact historic irregular field pattern and green links to Epping Forest.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	There are protected trees on and adjacent to the site, but the percentage of the site area affected is limited, and they would not be a significant constraint.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Theydon Park Road and Loughton Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Infilled Ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B378

	-
Site Reference:	SR-0326C-N
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	3.11
Address:	South of Clays Lane, West of Englands Lane, North of Coles Green, IG10 2NS
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Vacant field
Baseline yield:	30 dwellings
0	Indianted in Call for Citon 2016 2017

Source for Indicated in Call for Sites 2016-2017 baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	30

Hertford Beshunt Creater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0326C-N	Rev 1

© Contains US data V Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources, Est. HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METT, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmiridia, © OpenStreetMpc onthitudins, and the GIS Let Comunity Source: Est, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alribus DS, USDA, USGS, ArcoGRD, ION, and the GIS Let Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site partially located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 SSSIs.	The proposed development does not exceed Impact Risk Zone consultation thresholds and is unlikely to result in any adverse effects.
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 is separated from Epping Forest by Clays Lane but forms part of its rural setting. Dense tree buffer provides existing physical separation along northern edge. Retention of this is likely to mitigate impact on 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 all of a BAP priority habitat with no main feature, and a portion of an area of Deciduous Woodland. The site is likely to directly affect the BAP priority habitats and 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.	The site is partially within the Home Mead Local Nature Reserve LWS 250m buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the Local Wildlife Site, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 an area of protected trees and historic field patterns adjacent to Loughton. Proposed development could be brought forward to avoid impact on character and would need to be sensitively designed to avoid impact on trees.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	()	The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees, either on or adjacent to the site.	The extent of the protected tree cover, which encompasses the majority of the site, would likely have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Clays Lane. There is potential to provide further points of access from England's Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Infilled Pond / Infilled Gravel Pit). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B379
			© Arup

	5
Site Reference:	SR-0352
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	1.87
Address:	Land South of Oakland School, High Road/Warren Hill, Loughton
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Vacant land to the south of Oakland School
Baseline yield:	75 dwellings
Source for	Assumption based on 40 dph
baseline yield:	
Site	None
constraints:	NOTE
Cite calestian	Nono

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwollings:	75

Lea Hertford Bren Client

Epping Forest I	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0352	Rev 2

O, NPS, NRCAN Ig Kong), swissto d the GIS U unity bus DS, USDA, USGS



<u>Dwennigs.</u> <u>15</u>	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		CARLER PROPERTY NORMAL STREET
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site is adjacent to the Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portion of the Ancient Woodland, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning or compensation Woodland planting.
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 wholly within Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Grade II* Listed Building but impact on Humprey Repton designed landscape around The Warren needs further assessment.
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 A121 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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 but there are opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	Although managed public open space is located with the site, opportunities for re-configuration may enable the proposals to be delivered without loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Proposals have the potential to influence the wider landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access could be achieved off of High Road and Warren Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over small parts of site (Infilled Ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B380
			ura ©

SR-0353
Loughton
4.84
Roding Gardens Sports Pitches

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Private sports pitches

Baseline yield: 194 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>194</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council	
Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0353	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorn	n copyright and database right (2016) me, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP

Sources: Esri, HERE, Ducome, Internap, increment P Conp. GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geolbase, IGN, Vikadster NL, Ornannos Survey, Esri Japan, MET, Isir China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MagnnyIndia, & OpenStreeNap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, OpenStreeNap, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



<u></u>			The second second states and the second s
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 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 2 and exception test not required.	Approximately 50% of the site located in Flood Zone 2 with the remainder in Flood Zone 1. It is noted that 1% of the site is within Flood Zone 3b but the development could be configured to avoid this area.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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. The site is playing fields. However, since it is located adjacent to the Loughton tube station, intensification could enhance the character of the area by improving street scene.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	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.	B381
			© Arup

Site Reference:	SR-0354
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	5.22
Address:	Allotments north of Standards Hill, Loughton

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Allotment Gardens

Baseline yield: 209 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>209</u>

Hertford Breinford Breinford Breinford Breinford Breinford Breinford Breinford Breinford Breinford

Epping Forest Dis	strict Local Plan
Drowing Status	
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0354	Rev 2

Sources: Estl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Orntance Survey, Esti Japan, MeTI, Estl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, & OpenStreelMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Estl. (JugitalChioke, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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 opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would result in loss of public open space (allotments cover 99% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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 an allotment/gardening space 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	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Significant constraints with access. There are three small tracks into the site between houses with no other access options. Track access at north-west of site could be upgraded subject to agreement with third parties (possible widening onto railway land
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.	B382
			• © Arup

Site Reference:	SR-0356
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	4.78
Address:	Borders Lane Playing Fields, Opposite Epping College

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Amenity open space next to Epping College

Baseline yield: 191 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>191</u>



Epping Forest D	District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest D	istrict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0356	Rev 2
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crown cop	www.eppingforestdc.gov.t

Contents of Justie V curven copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmi/dia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DiglialGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, CN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 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 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the 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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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 opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would result in loss of public open space (woodland and semi natural public open space covers c. 98% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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, is located within the settlement boundary and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over very small part of site (Infilled Pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B383
<u> </u>			© Arur

Site Reference:	SR-0358
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	1.04
Address:	Sandford Ave/Westall Road Amenity Open Space

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Open amenity space

Baseline yield: 42 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>42</u>

Lient

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0358	Rev 2
ARUI	D Epping Forest District Council
ΠΙΟΙ	

Sources: E-4, HEFE, Detamotory regime to deadate provide the Corp. GEECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Goodbae, IGN, Kindateri NLL, Intermap, Increment IG, Corp., GEECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Goodbae, IGN, Kindateri NLL, Northalteri M, Goodbae, IS, Martin, Leithina (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Magmyndrai, & OpenSTRIMAp contributions, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digital Corp., Geodbae, Santa Santa, Carlos Carlos, Carlos Carlos, Arros Carlos, Arros Carlos, Arros Carlos, Arros Carlos, Arros Carlos, Carlos Carlos, Arros Carlos, Carlos Carlos, Arros Carlos, Arros Carlos, Arros Carlos, Carlos Carlos, Arros Carlos, Carlos, Arros Carlos, Arros



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Scheduled Monument due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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 opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would result in loss of public open space (covers c. 100% of the site, predominantly managed public open space), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re- provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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, the whole site is an existing open space. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	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 (Large Infilled Pit). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B384

Site Reference:	SR-0359
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	1.22
Address:	Newmans Lane/Rectory Lane Amenity Open Space

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Open amenity space

Baseline yield: 49 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>49</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London

t District Council
t District Local Plan
Date
March 2018
Issue
Rev 2
P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Lintermap, Increment P Corp., GBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmi/rdia, P OperStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, GN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 3 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed to the east of the site. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or translocation.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A1168 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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 opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would result in loss of public open space (covers c. 100% of the site, predominantly managed public open space), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re- provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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, the whole site is an existing open space. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
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	()	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.	B385

Site Reference:	SR-0360
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	4.97
Address:	Hillyfields Open Space, Loughton

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Open amenity space

Baseline yield: 199 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>199</u>

Hertford Brentwood

Epping Forest I	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0360	Rev 2

Client

Sontas Evri, HEFE, Dukanin ouyr gan an Jasabase rgo by CEBCO USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, EVR, HKataker NL, Oritemana, Inverse and Ppan, METL, Erin China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Modalase, EVR, HKataker NL, Oritemana, Inverse He GIS User Community Source: Exil: Organizational Conference on Community Source: Exil: Organizational Conference on Community AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Import on Internationally Distorted Cites		Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-	Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	combination effects.	effects from recreational pressure likely. Due to the development type (over 100 dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	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	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 12 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed throughout the site. Impacts trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or translocation.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are close to the A1168 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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 opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is almost entirely located in the site area. This would result in loss of public open space (covers 83% of the site, predominantly managed public open space), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re- provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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 is an existing open space. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	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 (Nursery / 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.	B386

Site Reference:	SR-0361
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	8.03
Address:	Colebrook Lane/Jessel Drive Amenity Open Space

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Open amenity space

Baseline yield: 321 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>321</u>

Clert

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0361	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Esti, HERE, DeLorme, Informan, increment P.Copn, GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Goolbas, IGN, Vidaster NL, Ornanco Survey Est I Agan MET, Est Orina (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapnyindia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esti, DigitalGioba, GeoSye, Earthstar Georgraphics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 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 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Home Mead LNR 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Scheduled Monument due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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 opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would result in loss of public open space (managed public open space covers 97% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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, the whole site is an existing open space. Therefore, redevelopment has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	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	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B387

SR-0362
Loughton
2.45
Willingale Road Allotments

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Allotments and vacant scrub land

Baseline yield: 98 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 40 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

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

Dwellings:

<u>98</u>

Hertford Hertford eshurit Brentwood

Job Title	
	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0362	Rev 2
ARUI	

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, (BN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanes Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmylndia, © OpenStreetMap, Contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DightalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, (IM), and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the north of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.
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.	Circa 89% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. The 11% area affected by Flood Zone 3a and 3b runs along the southern and eastern site boundaries and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Scheduled Monument due to distance and built-up surroundings.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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 with no opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is entirely located in the site area. This would result in loss of public open space (covers c. 92% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run-down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is an allotment space 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	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B388
		1	© Aru

one ountai	Sinty Assessment
Site Reference:	
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.25
Address:	9 Goldings Rise, Loughton, IG10 2QP
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	In part domestic garden and in part landlocked open space.
Baseline yield:	8 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Jucomio Jierai	
Site	Awkward shape of site and uniform street scene which would not
constraints:	lend itself to higher density housing.
Site selection	None
adjustment:	
0	

Community feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>

The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. $\underline{\mathbf{4}}$

Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0436	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.).
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the 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 encompasses a small area of a BAP priority habitat, and 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 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)	(-)	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 Golding Rise.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B389

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Site Reference:	SR-0446
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	3.80
Address:	Debden Hall, England's Lane/Debden Lane, Debden, Loughton, Essex, IG10
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Undeveloped site completely covered by trees and vegetation.
Baseline yield:	114 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in promoter material.
Site constraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	None

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwallinger	44.4

ellea Hertford Bren

istrict Local Plan
Date
March 2018
Issue
Rev 2
Epping Forest District Council



<u>Dwellings: 114</u>		Mapmy/India, © OpenSiteelMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, Digliatiohe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site partially located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 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 b 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	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the north of the site and may be affected b development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(-)	The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated.	Site separated from Buffer Land to the west by a road, but forms part of rural, wooded setting and part of the connection to the wider countryside. Proposed mitigation includes sympathetic boundary treatments and additional public open space.
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. The site is likely to directly impact the habita and effects 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 Home Mead LNR LWS. The site may indirectly affect some of 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 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Setting of Listed Building to be considered, possible mitigation by locating development away from Listed Building an high quality design/materials. Historic site of Debden Hall so possible archaeological implications.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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 area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Preliminary layouts propose the addition of new public open spaces.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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.	Debden Green has a strong historic character, and the development could have detrimental impact on the village, woodland areas and links to Epping Forest. Parts of site to the south adjacent to the settlement area may be more suitable for development.
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)	()	The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees, either on or adjacent to the site.	Albeit that the tree cover is not all subject to legal protection, the extent of the site affected makes it unlikely that effective development is feasible.
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 off England's Lane, however a ornate gated entrance that does not currently meet the road and would requir improvements.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination on very small part of site. Minimal adverse impact with opportunity to enhance.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B390

Dwellings:

<u>8</u>

Site Reference:	SR-0513A	
Parish:	Loughton	
Size (ha):	0.22	
Address:	Centric Parade, High Road, Loughton	
Primary use:	Residential	
Site notes:	Retail ground floor and flats on three floors above.	
Pacalina vialdu	8 dwollings	
Baseline yield:	o uwenings	
Source for	Assumption based on 40 dph due to the more urban location	
baseline yield:		
Site	The dwellings already accommodate ground floor retail uses and	
constraints:	flats above. It is not considered this could be intensified.	
Site selection adjustment:	The SLAA considered the site unlikely to deliver a net increase, however the baseline capacity of 8 dwellings was reinstated for the	
aujustinent.	purposes of site selection.	
Community		
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	



Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0513A	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources Esri HeRE, DeLorme, Interman, Increment Porp, Edit Corto GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop Makomylindia, OperSitentApp contributors, and the GIS Leer Community of Site Statistics Sources Esri, Digital Cito, GeoSye, Earthstat Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, NeroGRD, CM, and the GIS Leer Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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 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 station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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, re-development could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0		
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 Forest Road and A121.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Electric Substation). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B391
	-	•	© Arup

	,
Site Reference:	SR-0525
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.08
Address:	2 Connaught Avenue, Loughton, IG10 4DP
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	One dwelling and two garages. Corner plot forming a triangle with concrete area forward of the dwelling.
	concrete area forward of the dwelling.
Baseline yield:	12 dwellings
Source for	Indicated in Pre-Application Form (equivalent to 150 dph)
baseline yield:	
Site constraints:	This scheme proposes underground parking, as such it is considered a well designed flatted scheme which fitted in with the
constraints.	street scene could be acceptable on this site.
Site selection	None
adjustment:	
Community	

Community feedback: Dwellings:

The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. <u>11</u>

Lea Hertford Bren

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0525	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Counce

., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto the GIS U Jser Community s, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS Source: Esri, AeroGRID GeoEye, Earths



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	e is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton)
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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.	Access off Ollard's Grove and Connaught Avenue.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B392

Onto Ountai			
Site Reference: Parish: Size (ha):	SR-0527 Loughton 0.14		
Address:	Royal Oak public house, Forest Road, Loughton, IG10 1EG		
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential A vacant public house.		
Baseline yield:	14 dwellings		
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Pre-Application Form (equivalent to 100 dph)		
Site constraints:	Five Tree Preservation Order trees are located across the south of the site restricting development fronting Smart's Lane. As such capacity is reduced.		
Site selection adjustment:	None		
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is		

Community feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>

The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. <u>6</u>

Hertford Breast eshunt Brentwood

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0527	Rev 2
ARUI	

Client

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Infermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenSiteeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibee, GeoEye, Earlistar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, IOK, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is wholly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the 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 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer for Loughton Woods LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Scheduled Monument or Conservation Area. Locally listed building should be retained and sensitively converted. Potential for sympathetic, well designed rear extensions.
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access off Smarts Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B393

one outdointy Assessment		
Site Reference: Parish:	SR-0532 Loughton	
Size (ha):	0.21	
. ,	*-= ·	
Address:	Trevalyn House, Goldings Hill, Loughton, IG10 2SP	
Primary use:	Residential	
Site notes:	A grouping of three dwellings with private track access.	
Baseline yield:	8 dwellings	
0	Indicated in Dra Application Form (aquivalent to 20 dah)	
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Pre-Application Form (equivalent to 38 dph)	
busenne yleia.		
Site	There are currently 3 dwellings on site, redevelopment of the whole	
constraints:	site could accommodate 8 dwellings, a net increase of 5	
	-	
Site selection	None	
adjustment:		
a		
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is	



council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is The Council did near to this site. <u>5</u>

Dwellings:

Hertford

Client	
Epping Forest	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0532	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorr	n copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP: Ordnance Survey, Esri, Janan, MFTI, Esri China (Hong Kon

NPS, NRO DS, USDA, USGS



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is partly in the Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland buffer land. The site is unlikely to directly affect the Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within a BAP priority habitat buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Ash Green 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	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Located adjacent to Conservation Area boundary but high quality design/materials could mitigate.
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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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)	(-)	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	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	There may be vehicular access via a private track. This would need to be upgraded to facilitate access to the site.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment			
Site Reference: SR-0549			
Parish:	Loughton		
Size (ha):	0.19		
Address:	Limber, 49 Church Lane		
Primary use:	Residential		
Site notes:	Large vacant house and garage.		
Baseline yield:	6 dwellings (dwelling already on site but would be redeveloped)		
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph		
baseline yield:			
Site	50% of the site is covered by a locally listed building. However, it is		
constraints:	considered conversion along with sensitive extensions could accommodate six flats.		
	accommodate six hats.		
	New		
Site selection adjustment:	None		
aajuotinonti			
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is		

feedback:	1h ne
Dwellings:	<u>6</u>

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

Hertford Hertford eshunt Over Greater London

Client	
Epping Forest Dis	strict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest Dis	strict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0549	Rev 2
	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk thand database right (2016) map, increment P Cop., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS e Survey, Eri Japan, MET, Esi T, Si

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Inframma, increment P. Conp., GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GenStaas, IGN, Klavister NL, Ornanco Survey, Earl Japan, MET, Lair China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, & OpenStiteeNap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, IgniBiolitoite, George, Earlhatar Ceographics, CNES/Alibus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings. Locally listed building should be retained and sensitively converted.
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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	80% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B395

Site Reference:	SR-0564i		
Parish:	Loughton		
Size (ha):	37.86		
Address:	Willingale Road Debden		
Primary use:	Residential		
Site notes:	Open fields, some with expansive tree coverage, leading down to the motorway.		
Baseline yield:	2,579 dwelling and 343,800 sqm employment (for combined site)		
Source for baseline yield:	Of the parcels submitted, this site (west of rail line) is identified for housing. Assumption for housing based on 30dph and plot ratio of 0.4 for employment		
Site constraints:	No constraints identified.		
Site selection adjustment:	The site was split (SR-0564i and SR-0546ii) and the capacity was recalculated based on the proposed land use and basis for each part derived from the SLAA assuming 30 dph for housing only.		
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.		

Dwellings: 1,135

Hertford Harlow eshunt Greater London

District Council
District Local Plan
Date
March 2018
Issue
Rev 2
Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.u

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaert NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopc Mapmylridia, Opensitizenting, contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential and employment development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure and air quality likely.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 rural dwellings and >1Ha non-resi), 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.	Site is partly within the Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portion of the Ancient Woodland, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning or compensation woodland planting.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority 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.	A small part of the site encompasses a portion of Long Shaw LWS. The site may directly affect some of the LWS, but effects can be mitigated. Site is within 250m of Broadfield Shaw Grassland LWS and Broadfield Shaw LWS but is unlikely to affect these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 98% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones totalling 2% is located on the western boundary of the site and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Partial development of the site possible. Roman Villa Scheduled Monument within site so significant archaeological implications. Possible mitigation of development located away from Scheduled Monument.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 located on the edge of the settlement area and provides opportunity for intensification. The proposed development is likely to affect Ancient Woodland and Scheduled Monument which are located within the site.
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	()	There is no means of access to the site and no likely prospect of achieving access.	Access cannot be provided to the site.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential for 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.	B396
L		и	© Arup

Dwellings:

<u>958</u>

Site Reference:	SR-0564ii
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	63.91
Address:	Willingale Road, Debden
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Open fields, some with expansive tree coverage, leading down to the motorway.
Baseline yield:	2,579 dwelling and 343,800 sqm employment (for combined site)
Source for baseline yield:	Of the parcels submitted, this site (east of rail line) is split 50:50 housing and employment. Assumption for housing based on 30dph and plot ratio of 0.4 for employment
Site constraints:	Ancient Woodland and insufficient access restrict expansion to south of the site north of the motorway (employment) and housing on northern most site. Remaining areas covered by SR-0325 and SR-0326; yield is reduced to zero to avoid double counting.
Site selection adjustment:	The site was split (SR-0564i and SR-0546ii) and the capacity was recalculated based on the proposed land use and basis for each part derived from the SLAA assuming 50:50 housing employment, at 30 dph and 0.4 ratio.
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

Herition Herition Harlow Harlow Harlow Breatwood Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0564ii	Rev 2

Sources: Esrl, HERE, DeLome, Internap, Incoment P Corp., GBCO, USS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esrl Japan, METI, Esrl Chira (Hong Kong), swisstopc MapmyIndia, CopenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esrl, DiglialGlobe, GeoEye, Earthatar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, RNA, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential and employment development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure and air quality likely.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 rural dwellings and >1Ha non-resi), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	()	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.	The site is partly in the Broadfield Shaw Ancient Woodland and buffer land. The site may directly affect a portion 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	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 18 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed, and may be affected by development. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or translocation.
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 multiple areas of one, and the majority of an additional BAP priority habitat. It has records of three priority species within it. The site is likely to directly impact the habitats and species, 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 encompasses the majority of the Long Shaw LWS and the whole of the Broadfield Shaw Grassland LWS and Broadfield Shaw LWS. The site may directly affect some of the features and species of the LWS, but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 90% of the site is within Flood Zone 1, with Flood Zone 2, 3a and 3b in the southern portion of the site. The development could be configured to avoid these areas.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area. Further assessment required due to proximity to Roman Villa Scheduled Monument - potential archaeological implications. Possible mitigation by developing part of 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.	Part of the site is very close to the M11 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	The majority of the site is within high/very high sensitivity Green Belt parcels which are important for preventing the coalescence of Loughton and Theydon Bois. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to existing settlements (Loughton and Theydon Bois).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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 in the development site, however ancient trees do constrain some of the site. Site adjacent to existing public open space which could provide opportunities for improved access to woodland and natural public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Existing Ancient Woodland contributes to the area's historic character, which development would likely impact. Unconstrained parts of the site adjacent to Langston Road Industrial Estate could be developed to not impact the historic character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Would require extension to Langston Road through third party land.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential for contamination (Farm / Airfield / 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.	B397
L		1	© Arug

Site Reference: SR-0565			
Parish:	Loughton		
Size (ha):	0.72		
Address:	Loughton Library adjacent car park		

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Library and leisure centre with substantial parking provision.

Baseline yield: 21 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>21</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Date			
March 2018			
Issue			
Rev 2			
P Epping Forest District Council www.eppinghrestde.gov.uk			

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLormer, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBaee, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmiridia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS Liver Community Source: Earl, DigitalCitote, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS Liver Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to built-up surroundings.
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run-down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is an existing car park. Redevelopment could enhance the existing housing character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the provision of parking for library uses.
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 from Traps Hill.
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 site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B398
		•	Carup ©

Site Reference:	SR-0565-N
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.26
Address:	Loughton Library, Central Library, Traps Hill, Loughton, IG10 1HD

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Library building

Baseline yield: 8 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	8

Client

Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status	Date		
Issue	March 2018		
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0565-N	Rev 1		
sr-0565-N ARUI			
πιυι	District Counci		

Sources: Earl, HEFE, Dalcrme, Januarian Jorgeneral P.Corp., GEECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, ICN, Kadatater NL, Ordnano Survey, Earl Japan, MET, Earl China (Hong Kong), avissiopo, Magnyindia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digitalicidore, Geogrege, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all development except householder applications), 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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.	Proposed redevelopment of library building to provide residential and library uses not likely to impact on character at the edge of town centre.
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 from Traps Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Made Ground). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B399
		•	© Arup

0.00 0.000	
Site Reference:	SR-0582
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.60
Address:	England's Lane, Loughton
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Wooded area
Baseline yield:	16 dwellings
Source for	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 27 dph)
baseline yield:	
Site	Site is 100% covered by SR-0326. As such the vield is omitted for
constraints:	this site to avoid double counting.
Site selection adjustment:	Capacity reinstated from overlapping site.

Community	The Coun	
feedback:	near to thi	
Dwellings:	<u>16</u>	

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

Hertford Brester London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0582	Rev 2

Sources: Earl, HERE, Dal,orme, Internas, Increment P.Corp., GEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, ICN, Kodater ML, Orinano Survey, Euri Japan, MET, Earl China (Hong Kong), avissiopo, Magmyincia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digitalicitoke, GeoGreye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USOS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



11 Interaction interaction year with an end of the sector of the sector is a set of the sector is				
Interaction Note that we determine the set of the set	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
CalingCalin	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
Laming	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)		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.
Non-Window Non-Window Constraints Constraints 1-lings for data from the first in the first program base for the first programbase for the first program ba	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Number Number<		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Classified intervertions genetic arrivations Constraint of the process of the set of the process of the set	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(-)		
Note type in the instantian instantin instantian instantian instantian instantian instantian	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 covered by a BAP priority habitat. The site is likely to directly impact the BAP habitat, but this may be mitigable.
Internation Internation 1 Subject of intrigge seath Int Be in which is the back is the bac	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 Home Mead LNR LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
Lating of a straight of an under a straight of an under a straight of a base of a straight	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Notice is a same of the same of	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
11 Structure (and quarks) 0 Incrementation (and quarks) 0 21 Love of ham to Green bet 60 Review (and quarks) 0 Site is batteren to Dott in and 4000m from the nearest in all or bate station. 31 Distance to be nearest inside station 0 Site is batteren to Dott in and 4000m from the nearest in all or bate station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station 32 Distance to review Is used 0 Site is batteren to Dott in and 4000m from here nearest inside station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station. 33 Distance to review Is used 0 Site is batteren to Dott in and 4000m from here nearest inside station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station. 34 Distance to review Information static Comparison of an employment station of the nearest inside station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station. 35 Distance to review Information static Comparison of an employment station of the nearest inside station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station. 36 Distance to review Information of the nearest inside station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station. Image: Comparison of the nearest inside station. 37 Distance to review Information of the nearest informatin entitin an entitin entitie informatin ent	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
2 / Lotent think to vert bet PP PP 3 / Distance is the evert failube station 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest tail on ble station. 3 / Distance is the evert failube station 0 Site is between 420m and 1000m from the nearest tail on ble station. 3 / Distance is the evert failube station 0 Site is between 420m and 1000m from the nearest tail on ble station. 3 / Distance is every failube station 0 Site is between 4100m and 4000m from the nearest tail on ble station. 3 / Distance is every failube station 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest tail on ble station. 3 / Distance is reavest infordymmany stated 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest OP sugary. 3 / Distance is reavest (PP sugary) 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest OP sugary. 3 / Distance is reavest (PP sugary) 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest OP sugary. 3 / Distance is reavest (PP sugary) 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest OP sugary. 3 / Distance is reavest (PP sugary) 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest OP sugary. 4 / Brownfield and Greenfeel Land 0 Montry of the site is generifield is a diseared tail meat versitilit agrituluin land igratest is in the obestign entities.	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		
3.1 Detailed by the factor is marked building of the factor is marked in the factor is marked in the factor is marked in the factor is	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	very high.	
3.1 Detained in Parental cast support 0 3.3 Detained in Parental cast support 0 Set is writer (000 m and 4000m from nearest toor), single sillage of small vilage. Image: Comparison of the cast state is the state in the cast state is the state is	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0		
3.1 Detailed for programmer detailing 10 Internet of a sequence of	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.4 Search to fold an intensive 0 International action of the searce intervent intervent of the searce intervent intervent of the searce intervent intervent of the searce intervent of the searce intervent	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.5 Distance to nearest secondary school 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgary 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest decodary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgary 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest decodary school. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network 1 Not applicable. Intersection of the set is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (r) More applicable. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (r) Development of the aits would involve the loss of the best and most vensatile agricultural lend (grades 1-3). Intersection adjacent to an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No public open spaces is in the development site. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (r) Bate fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are realisent to charage Intersection and as to readow seleptonent withinking settlement character . 6.2 Distance to gas and oil poelines 0 Revelopment is unlikely to have an ingect on the set. Set as identified as a potentific as a potentific in t	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.6 billiardie to relatest secondary should 0 Image: Control of the statest secondary should 0 3.7 Distance to nearest CP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest CP surgery. 1mit Statest secondary should 1mit Statest secondary should 1mit Statest secondary should 1mit Statest secondary should set secondary should 1mit Statest secondary should s	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
S. J classified in Planets OF surgery 0 International of the above of the surgery 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network International of the applicable. International of the applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (c) Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 10% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (c) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). International of the site would involve the loss of public open space. No public open space is in the development site. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development without significant character character ange. No public open space is in the development site. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (c) Set fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character. Set is identified as a potential intensification area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character sensitivity 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. International intensification area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines do not pase a constraint to the site. Intenational pipelines do not pase a constraint to the site.	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.5 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Addition of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No public open space is in the development site. 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 in the development site. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential intensification area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Character of the area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Character of the area. Image: Character of the area. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (-) The site has benevely limited fasability	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
1. Brownied and Greenied Land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No public open space is in the development site. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (-) The site has severely limited fasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected tree. 8.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (-) The site has severely limited fasibility for development to the bility.	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 in the development site. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (c) Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change Site is identified as a potential intensification area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential intensification area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character sensitivity 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Constraints on the site of the area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (c) The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected tree. The extent of the protected tree cover across the site would be likely to have a significant adverse impact	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 (Loughton).
1.3 Capacity (0 in prove access to deer space 0 Image: Capacity (0 in prove access to deer space 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on 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) (-) The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected tree cover across the site would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the pile cape to the site.	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()		
5.1 Latitude data be serviced by service of protected trees. Index data be to absorb development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on 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) (-) The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected tree. The extent of the protected tree cover across the site would be likely to have a significant adverse impact	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 in the development site.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Interview of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Interview of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Interview of the area. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Interview of the area. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Interview of the area. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) () The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees, suitability of the site for development The extent of the protected tree cover across the site would be likely to have a significant adverse impact suitability of the site for development	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)		
6.1 topography constraints 0 Constraints 0 Constraints 0 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. 0 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) () The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees, suitability of the site for development The extent of the protected tree cover across the site would be likely to have a significant adverse impact 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) () The site can be created within landholding adjacent to the bideway. Acrees can be created off England's Poad.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential intensification area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the existing character. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.24 Distance to gas and on pipelines 0 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines 0 Power lines 0 Power lines 0 Final descent of the stere of power lines 0 Final descent of the stere of power lines 0 Power lines 0 Power lines 0 Power lines 0 The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees, suitability of the site for development Suitability of the site for development Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the bibly and to the site.	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
0.20 Distance to power lines 0 0.20 Distance to power lines 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (-) The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees. The extent of the protected tree cover across the site would be likely to have a significant adverse impact suitability of the site for development	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
b.3 impact on free Preservation Order (1PO) () either on or adjacent to the site. suitability of the site for development suitability of the site for development Access to the site can be created within landbolding adjacent to the highway. Access can be created off England's Road	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint 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 created off England's Road.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	()		
	6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access can be created off England's Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Gunpowder Works). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	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 Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. B400	6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B400

onto ountai		4
Site Reference:	SR-0834	
Parish:	Loughton	
Size (ha):	0.18	
Address:	Car Park, west of High Road, Loughton, Essex	
Primary use:	Residential	e
Site notes:	Former post office depot and associated car parking (now vacant)	
Beeeline violdy	29 duellinge	1
Baseline yield:	26 dwenings	
Source for	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 153 dph)	
baseline yield:		-
Site	None	-
constraints:	none	0
		l
		0
0.4	News	c

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	28

Client

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0834	Rev 2
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council
ΠΙΟΙ	

Sources: Eari, HERE, DeLorme, Infernag, horement P.Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeeBase, IGN, Kadatskir AL, Ordnance, Survey, Esri Japan, MET, Eari China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Eari, Digital/Gicke, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, GN, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dwennigs.</u> <u>20</u>				
Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (fly tipping, fires, invasive species) and runoff.	
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the 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 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Scheduled Monument or Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.	
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 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 station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 intensification area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	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 off High Road.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Infilled Pond / Sorting Office / Garage / Tank). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B401	
			©Arup	

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Ballin
Site Reference:	SR-0835	Hertford
Parish:	Loughton	
Size (ha):	1.02	12
Address:	Old Epping Forest College Site, Borders Lane, Loughton, Essex	
Primary use:	Residential	eshunt
Site notes:	Vacant school plot (Old Epping Forest College Site) - vacant land and buildings	14
		A1055
Baseline yield:	153 dwellings	
Source for	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 153 dph)	Client
baseline yield:		Epping
		Job Title
		Epping
Site constraints:	None	Drawing Sta
constraints.		Issue
		Drawing No
Site selection	None	SR-0835
adjustment:		

ad stment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellinas:	153

aver Lea Bren

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0835	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

NPS, NRC. Kong), swis , USGS



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (over 100 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the 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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore, redevelopment could enhance the existing housing character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the proposed density.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B402
L		1	QuPA@

onto ountai		RU
Site Reference:	SR-0836	H
Parish:	Loughton	1
Size (ha):	0.16	2
Address:	Yard at Eleven Acre Rise, Traps Hill, Loughton, Epping	101
Primary use:	Residential	es
Site notes:	Vacant paved area used for parking by adjacent bowls club (previous tennis club site)	7
		X
Baseline yield:	25 dwellings	
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 154 dph)	Clie El
		Jot
		E
Site	None	Dra
constraints:		ls
		Dra
Cite coloction	Neze	9

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	25

Hertford Beshunt Big Creater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0836	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

lien

Sources: Eari, HERE: DeLorme, Infermag, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeeBase, IGN, Kadatser NL, Ordance, Survey, Ear Japan, METT, Eari China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Eari, DigitalGicke, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, GM, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to built-up surroundings.
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 intensification area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints 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.	Via shared entrance to adjacent bowls club (outside of site boundary).
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B403
			aru QurA ©

Sile Sulla	Sinty Assessment	R
Site Reference:	SR-0837	н
Parish:	Loughton	
Size (ha):	4.05	
Address:	Alderton School, Alderton Hall Lane, Loughton, Essex	1
Primary use:	Residential	es
Site notes:	Alderton Infant and Junior School, children's centre and nursery with associated playing fields	1174
		1
Baseline yield:	358 dwellings	1
Source for	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 88 dph)	Cli
baseline yield:		E
		Jo
Cite	None	E
Site constraints:	None	Dr
		ls
		Dr
Site selection	None	S
adjustment:		

adjustment:	

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>358</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0837	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HEFE, DeLorme, Internap, Increment P.Corp, GEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geolaas, IGN, Kadatetr NL, Contrance Survey, Earl Japan, MET, Lari China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapnyindia, & OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Igiliatiloble, Geolye, Earlhstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



NUMber (NUMber				
11 MBC	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Content of Annual Privation and Content of Annual Content of Annual Content of Annual Annua	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)		Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
Lating and production interviewPPLight code of production interviewPRevealed in the state of the interview of the interviewPLight code of production interviewPRevealed interviewPLight code of production interview	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)		Due to the development type (over 100 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.
Non-Standard Number Standard Number Standard Number Standard 1 Stream of the function of the standard 2 Provide Standard	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Number Number Number Number Number 1 Instant with the lasting total bands of the lasting		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Interfact with a plane in the second secon	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Contract within the same Contract with the same Contract with the same Contract with the same 17 Prescription Mode Mode with the same Mod withe the same Mode withe same	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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
Control Control Control Lake invest on informage assoc Control File in tradit of informage assoc Control File in tradit of informage assoc Control File interact on informage File interact on	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.	
Laking out whethy is sets1011 <td>1.7 Flood risk</td> <td>(++)</td> <td>Site within Flood Zone 1.</td> <td></td>	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Numerical structury P1 Procession 1 Subpart of an each of an each of a loss of an east excitible of an east excitible of a loss of an east excitible of an e	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
1 Interaction and outside 24 Description 21 Label of harm to direct filted (c) Site in to base in the Green Bolt. Image: Site in the Control of the Green Bolt. 31 Distance in the measer failback sites 0 Site in base of the measer failback sites 1 32 Distance in the measer failback sites 0 Site in base of the measer failback sites 1 31 Distance in the measer failback sites 0 Site in base of the measer failback sites 1 32 Distance in the measer failback sites 0 Site in base of the measer failback sites 1 31 Distance in the control 0 Site in base of the measer failback sites 1 33 Distance in the control 0 Site in base of the measer failback sites 1 34 Distance in the control 0 Site in base of the the control of the measer failback sites 1 34 Distance in the control 0 Site in base of the control of the measer failback sites 1 34 Distance in the control 0 Site in base of the control of the site weeker of the site wee	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
2 Lock of them is covering if it is not before the covering if it is the covering if it is before the covering if it is the covering if it is before the covering if it is be	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
3.1 Detailed by the finite factor factor 0 3.2 Detailed by the finite factor factor 0 3.3 Detailed by the finite factor factor 0 3.3 Detailed by the finite factor 0 3.4 Detailed by the finite factor 0 3.5 Detailed by the finite factor 0 3.6 Detailed by the finite factor 0 3.6 Detailed by the finite factor 0 3.7 Detailed by the finite factor 0 3.8 Access to Stratege Road Network 1 4.1 Brownfield and Genefield Land 1 4.1 Brownfield and Genefield Land 1 4.1 Brownfield and Genefield Land 1 4.2 Departed in angle of the site word and result in the oost of agricultural and. 1 4.3 Coabriely to improe accose to go an space. 1	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Detained in families due support 0 Set a within 1000m of an employment biolocation. 3.3 Detained in one propertiest locations 0 Set is between 100m and 4000m from nearest two, large vilage or anal vilage. Image: Comparison of the propertiest location of the propertiest two propertiest location of the propertiest location. Image: Comparison of the propertiest location of the propertiest location. 3.5 Detained in ending 0 Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest location of the propertiest location. Image: Comparison of the propertiest location. 3.6 Detained in endings in the propertiest location. 0 Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest location. Image: Comparison of the propertiest location. 3.7 Detained in endings in the propertiest location. 0 Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest location. Image: Comparison of the propertiest location. 3.7 Detained in endings in the propertiest location. 0 Set is between 100m and 4000m from the nearest location. Image: Comparison of the propertiest location. 3.6 Access to Districtly in and diston of an employment of the site propertiest location. Net application. Image: Comparison of the propertiest location. 4.1 Browneld and Greenfels Land Image: Propertiest location of the propertiest location of the propertiest location of the propertiest location of the propertiest location. Image: Propertiest location of the proproprint location of the propertiest location	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 detailed is implyiment colors (1) Implyiment colors (1) 3.4 Detailed is intropyiment colors 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from menest town, large vilage or small vilage. Implyiment colors 3.5 Detailed to be observed interpyiment colors 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest interpyimary school. Implyiment colors 3.6 Detailed to be observed interpyiment colors 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest scondary school. Implyiment colors 3.6 Detailed to reserved to any school 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest scondary school. Implyiment colors 3.6 Detailed to reserved to any school 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest scondary school. Implyiment colors 3.6 Access to Strategic Road Network. 0 Not explicable. Implyiment colors 100% brownfeld site, within an existing settlement (Longthon). 4.1 Brownfeld and Greeefield Land 0 Development on the loss of public open space. Implyiment and development in the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscase sensitivity 0 Beeformert character induces estivity - character induces estivity to advacter context is urban and development. The origo development. The origo development. The origo development. 5.2 Settiment character sensitivity 6.1 Development contacter context i	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3-1 Desired to doe at intense 0 Incrementation of the set of	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
1.1. Obtained to betterest intercipting studies 1/1 3.6. Distance to nearest secondary school 0 Site between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 1 3.7. Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 1 3.8. Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network Not applicable. 100% brownfied site, within an existing settlement (Loogthon). 4.1. Brownfield and Greenfiel Land Image: Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network Not applicable. 4.1. Brownfield and Greenfiel Land Image: Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network 4.2. Impact on agricultural land 0 Development of the site world not result in the loss of agricultural land. Image: Strategic Road Network 5.1. Landscape sensitivity 0 Development unitely to involve the loss of guidic open space. Image: Strategic Road Network Image: Strategic Road Network 5.2. Settement character sensitivity 0 Development could dettart for the sisting settement character. The repearater also character context is utban and development is unithely to adversing advelopment. 5.2. Settement character sensitivity	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.6 Obtaining in provide the infeatients secondary significant 0 Interfactors in provide the infeatients secondary significant constraints in the site is previously development. 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Stritegic Road Network Image: Constraints in the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (**) Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land 0 Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land. Image: constraint land 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unitedly to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Bet elist within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate the anacter. The proposals are for higher density development is unitikely to adversely affect the wider land datact for the area. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development constraints in the site may preclude development. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring development. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Gas or of pipelines	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.1 Jonalia to Instants to Harles to Subjery 0 Construction Instruction 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: An explicit to the site previously developed and within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (++) Majority of the site is previously developed and within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.2 Inpact on agricultural land 0 Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land. 1 4.3 Capacity to mprove access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 1 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Set fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate the previousle development without significant character character. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to alvoresely affect the without significant character character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (+) Development could detract from the existing settlement. The previousle are for higher density development than the neighbouring development. 6.1 Topography constraints (+) Development could detract from the existing settlement. The previousle are for higher density development. 6.2 Distance to gas and of pipelines 0<	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.5 Access to Stategic Road Network Image: Control of the state is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land Image: Control of the state is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land 0 Development on the state of public open space. Image: Control of the state of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 State fails within an existing settlement (control of the state of public open space. Image: Control of the state of public open space. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 State fails within an existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider land character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring development. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: control of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The internaty of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or Image: control of the site. 8.4 Access to site (3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A.1 Brownheid and Greented Land (*) Product And Construction Product Product And Construction Product Product And Construction Product Product And Construction Product Product Product And Construction Product Prod	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
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 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate divelopment is unlikely to adversely affect the wider land development without significant character change. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider land daracter. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, develop likely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (c) 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. 6.3 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 (c) Suitable access to site already exists. Image on the site.	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate that is character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider land development without significant character change. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate that character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider land character sensitivity 6.2 Settlement character sensitivity (r) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is unlikely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (r) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Image: constraint of the area. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: constraint of the area. 6.2b Distance to gower lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: constraint of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (r) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: constraint of	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
b.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 development without significant character change. character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development likely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Image: Constraints in the site may preclude development. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose an 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. 6.4Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Constraint to the site.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) If the character of the area. Iikely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Iikely to affect the character of the area. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any 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. Image: Constraint to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Constraint to the site.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
0.1 ropography constraints C2 Index of the steel Index of the steel 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Index of the site. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Index of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Intensity of site already exists.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.2a Distance to gas and on pipelines 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 (+) Suitable access to site already exists.	6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
0.20 Distance to power lines 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 1.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists.	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		
	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.	6.5 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. B404	6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B404

	5	For.
Site Reference:	: SR-0867	He
Parish:	Loughton	1
Size (ha):	0.04	
Address:	Lucas McMullen, 258 High Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 1RB	
Primary use:	Residential	es
Site notes:	Retail (restaurant and Subway) at ground floor, offices at first floor	1
		4-
		Y
Baseline yield:	9 dwellings	
Dasenne yiera.		Clie
Source for	Indicated in Planning Application Form (equivalent to 210 dph)	
baseline yield:		Ep
		Job
Site	The site has 2 refusals for the proposed scheme on site because	Ep
constraints:	the application failed to demonstrate that the appropriate refuse	Dra
	facilities could be provided. If this could be overcome then there are no further constraints to the yield of the site.	ls
		Dra
Site selection	None	SF
adjustment:		
		F

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>9</u>

Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0867	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Counci

Contains Oc Leals of converticelying in an Quadrase ingly (2010) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Incernent P Corp., GBCO, USSS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanos Burvey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Magmylridia, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digilatiose, GeoEye, Earnistar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, Kian ath te GIS User Community



OneUnitaryUnitaryUnitaryUnitaryUnitary11 carany22				
InductionInductionInductionInductionInductionOptionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionOptionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionAdvancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the inductionSet Advancement of the	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Index (a)	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	
Initial and another in the second state of the sec	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)		
Additional Image Image Image Image 14 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 14 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 14 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 14 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 15 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 16 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 17 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 16 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 17 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum 17 mean region minimum 0 Restriction minimum Restriction minimum Restriction minimum	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Antiked region work with any Displayed and with any displayed back with any displa		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Induction Mathematican Markam Image of Mathematican Markam M	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.
Charland constraintCCConstraint17 NoticeNoticeNoticeNoticeNotice17 NoticeNoticeNoticeNoticeNotice16 Instant defenderNoticeNoticeNoticeNotice16 Instant defenderNoticeNoticeNoticeNotice17 NoticeNoticeNoticeNoticeNotice18 Instant defenderNoticeNoticeNoticeNotice19 NoticeNoticeNoticeNoticeNotice19 Notice<	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.
LinkandViaMethod12 hand and undergrade sector for the secto	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.	
NameNoteNoteNote10 hear contraction00The labeled of a la	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Balance of equationControlControl19 mod of equationControlControlControl19 mod of equationControlControlControl10 mod of equationCo	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
14 Interview14 Interview14 Interview14 Interview14 Interview12 Interview10InterviewInterviewInterview13 Denore in the reservation of the second of or second of the station.InterviewInterview13 Denore in the reservation of the second of or second of the station.InterviewInterview14 Denore in the reservation of the second of or second of the second of or second of the second of t	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
A Lick of many 6 user left (H) 31 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 31 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 32 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 31 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 31 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 32 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 35 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 35 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) (H) 34 Data or by the wave (at high ward) <	1.9 Impact of air quality	()		The site adjacent to A121 and would be difficult to mitigate air quality impacts.
1.1 Desktor Graveset Bas sing CB 2.2 Detects to severet Bas sing CH 2.3 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.4 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.6 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.7 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.6 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.6 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.7 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.6 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.6 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.7 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH 3.6 Detects to neveret Bas sing CH	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
A Labele to react of status 10 Intervalue of antipolymetric local dot antipoly	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.3 betained and periodical set of book amontoes (1) In the set of book amontoes (2) 3.4 Detained to local amontoes (4) Site is than 1000m from hereset loan, large silege or smal vilage. Image: Comparison of the set of book amontoes 3.5 Detained to nearest secondary school (4) Site is than 1000m from the nearest loan (large vilage or smal vilage. Image: Comparison of the set of book amontoes 3.6 Detained to nearest secondary school (4) Site is than 1000m from the nearest loan (Code wild or set of book amontoes) Image: Code wild of book amontoes 3.7 Detained to nearest secondary school (4) Site is than 1000m from the nearest loan (Code wild or set of book amontoes) Image: Code wild of book amontoes 3.6 Detained to nearest secondary school (4) Site is than 1000m from the nearest loan (Code wild or set of participant) Image: Code wild of book amontoes 3.6 Detained to nearest secondary school (4) Site is than 1000m from the nearest loan (Code wild or set of participant) Image: Code wild of book amontoes Image: Code wild of book amontoes 3.6 Detained to nearest secondary school (4) Site is than 1000m from the nearest loan (Code wild or set of participant) Image: Code wild of participant) Image: Code wild of participant) 3.6 Detained to nearest loan and the nearest loan (Code wild or set of partin the nearest loan and the nearest loan an	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
A Detailed to duration tion No International interview B Detailed to duration tion No B Detailed to duration tion No B Detailed to nearest linkty binnys tobic No B Detailed to nearest linkty binnys tobic No B Detailed to nearest linkty binnys tobic No B Detailed to nearest (P surgery No	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.3 Detained inferient matry muty doubt (*) Inferience in failed and the set in section is secondary school. 3.6 Detaines to nearest QP surgery (*) Sis is is shin 1000m from the nearest QP surgery. Inferience 3.7 Detaines to nearest QP surgery (*) Net applicable. Inferience 3.8 Detaines to strategic Road Network. 100 Net applicable. Inferience 4.1 Brownelad and Greenfels Land 100 Net applicable. Inferience 4.2 Inpact on signification is an easily of the site would not result in the loss of agnonhural land. Inferience Inferience 4.3 Capacity to impore access to one same 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Inferience 4.1 Inductorie servisitivity 0 Steffers Whith an areage of low involves development and servisitivity or instance and applicable. Inferience 6.1 Inductorie servisitivity 0 Steffers Whith an areage of low involves development and applicable on applicable. Inferience 6.1 Depositivity contrained 0 Development contrained whith or space and publicable. Inferience 6.1 Depositivity contrained and publicable. 0 Development contrained whith the set of agnonhumal land. Inferience 6.1 Depositivity contrained 0	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
ab UBRING In Relative Recording stration (*) Information Constraints 3.7 Distance to rearrest OP surgery (*) Se is less than 1000m from the nearest OP surgery. 3.8 Distance to rearrest OP surgery (*) Se is less than 1000m from the nearest OP surgery. 3.9 Distance to rearrest OP surgery (*) Not applicable. 4.1 Becomfield and Greenfield Land (*) Mole professorally developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 10% brownfreid site, within an existing settlement (Loughton). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land 0. Development unitably to molve the loss of agricultural land. 10% brownfreid site, unitable to advect settlement. 6.1 Lindscape sensitivity 0. Beelse writin an area of tox indices escalitivity - characteristica of the lindscape an equility of advective the vice transfer context is urban and development is unitably to adversely affect the wice transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is unitable) to advective transfer context is urban and development is un	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.7 Deskinde University of Statistic Production University of Production Constraints of Pro	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km from the nearest secondary school.	
3.3 Access to strategic root relationt Image: Control Contence Contenter Control Control Control Control Control	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4. In provinited and Greenies Link 1	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2 Impact on agricultural and011014.3 Capacity to improve access to open space0Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.15.1 Landscape sensitivity0Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodal 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(A)Development could detract from the existing settlement character.The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.6.1 Topography constraints0No topography constraints are identified in the site.The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is kiely to affect the character of the area.6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines0Ges or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.State access to site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on a case state in the site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on case access to site already exists.6.4 Access to site(A)Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.Potential contamination (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.6.5 Contamination constraints(A)Ste below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.Potential contamination (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. </td <td>4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land</td> <td>(++)</td> <td>Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.</td> <td>100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).</td>	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 The intervent in the intervent is the intervent is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape sensitivity. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity. characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodel daracter. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (A) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is usely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Intervent to the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Boar oil pipelines do not pose an constraint to the site. Intervent 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 a diagoner to the site. Intervent to unlikely. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suble access to site already exists. Intervent to unlikely. Potential contamination (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination constraints (5) Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
S. TLandscape sensitivity 0 development without significant character change. character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Ime proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 No topography constraints on the site. Ime proposals are for higher density development. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Resonant to the site. Ime proposals are for higher density development. 6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 Resonant to the site. Ime proposals are for higher density. 6.4 Access to site (c) Suitable access to site already exists. Immediate and the site. 6.5 Contamination constraints (c) Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Potential contamination (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that 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 Settlement character sensitivity (1) If the the character of the area. inkely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Ges or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint on the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint on the site. 6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. Image: Constraint on the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Constrainter on the site. 6.5 Contamination constraints (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Constraint on site, which could be mitigated. 6.6 Torific insend Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Constraintal on Claundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		
0.1 roduginging constraints 0 Percent and the state of the st	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	
6.2a Distance to gas and on pipelines 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 ajacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Image: Contamination constraints 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Laundry). 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 links 0 Image: constrained to power links 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 1 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. 1 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.4 Entreffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on the Preservation Order (1PO) 0 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. 6.4 Freefic inspect Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Potential contamination (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site (*) 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. e.6 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		
6.5 Containing on State size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	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 (Laundry). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
	6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B405

	,	to. I
Site Reference:	SR-0878	Hertf
Parish:	Loughton	5.4
Size (ha):	0.14	100
Address:	46 - 48 Station Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4NX	5
		eshur
Primary use:	Residential	esnur
Site notes:	Residential dwellings and gardens	4
		4-1-
		YI
		4
Baseline yield:	12 dwellings	
Source for	Indicated in Request for Pre-Application Planning Advice form	Client
baseline yield:	(equivalent to 86 dph)	Ерр
		Job Tit
		Ерр
Site	Application refused for one dwelling to the rear of 48 station road	Drawir
constraints:	due to obtrusive development by virtue of its height, size, appearance, position and detraction of the outlook of 50 Station	lssu
	Road. This promoted scheme seeks to address these constraints	
0.1	Marea	Drawin
Site selection adjustment:	None	38-0
aajaotinonti		Α
0		© Conta
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is	Sources

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>10</u>

Hertford Brenkwood

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0878	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Counci

Sources: Earl, HERE, Dalcome, Intermag, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadataten NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, MET, Earl China (Hong Korg), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreelMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digital/Globe, GeoEye, Earthatar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USOS, AeroGRID, RN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 intensification area. Proposed redevelopment is of a significantly higher density than adjacent development and could impact the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B406

		Brad
Site Reference:	SR-0885	Hert
Parish:	Loughton	
Size (ha):	0.04	1
Address:	1 Spring Grove, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4QA	
Primary use:	Residential	eshu
Site notes:	One residential dwelling, garden and garage	Y
		1
		4
Baseline yield:	8 dwellings	1
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Request for Pre-Application Planning Advice form (equivalent to 200 doh)	Client Epp
busenne yieru.		Job T
		Epp
Site	None	Drawi
constraints:		lssı
		Drawi
Site selection	None	SR-
adjustment:		٨

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>8</u>



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
lssue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0885	Rev 2	
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk	
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorn	n copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP Ordnance Survey, Esri, Janan, MFTL, Esri China (Hong Kon	

Sources: Eari, HERE, DeLorme, Infermag, Increment P.Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadater NL, Ordance Survey, Esri Japan, MET, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, @ OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Eari, Digital Clobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, (KN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.).
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	possible. The site is wholly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the 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 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the site are very close to the 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 station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 intensification area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the existing housing character, 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	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B407

0.00 0.000	
Site Reference: Parish: Size (ha): Address:	SR-0963 Loughton 0.49 North Haven, High Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4JJ
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Residential dwelling and outbuildings
Baseline yield:	6 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites 2016-2017
Site constraints:	Some 1% of site area along southwestern boundary falls within Epping Forest or the buffer lands. Given small extent of site subject to the constraint, it is not considered to affect on-site capacity so no adjustment to site capacity has been made.
Site selection adjustment:	None

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>6</u>

Hertford Harlow Harlow Brentwood Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0963	Rev 1
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

© Contains US data © Loven copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, Deltomer, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swissbopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalClobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, RAM, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all development except householder applications), 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 adjacent to the Epping-Ambresbury Banks Ancient Woodland. The site would likely indirectly affect a small area of the Ancient Woodland but it is likely that potential effects can be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Although the site is in close proximity to Buffer Land, it is previously developed and its scale and the intensity of development on the site is unlikely to impact the 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 Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation could 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the 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.	The site is close to the A121 and therefore mitigation measures may be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	65% greenfield site, 100m from an existing settlement (Loughton)
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
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.	A negligible part of the site contains Epping Forest. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of open space. Site adjacent to existing open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to Epping Forest.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Proposals have the potential to influence the wider landscape character area. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the site's landscape context.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which generally reflects surrounding development therefore the site is not likely to impact on 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.	Less than 1% of site along north eastern boundary is in HSE middle zone. Due to the location/small size of the affected area this results in negligible impact and is not considered a constraint. HSE guidance is don't advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from High Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B408

Site Reference: SR-0974 Parish: Loughton	He
Parish: Loughton	
Size (ha): 0.19	20
Address: Former Electricity Substation, Roding Road, Loughton 3ED	i, Essex, IG10
Primary use: Residential	esh
Site notes: Former electricity sub station	
Baseline yield: 12 dwellings	Z
Dasenne yield. 12 anomingo	Clie
Source for Indicated in Call for Sites 2016-2017 baseline yield:	Ep Job
Site Flood Risk Zone 3b affects the eastern boundary of s not accounted for in the capacity provided in the Casubmission form. Therefore, site capacity adjusted pro account for flood constrained area.	site (2%), and
Site selection None adjustment:	sr
	ک ۵۵۵۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰

Community
feedback:The C
near toDwellings:11

Y The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
 <u>11</u>

Hertford Hertford Hertford Harlow Har

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0974	Rev 1
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HERE: DaLorme, Internag, horement P.Corp., CEECO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopc MapmyIndia, & OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Communiay Source: Earl, DiglialClobe, GeoEye, Earltstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



Criteria 1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites			
	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In- combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
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	(++)		Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zone 3b covering 2% is located along the eastern site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	be mitigated.	Site contains Locally Listed Building (LLB) (substation). LLB should be retained, demolition would be resisted. Development should seek sensitive retention of LLB and high quality design/materials. Unlikely to impact on CA due to distance.
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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	70% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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.	Proposed development to the rear of London Underground station not likely to affect settlement character and unlikely to impact Conservation Area. However potential loss of Locally Listed Building would have detrimental impact on 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 from Roding Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Railway / Electricity Substation). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B409

Site Reference:	SR-0984
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.26
Address:	63 Wellfields, Loughton, Essex, IG10 1PA

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:GP surgery and car park

Baseline yield: 8 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:8



Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0984	Rev 1
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Contains Co traiter Comm copyright and Galaxies right (CVG) Sources: Esti, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., CBBCO, USSS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, (CN, Kadaster NL, Ordnanet Survey, Esti Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopc MapmyIndia, & OpenStinzelMap, Contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGiboe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In- combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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.	The site is very close to the A1168 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	90% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 offers potential for infill development, however development of corner site would require sensitive design to mitigate impact on low density surrounding development.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Wellfields. There is potential to provide further points of access from Rectory Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B410

Site Reference:	SR-0986
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.23
Address:	70 Wellfields, Loughton, IG10 1NY

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Ground floor commercial uses with residential uses on upper floors

Baseline yield: 7 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:<u>7</u>



Epping Forest	District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0986	Rev 1
	Epping Forest District Council www.spingforestdc.gov.ak copyright and database right (2016) re, Intermap. GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP

© contains US data V Chown copyright and database nght (2016) Sources, Est, HERE, DeLome, Hitemap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopc Mapmylicita, © OpenSiteseMps contributors, and the GIS User Community Sources, ISS, North (1998), Sources, Carlos (1998), Sources, Carlos (1998), Sources, Arror (2016), Sources, Carlos (1998), So



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In- combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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.	The site is very close to the A1168 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	90% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.	
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.	A negligible part of the site contains open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of open space. Site adjacent to existing managed open space and could provide opportunities to improve access.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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 offers potential for infill development, however development of corner site would require sensitive design to mitigate impact on low density surrounding development.
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 from Wellfields. There is potential to provide further points of access from Rectory Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B411

Site Reference:	SR-0993
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.02
Address:	126 High Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4BE

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Nightclub premises

Baseline yield: 8 dwellings

Source for Indicated in planning application baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:8



Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0993	Rev 1
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources Test, HEFE, DeLormo or yrigin an Usaboase Technol, GEDCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeSteas, EGN, Kidstein NL, Intermep, Increment BCorp, GEDCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeSteas, EGN, Kidstein NL, Intermep, Increment BCorp, METI, Earl China (Hong Korg), swisstopo, Maprinjinda, & OpenSTIRMAp partitibutor, and the GIS User Community Source: Test, DigliatGlobe, GeoStratistar Geographics, CNES/Alribus DS, USDA, USGS, ArerORID, IOA, and the GIS User Community



<u>bwoningo.</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. 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 development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all development except householder applications), 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	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance from site. However, building identified as being of local interest during planning application process so its retention and conversion is encouraged.
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.	The site is very 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 station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	Proposed demolition and redevelopment of period building is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on the townscape of the High Street and it is not likely to be mitigated.
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 from High Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Repair and Refuelling Garage / Dyers and Cleaners). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B412
			• © Arup

Site Reference:	SR-1006
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.34
Address:	Fairmead, 48 Church Lane, Loughton, Essex, IG10 1PD

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Single detached dwelling

Baseline yield: 14 dwellings

Source for Indicated in pre-application request baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:14



Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-1006	Rev 1
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council

© Jonania US data V Orown copyright and odadase ngift (2016) Sources: Est / HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Incerement P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmylindia, © OpenStiteetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGiobe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, AnorORID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
		Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	combination effects.	combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	75% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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.	Proposed replacement development is of a higher density than the surrounding lower density character, and could affect settlement character. Development would require sensitive design.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	As a result of their locations, protected trees on or adjacent to the site would likely have an adverse impact on the suitability of the site for the intensity of development proposed.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Church Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B413
Site Reference:	SR-1007		
-----------------	--		
Parish:	Loughton		
Size (ha):	0.02		
Address:	111 Church Hill, Loughton, Essex, IG10 1QR		

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Single detached dwelling

Baseline yield: 8 dwellings

Source for Indicated in pre-application request baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:8



Epping Forest D	istrict Council	
Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date	
lssue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-1007	Rev 1	
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council	
© Contains OS data © Crown cop Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, I	www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk	

Sources: Esr. (HERE, DeLome, Lintermap, Increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyindia, OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalCible, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, GN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	()	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use likely to be significant.	Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
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 likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.	Due to the development type (all development except householder applications), 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	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings but within the setting of Grade II Listed Building opposite (122 Church Hill) so impact should be considered and mitigated through high quality design/materials.
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.	The site is very 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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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.	Replacement development at higher density on High Street not likely to impact on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Church Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B414

Site Reference:	SR-1026
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	1.28
Address:	13 Alderton Hill, Loughton, Essex, IG10 3JD

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Five residential dwellings

Baseline yield: 38 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:38



Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date	
lssue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-1026	Issue Rev 1	
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council	

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorne, Intermap, Increment P.Cony, GEBCO, USOS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Goobase, IGN, Kadatser NL, Ordnance Survey, Everi Japan, MeTI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapnyindia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, IgilialGlobe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria			
		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In- combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area 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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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 (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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.	Flatted development to replace detached dwellings likely to negatively impact on low density character. Reduction in density and 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.	There are protected trees on and adjacent to the site, but the percentage of the site area affected is limited and, as a result of their locations, they would not be a significant constraint.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing multiple points of access from Alderton Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B415

Site Reference:	SR-1027
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.14
Address:	60 Traps Hill, Loughton, Essex, IG10 1TD

Primary use:ResidentialSite notes:Single detached dwelling

Baseline yield: 8 dwellings

Source for Indicated in pre-application request baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:8



Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-1027	Rev 1	
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council	

© Jontanis US data © Jown copyrigin and database right (2016) Sources: Est / HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GBBC0, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, (GN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METT, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmylindia, © OpenStitentMap contributions, and the GIS Let Comunity Source: Est, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRib, IGN, and the GIS Let Comunity



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In- combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and built-up surroundings.
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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	70% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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.	Proposed replacement development is of a higher density than surrounding detached and semi-detached housing and could affect character of the area. Development would require sensitive design.
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 from Traps Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B416

	-
Site Reference:	SR-1032
Parish:	Loughton
Size (ha):	0.50
Address:	St Thomas More RC Church And Presbytery, 106 Willingale Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 2DA
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Church and car park
Baseline yield:	14 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in pre-application request

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	14

Client

Job Title		
Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-1032	Rev 1	
^{sr-1032}	Rev 1 P Epping Forest District Counc	

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Korg), swisstopo, Mapmylnidia, 6 OpenStituetMap contributors, and the GIS User Comunity Source: Earl, Diglatione, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, 104, and the GIS User Comunity



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in- combination effects.	Residential development located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In- combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Scheduled Monument due to distance and built-up surroundings of 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000km 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.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield), within an existing settlement (Loughton).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 derelict church sites provides an opportunity for infill development in existing residential area that could positively contributes to settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Willingale Road and Collard Avenue.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Made Ground). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B417



CR	X	How It	THE AND
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0015-Rev2	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 and Stage 6.2 Assessment in Matching	Legend
ARUP	Date: March 2018	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	Residential sites assessed at Stage 2 and Stage 6.2 N Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:26,000 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	This legend shows only key map symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

	2	B. Call
Site Reference:	SR-0584	Hertford
Parish:	Matching	
Size (ha):	1.56	1
Address:	Morgans Farm, Moorhall Road, Matching, Old Harlow, CM17 0LP	
Primary use:	Residential	eshunt
Site notes:	Open land used as a paddock to the front of Chigwell Convent. Also includes a single dwelling.	Aross
Baseline yield:	60 dwellings	
Source for	60 dwellings included in the Call for Sites (equivalent to 35 dph).	Client
baseline yield:	The 60-80 bed care home is classed as 'other uses' and is not assessed in the SLAA.	Epping
		Job Title
Oite	None	Epping
Site constraints:	None	Drawing Sta
		Issue
		Drawing No
Site selection	None	SR-0584
adjustment:		AR

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	60

Hertford Hertford Heshunt Brentwood

Plan
8

Sources: Est, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P.Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GenStae, IGN, Klavater NL, Orinnanco Survey, Est Ivagan, MET, LEri Orbina (Hong Kong), swissiopo, MapmyIndia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Est, InglialGlobe, GeoSye, Earthstar Ceographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	()	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.	The site is wholly within a Wood Pasture and Parkland BAP priority habitat. The site is likely to directly affect the BAP priority habitat. There is likely to be effects from this impact that 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Registered Park and Garden due to distance and scale of site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	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.	80% greenfield site, 500m from an existing settlement (Harlow).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	()	Site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	The site characteristics are consistent with it being assessed as highly sensitive to the impact of development. Development would be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is existing farm use, some distance from a settlement. Proposed density is higher than neighbouring uses, and could impact the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Stables). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B419



Report on	Drawing No.	Content	Legend	
	and the for			general Ch
Ales States	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	The second second		HOH
1		5	P	HighStreet
		I DAPALI	No the second	
				Ongar
North Weald				Ongar
				A BEALS
				ChelmsfordiRoad
TENTER STATES				- I Dood

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0011-Rev2	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 and Stage 6.2 Assessment	Legend	
ARUP	Date: March 2018	in Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.		Resider Parish B
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:25,000 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	This legend sho	ws only key ma

Residential sites assessed at Stage 2 and Stage 6.2

Parish Boundary

his legend shows only key map symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

Sile Sulla	Juily Assessment
Site Reference: Parish: Size (ha): Address:	SR-0075 Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers 0.75 Land to the north of Church Road, Ongar
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Vacant field
Baseline yield:	22 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 50:50 housing to employment at 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for employment
Site constraints:	Circa 5% of the site has potential contamination which may not be suitable for housing development (landfill). As such developable site area reduced to 95%.
Site selection adjustment:	For the purposes of assessment, it is assumed that the contamination constraint may be overcome, and the full capacity has been reinstated.
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

Dwellings: 22

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London

Client	
Client	
Epping Forest	District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0075	Rev 2
ARUI	D Epping Forest District Council
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm	copyright and database right (2016) e, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmylindia, OpenStineetMap contributors, and the GIS bare Community Source: Earl, DigitalGiobe, GeoCye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, ArarOGHD, I-MJ, and the GIS bare Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 a Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but adjacent to Grade II* listed church. Possible mitigation by locating development away from church to west half of site, appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.
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	(-)	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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.	100% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 located within historic part of village, adjacent to a Grade II* church, and Grade II Rectory. Development would likely negatively impact on the historic character of the village. This could be mitigated through lower density, design and layout.
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 severe contamination on site, where assurances would have to be sought from the developer that remediation would not harm site viability.	Domestic landfill on north-west of site. Subject to investigation, may be possible to mitigate - install grout cut-off wall to stop leachate or landfill gases entering the rest of the site - need for further detailed work regarding groundwater drainage.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B421

Sile Sulla	Sile Suitability Assessment		
Site Reference:	SR-0443		
Parish:	loreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers		
Size (ha):	0.86		
Address:	Harlow Road, Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers, Ongar, Essex		
Primary use:	Residential		
Site notes:	Scrub land and disused allotments.		
Baseline yield:	26 dwellings		
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph		
Site constraints:	None		
Site selection	None		

adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>26</u>

Clent

Epping Forest	
	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0443	Rev 2

© Contains US data V Lotown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Hitemap, Incernent P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NJ, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METT, Earl China (Hong Korg), swisstopo, Mource 1:str.) Optimicities, Coopyright, Earlthan (Hong Korg), swisstopo, Mource 1:str.) Optimicities, Coopyr, Earlthan (Hong Korg), Substance (Str.) Optimicity AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within the buffer zones for Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and Semi Improved Grassland habitats. 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 of Dorkings Farm Meadow LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Grade II* Listed Building due to distance. Within setting of, and partially adjacent to at south-west corner, Moreton Conservation Area. Possible mitigation through sensitive layout and high quality design/materials.
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	(-)	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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 within a settlement.	100% greenfield site, within an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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 with no opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is largely located in the site area. Development would result in loss of public open space (allotments covers 94% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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 wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Development of this allotment site within village centre is not likely to impact on settlement character, subject sensitive scale, design and materials reflecting settlement pattern, adjacent Conservation Area and sense of enclosure of High Street.
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 Harlow 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.	B422
		1	© Arup



THE SAME K	
	S A A A A A
Croo	
Acd Mile	

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0017-Rev2	Content Residential Sites for Stage 2 and Stage 6.2 Assessment in Nazeing	Legend	Reside
ARUP	Date: March 2018	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.		Parish
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:25,000 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	This legend sh	iows only key

Residential sites assessed at Stage 2 and Stage 6.2

Ν

B423

Parish Boundary

his legend shows only key map symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

Site Reference: SR-0010		
Parish:	Nazeing	
Size (ha):	0.56	
Address:	Leaside Nursery, Sedge Green, Nazeing, Essex	
Primary use:	Residential	
Site notes:	Existing Glasshouse	

Baseline yield: 17 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. **Dwellings:** <u>17</u>



Job Title	t District Council
	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0010	Rev 2
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorr GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreet/V	n copyright and database right (2016) me, Internag, increment P. Coro, C.GEGO, USGS, F.AO, NPS, NRCAN, Ordnanes Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Eari Chna (Hong Kong), swissto fag contributors, and the GIS User Community eacEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, User Community



<u>Dwellings: 17</u>		AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and Wet Woodland 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 of Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 600m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Existing access lane off Sedge Green. Would need upgrade and widening but could be achieved.
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential severe contamination on site, where assurances would have to be sought from the developer that remediation would not harm site viability.	West side of site unsuitable for development. East side of site could possibly be redeveloped if the applicant is able to carry out a detailed investigation and demonstrate that all risks could be mitigated for the lifetime of the proposed development.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B424
		•	© Arup

Sile Sulla	Sinty Assessment	PUVB Le
Site Reference:	SR-0011	Hertfor
Parish:	Nazeing	
Size (ha):	8.30	
Address:	St. Leonards Road, Nazeing, Essex (Known as 'Perry Hill')	
		-11
Primary use:	Residential	eshunt
Site notes:	Agricultural/Grazing Fields	4-4
		44
		41055
	040 4 10	
Baseline yield:	249 dwellings	
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph, reduced to exclude area subject to	Client
baseline yield:	planning permission EPF/0937/16 for 60 dwellings, covering 2.23ha of site.	Eppin
		Job Title
		Eppin
Site constraints:	Capacity reduced to exclude area subject to planning permission EPF/0937/16 for 60 dwellings, covering 2.23ha of site.	Drawing
constraints.		lssue
		Drawing
Site selection	None	SR-00
adjustment:		ΔΙ
Community feedback:	Feedback was received on NAZ-B which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.	© Contains Sources: Es GeoBase, I MapmyIndia
		Source: Esr

Litent

Epping Forest	District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0011	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council
	copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP

© Contains US data © Clown copyright and database ngift (2016) Sources: Est / HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, (DN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo MapmyIndia, © OpenStimetMap, onthituders, and the GIS User Community Source: Esti, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, ION, and the GIS User Community



Linear Mathema (Market Market Marke	Dwellings: 182	. + for furth	MapmyIndia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri. Digitalicide, GeoEye. Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community	I . I The /
Index default and any second	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Or unit of a section of a se	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
unitant controlvvv	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Mathematical constraint intercasion C Enclosed and Proceedings Constraint of a part of a par	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Non-body definition of an analysisNoNoNoNo11 space in Non-body space in Non-body definition of Non-body space in Non-body	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
and and only dependent of an end of an e	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
n in controlNNN12 bodyAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd ControlAnd 	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.	
CriterionCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion12 media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion13 media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion14 media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion15 media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion16 media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion17 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion18 media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion19 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion10 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion19 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion10 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion10 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion10 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion11 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion12 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion13 Media integra serviceCriterionCriterionCriterionCriterion14 Media integra	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.	
InterfactorInterfactorInterfactorInterfactorInterfactor18. Inpact or evenestor0.0File as a metaling influence for a functor of evaluation on the site to development insultationInterfactor13. Inpact or evenestor0.0Restance of even sharing as a larger of for larger of a	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Additional constraint of product and instant of product and pr	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settling of Conservation Area due to distance but impact on landscape should be considered.
In Funct value (a) Constraint for the second of the function of the second of th	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0		
A Level read -0 Percentage A Level read -0 Relevel read Relevel read A Level read -0 Relevel read Relevel read A Level read -0 Relevel read Relevel read A Level read -0 Relevel read Relevel read Relevel read A Level read -0 Relevel read Relevel read Relevel read A Level read -0 Relevel read Relevel read Relevel read A Level read -0 Relevel read Relevel read Relevel read Relevel read A Level read -0 Relevel read	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
a 1 outside the field from and Lobe and D 10 3 20 below to meet this step 0 Site where it denotes the meet where it denotes the step 3 3 Define to meet this step 0 Site where it denotes the meet where it denotes the step 3 Obtains to meet this step 0 Site where it denotes the meet where it denotes the step 3 Obtains to how end this step 0 Site where it denotes the meet step is diago or stand trigge. 3 Obtains to how end the contrast step 0 Site where it denotes the meet step is diago or stand trigge. 3 Obtains to how end the contrast step 0 Site here than 4000m to the meet step is diago or stand trigge. 3 Obtains to meet the step 0 Site here than 4000m to the meet step is diago or stand trigge. 3 Obtains to meet the step 0 Site here than 4000m to the meet step is diago or stand trigge. 3 Obtains to meet the step 0 Site here than 4000m to the step is diago or step Tite is grantful after contrast steps 3 Obtains to meet the step 0 Site here than 4000m to the step is diago or	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.	
Control to teneform the starting of a control Control Control to teneform the starting starting with starting starting with the starting starting with th	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
a Definite discipational control Vol Image: Control discipational control Image: Control discipational control discipational control Image: Control discipational control Image: Control discipational control discipational control discipational control Image: Control discipational	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
a classifie for local statistics (*) Image: classifie for local statistics 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprinary school (*) Set is table in 1000m from the nearest inferriprimary school. 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprinary school (*) Set is table in 1000m from the nearest inferriprimary school. 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprinary school (*) Set is table in 1000m from the nearest inferriprimary school. 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprinary school (*) Set is table in 1000m from the nearest inferriprimary school. 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprinary school (*) Not applicable Not applicable 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprinary school (*) Not applicable Not applicable 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprimary school (*) Not applicable Not applicable 3.0 Editions to narrest inferriprimary school (*) Not applicable Not applicable 3.1 Editarios to narrest inferriprimary school (*) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public spin spince. Set falls within an area of modulin introdeces are restlikely to involve the loss of public spin spince. Set falls within an area of modulin introdeces are restlikely of the autologica and the public spin spince. 3.1 Editaries sensibility (*) Development cuuld detect that the classifies addetect in the autologica are restlikely to involve the loss of public spin spin applicable. 3.2 Editaries dev	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.3 Distance to rearest secondary school 10 Information of readest intercention of the secondary school. 3.0 Distance to rearest GP suggery 0 Site between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP suggery. Information of the secondary school Information of the seco	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
a bit interactive sectorization become a sectorizatio developerese titic sectorization a sectorizatio deve	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
a. I channels of interfact of supply 0 Access to Strategic Read Network 10 A. B Access to Strategic Read Network 0 More splicable. 100% greenfield state, adjacent to an existing settiment (Lower Nazzing). A. I forwrited and Greenfield Land 0 More splicable. 100% greenfield state, adjacent to an existing settiment (Lower Nazzing). A. I forwrited and Greenfield Land 0 Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Include the site would involve the loss of public open space. A. Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Include the site would worke were setting settiment character in the site may preclude development. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Stel fails with an area of medium landscape area resulter character. Stel is on the edge of the existing settement and the propositis are for higher density development than the new area of medium landscape area resulter to character mediance development to and detracter for the existing settement character. Stel is on the edge of the existing settement and the propositis are for higher density development than the regenon insighbouring development to and the propositis are for higher density development than the site may preclude development. Stel is on the edge of the existing settement and the proposition of anacter character is settement. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Ges and ol ppelines don	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
a A Access to strategic Hoad Network Image: Contract Strategic Hoad Network Image: Contract Strategic Hoad Network Image: Contract Strategic Hoad Network 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (-) Mapping the site is greenfield Land adjacent to a settement. 10% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazerig). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of public open space. Image: Contract Strategic Hoad Network Image: Contract Strategic Hoad Network 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site field within an eac of moduli native site spinetivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to character Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposale are for higher damapting development. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement is in the site may preclude development. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement is likely to affect the procommutity rule development. 6.2a Distance to power lines (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on a dighe-entities the procommutity rule development. 6.2a Distance to power lines (-) Rever lines do not power a cons	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. I provinted and creating and creatin	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2 Impact on agriculturat and Impact on agriculturat and agr	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 (Lower Nazeing).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 International constraints 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (e) Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (e) 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 is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposals are for higher density development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposals are for higher density development. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Internative development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or 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 a 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Si Leonards Road. 6.5 Con	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) and able to absorb development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area. 6.1 Topographic constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. Existing access off St Leonards Road. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off St Leonards Road. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site (former Gun Emplacement). Potential adverse impact that 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 Setuement Character sensitivity (*) Index of the sensitivity of the sensitivity of the predominantly rural character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (*) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Index of the sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity of the sensitivity of senset sensity of sensitivity of sensitivity of sensitivity	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)		
6.1 Topography consumits (*) Performance of the state of the	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.
6.24 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 International constraints 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. International constraints 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. Existing access off St Leonards Road. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off St Leonards Road. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site (former Gun Emplacement). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Image: Im	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact of the Preservation Order (FPO) 0 adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off St Leonards Road. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site (former Gun Emplacement). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time. Existing access off St Leonards Road.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site (+) -	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) mitigated.	6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off St Leonards Road.
6.6 Traffic impact Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time. B425	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	
	6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B425

Community feedback:

Dwellings:

	,
Site Reference:	SR-0064
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	2.91
Address:	Sedge Green Nursery, Sedge Green, and Chalkfield Nursery, Pecks Hill, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2NX
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Nursery (Glasshouses) with residential dwelling.
Baseline yield:	100 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 35 dph)
Site constraints:	None
Site selection adjustment:	None

	A
The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	© Contains Sources: E GeoBase, MapmyInd
<u>100</u>	Source: Es AeroGRID

Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0064	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, intermap, increment P Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadatster NL, Ordnance Survey, Everi Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalCilobe, eceye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alribus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
		Effects of allocating site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	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 SSSIs.	
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 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 Lee Valley Central 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 identified as a potential opportunity area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery & within 250m of 3 landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B426
		!	© Aru

Site Reference:	SR-0064-N
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.92
Address:	Chalkfield Nursery, Pecks Hill, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2NX

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Site of demolished glasshouse / nursery

Baseline yield: 28 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:28



Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0064-N	Rev 1

Sources: Esrl, HERE, DeLorne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEDCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esrl Japan, METI, Esrl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmyndia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esrl, DigitalGiobe, GeoGye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Induction of any sector of a sector of				
Number of the second	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Linking windsImage and statistical statis	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
La hate definition101	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		No requirement to consult with Natural England for residential development.
Identify Identify IdentifyIdentify IdentifyIdentify Identify1 Fundamentation30Restand and exclusion data status data status data status IdentifyRestand and exclusion data status data status data status IdentifyRestand and exclusion data status Identify10 AddressIdentifyIdentifyRestand and exclusion data status IdentifyRestand and exclusion data statusRestand exclusion Identify11 AddressIdentifyIdentifyRestand and exclusion data status IdentifyRestand exclusion IdentifyRestand exclusion Identify12 AddressIdentifyIdentifyRestand and exclusion data status IdentifyRestand exclusion IdentifyRestand exclusion13 AddressIdentifyIdentifyRestand exclusion data status IdentifyRestand exclusion IdentifyRestand exclusion13 AddressIdentifyIdentifyRestand exclusion data status IdentifyRestand exclusion Identify14 AddressIdentifyIdentifyIdentifyRestand exclusion15 AddressIdentifyIdentifyIdentifyRestand exclusion16 AddressIdentifyIdentifyIdentify <td< td=""><td>1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland</td><td>0</td><td>Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.</td><td></td></td<>	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Chance of production of all is an end of each of a standard of a s		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Induction of any sector of a sector of	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Number of the second states for (1) and the second sta	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 an area of Deciduous Woodland. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation could be implemented to address this.
DraceProblemProblem12 may and making and making and making and mark addata addataPark addata addata addata addata addata addata addata addata13 may addata addatanoPark addata addata13 may addatanoPark addata addata13 may addatanoPark addata14 may addatanoPark addata15 may addatanoPark addata16 may addatanoPark addata17 may addatanoPark addata18 may addatanoPark addata19 may addataPark	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 partially within the Lea Valley Central LWS 250m buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the Local Wildlife Site but mitigation could be implemented to address this.
Link index ind	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Linking LinkingPioRecord a stand of proceeding with of point withingImage: Constraint of point withing with of point withing11 Repart of a point of the stand of monetal by what withing in a dipoint withingImage: Constraint of the stand of point withingImage: Constraint of the stand of point withing12 Repart of point of the stand of monetal by what withing in a dipoint withing in a dipoint withingImage: Constraint of the stand of point withingImage: Constraint of the stand of point withing13 Repart of point of the stand of monetal by what withing in a dipoint withing in a dipoint withing in a dipoint withing in a dipoint withingImage: Constraint of the stand of point withing13 Repart of point withing in a dipoint withing i	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
Initial grantIII1 Statistication of the second statistication of the se	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0		
A Lorenzia CV is, one or wateria A Lorenzia CV is, one or wateria A Lorenzia CV Six bases in total seases in all of table station. D Datarce is the wateria rank table station. CV Six bases in total and exponential in table station. D Datarce is the wateria rank table station. CV Six bases in total and exponential in the station. D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six bases in total and exponential is all station and exponential is all station. D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six bases in total and exponential is all station. D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six bases in total and exponential is all station. D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six bases in total and exponential is all station. D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six bases in total and exponential is all station. D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six bases in total and exponential is a station. D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six experiment output D Datarce is the experiment output CV Six experiment output D Datarce is the experiment output Six experiment output Six experiment output D Datarce is the experiment output Six experiment output Six experiment output D Datarce is the experiment output <td< td=""><td>1.9 Impact of air quality</td><td>0</td><td>Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.</td><td></td></td<>	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
A Lotacity for weight situation weightColConcent of the section of the sectio	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)		
S2 Journels function Vol Information Note S3 Datare is employment lacio No No No S4 Datare is employment lacio No No No S4 Datare is employment lacio No No No S4 Datare is bead arealise No No No S4 Datare is bead arealise No No No S4 Datare is neared socialization No No No S4 Datare is nearealization No No No<	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 Jakan de minjoren tabalan 0.0 14 Datama biolo mentions 0.0 15 Datama biolo mentions 0.0 16 Datama biolo mentions 0.0 16 Datama biolo mentions 0.0 17 Datama biolons 0.0 18 Datama biolons 0.0 19 Datama biolons 0.0 19 Datama biolons 0.0 10 Datama bions 0.0 10 Datama biolons	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
A Hamme is dota mention O Intermediation O 3.5 Datame is neared lifetypinary shool 0 8 is balance in formation of the nearest information stocodary school. Image: Comparison of the nearest information school information in the nearest information school information	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.3 Detained of thereises insighting food 0 Information of the insight food 0 3.6 Detained to thereises insighting food 0 3 be is note than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 0 0 3.7 Detained to nearest QP surgery 0 3 be is bes than 1000m from the nearest QP surgery. 0 0 National School (School (3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
A Distance is lease at electricity station Image: Control of the state at electricity station Image: Control of the state at electricity station 3.7 Distance to nearest CP surgery Image: Control of the state at electricity station Image: Control of the state at electricity station Image: Control of the state at electricity station 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Control of the state at electricity station Image: Control of the state at electricity station Image: Control of the state at electricity station 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land Image: Control of the state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) Image: Control of the state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) 4.2 Impact on agricultural land Image: Control of the state would involve the loss of public const space. Image: Control of the state at electricity state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) 4.1 Indicaces sensitivity Image: Control of the state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) Image: Control of the state at electricity of the state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) 5.2 Settlenet chancler sensitivity Image: Control of the state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) Image: Control of the state at electricity of the state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) 6.2 Settlenet chancler sensitivity Image: Control of the state and nost versatile agricultural land (greads 1-3) Image: Control of the state at electricity of the state and nost versatile agricon at a land as a stote the state at electricity of the st	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
0.1 Description for marked on adject 0.1 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network 0.1 Not applicable. 55.1 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 0.1 Monotry of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 55.5 4.2 Inpact on agricultural land 0.1 Development unlikely to involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 15.). Incommentation of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0.1 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Incommentation of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0.10 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Incommentation of the site is greenfield tank the site intervent development in the site is greenfield tank the site intervent development in the site is greenfield tank the site is greenfield tank the site intervent development in the site is greenfield tank the site intervent development in the site is a potential opportunity area. The proposals are for higher development in the site is greenfield tank the site is green and to public open space. 6.1 Dipography constraints 0.0 Development unlikely to the site is green advector development. Constraints of the site is green advector development is likely to advect	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
SA Access to stating individuation Image: Control Meeting in the stating individuation on the stating indindividuation individuatine individuation on the stating individuati	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4.1 Bowines and Greeneed Land (a) And an anticipation of the state would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). International state of the state would involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0.0 Development utiledy to involve the loss of public open space. International operation of the state would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0.0 Ste fass within an area of tow bundscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area. 5.2 Settement character sensitivity 0.0 No topography constraints Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. The proposals are for higher density development than the site. 6.1 Topography constraints 0.0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. The proposals are for higher density development to the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0.0 No topography constraints to the site. Site is identified area on advelopment is likely to affect the character of the area. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (PTPO) 0.0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. There is no axisting access to the site. Access would be required through third party land and agreement in place, or oxisting access to the site. Access would be required through third party land for the grade. <td>3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network</td> <td></td> <td>Not applicable.</td> <td></td>	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2 Impact of agricultural and1011114.3 Capacity to improve access to open space0Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space.5.1 Landscape sensitivity0Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodel5.2 Settlement character sensitivity(d)Development could detract from the existing settlement character.5.2 Settlement character sensitivity(d)Development could detract from the existing settlement character.6.1 Topography constraints0Robography constraints are identified in the site.6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines0Ges or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.6.3 Distance to power lines0Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.6.4 Access to site0The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or6.4 Access to site(d)Development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or6.4 Access to site(d)Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land from Sedge Green or Peer lands6.4 Defending constraints(d)Defending constraints on site, which could be mitigated.6.4 Defending constraints(d)Defending constraints on site, which could be mitigated.6.4 Defending constraints(d)Defending constraints on site, which could be mitigated.6.4 Defending constraints(d)Defending constraints on site	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
1.1 contraction 0 Set contraction Set contraction Set contraction 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Set contraction Set contanicton Set contraction <td< td=""><td>4.2 Impact on agricultural land</td><td>()</td><td>Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).</td><td></td></td<>	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
1.1 Landscape entrsinvity 0 development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 6) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No loography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Constraint of the area. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraint on the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPD) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or diacent to the site. There is no existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land from Sedge Green or Peoc Hill. 6.4 Access to site (-) Detential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. There is no existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land agreement in place, or existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land from Sedge Green or Peoc Hill. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Development switch witch witch witch witch witch of the site. 6.0 Tureficiencent Low level corges	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
0.2 Seturement character sensitivity (1) Image: Contraining developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Contraining developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Contraining development. Image: Contraining development. 6.2 b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Contraining development. Image: Contraining development. 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 outper site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place, or existing access to the site. Image: Contraining development in place,	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		
6.1 Holography Constraints 0 Additional status Additional status 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. feature 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. feature 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. feature 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 to the site. Access would be required through third party land from Sedge Green or Peer Would require upgrade. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Landfill within 250m). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.24 Distance to gas and on pipelines 0 Image: Constraint on pipelines 0 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. Image: Constraint 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 to the site. Access would be required through third party land from Sedge Green or Peoc Hill. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.4 Exercise (-) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site. Exercise	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
0.2 Distance to power lines 0 Image: Constance to power lines 0 Image: Constance to power lines 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 0 Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access There is no existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land from Sedge Green or Percentiation constraints 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site. 6.6 Trafficiencent (-) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site. Expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Landfill within 250m). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated. 0.6 Termining (-) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site. Expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	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. Hill. 6.5 Contamination constraints (*) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Landfill within 250m). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated. 6.6 Terfic impact (*) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site. End 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.	
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	6.4 Access to site	(-)		There is no existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land from Sedge Green or Pecks Hill.
	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Landfill within 250m). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
B427	6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B427

Site Reference:	SR-0116
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	1.51
Address:	Land to the rear of Oakley Hall, Nazeing
Size (ha):	1.51

Primary use: Residential Site notes: Former Nursery site, open storage

Baseline yield: 45 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>45</u>

<u>Dwellings:</u>



Epping Forest D	istrict Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest D	istrict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0116	Issue Rev 2
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crown copy	

gnt and oatabase ngnt (2016) mmap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, nce Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto tributors, and the GIS User Community Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, community



Criteria Score Qualitative Assessment 11 Ingact on Internationally Protected Bites 0 Effects of alcoaling with or the proposed tade do not undermine conservation dejectors (due or in combination 12 Ingact on Nationally Protected Bites 0 Bade of m the Ingace fibble Zoots there is no requirement to consult Naturel England because the proposed 13.a Ingact on Ancient Woodawd 0 Bite en of Located within the algoest to Assist. Information of the Ingace fibble Zoots there is no requirement to consult Naturel England because the proposed 13.a Ingact on Ancient Woodawd 0 Bite end to cated within the alle. Information of Ancient Woodawd Information of Ancient Woodawd Information of Ancient Woodawd Information Ancient Woodawd	impact on historic
11 Impact on Internationary Protocoid sites 0 who the stress. 1 2 Urpact on Nationary Protocoid sites 0 Based on the Impact Risk S288. 1 3a Impact on Nationary Protocoid sites 0 Base and the Impact Risk S288. 1 3a Impact on Andrein/Veteran Trees outside of No. Andrein Veteran trees in located within or adjacent to Andrein Woodhard. Impact on Andrein/Veteran Trees outside of No. Andrein Veteran trees in located within the site. 1 3b Impact on Andrein/Veteran Trees outside of No. Andrein Veteran trees are located within the site. Impact on Expine Freest Buffer Land 0 1.4 Impact on Expine Freest Buffer Land 0 Rote Rich Rich Rich Rich Rich Rich Rich Rich	impact on historic
12 Pripate of Nederlary Protected state 0 development is unikely to pose a risk to SSSs. 1.3. Impact on Ancient Woodland 0 Sile is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. 1.3. Impact on Ancient/Woodland 0 Sile is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. 1.3. Impact on Ancient/Woodland 0 No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the sile. 1.4. Impact on Accent/Wordling Trees Suffer Land 0 Sile is unikely to impact on Epoing Forest Buffer Land. 1.6. Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habilitis 0 Sile has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of ISAP priority habilitis from sile. The sile is partially within a Decidious Woodland buffer zone. The sile may indirectly affect the fract bin plennethield to address frists. 1.6. Impact on Local Widtle Siles 0 Sile has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local widtle sites from sile. The sile is partially within a Decidious Woodland buffer zone. The sile may indirectly affect the fract bin from sile. 1.7. Flood risk ees Sile is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Lated Building or other heritage asset and efficis as from sile. Adjacent for Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development herita should on ording a treat of previous tack of meritigation. 1.9. Impact on anterage Sile is is writin (Cene Bell, where The level of ham caused by release of the land for	impact on historic
Later input of influent (invocuting 0 No Ancient (vocuting 0 1.3b. Impact on Andrein/Vietnen Trees outside of 0 No Ancient (vocuting 1 1.4b. Impact on Andrein/Vietnen Trees outside of 0 No Ancient (vocuting 1 1.4b. Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0 Stele is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. 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 heart of the implemented to address this. 1.6 Impact on Local Widdlife Sites 0 Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local widdlife sites from site. Implemented to address this. 1.7 Flood risk Implement on beffect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local widdlife sites from alle. Adjuscent to Nazeing and South Royton Conservation Area. Development there should conside the transpecies assets 1.8 Impact on herflage assets (may be within a Conservation Area or adjucent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset may be discovered on the site, but potential is Adjuscent to Nazeing and South Royton Conservation Area. Development there should conside and help quality. 1.9 Impact of ar quality 0 Site is norate matchelelebood thet further archaeological assets may be disc	impact on historic
Lab Impact on Apping Forest Buffer Land 0 Set surfaced vectors 0 1.4 Impact on Exping Forest Buffer Land 0 Set surfaced vectors 0 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats 0 No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of IGAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodand buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the here is a features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildle sites from site. The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodand buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the here is a features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildle sites from site. In a the site is partially within a Deciduous Woodand buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the here is a features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildle sites from site. In a the site is partially within a Deciduous Woodand buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the here is a features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildle sites from site. In a the site is partially within a Deciduous Woodand buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the here is a buffer down within a Conservation Area. Development here should conside a features assets 1.8. Impact on anchaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is 1.1.9. Impact of air quality 0 Site is within Green Bett 0 Site is nore than a 1000m from the nearest rail of tube station. In site lise mostly wit	impact on historic
1.4 impact on Egeng Poles Bullet Link 0 Perform the second of the s	impact on historic
1.5 implat on ber Priority species of Plastas 0 Include of ber Priority species of Plastas 0 1.6 impact on Local Wildlife Sites 0 Site has no effect as features and species could be relained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. Include states 1.7 Flood risk (#) Site within Flood Zone 1. Include states Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should conside landscape and settlement patterns. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality 1.8 Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is Include states 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site is located within Green Belt (e) Site is custed or areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality. 2.1 Level of ham to Green Belt (f) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. The site lies mostly within a Green Belt parcel of very high sensitivity but is partially developed. Duffers to the north would limit ham to the wider Green Belt to the north (which maintains the g and Roydon). 3.1 Distance to nearest bus stop (f) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. Include states 3.2 Distance to nearest to local amenties 0 Site is more than 1800m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location. Include state	impact on historic
1.3 injust on Local while sites 0 Site within Flood Zone 1. 1.7. Flood risk (44) Site within Flood Zone 1. Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should conside andscape and settlement patterns. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality 1.8. 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. Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should conside andscape and settlement patterns. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality 1.9. Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation. 1.9. Impact of air quality 0 Site is outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality. 2.1 Level of ham to Green Belt (4) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. 3.1 Distance to the nearest railrube station (4) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop (4) Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location. Image: Comparison of the nearest rail or tube station. 3.3 Distance to nearest bus stop (5) Site is more than 1600m and less than	impact on historic design/materials.
I. / Proof fisk (**) 1.8a Impact on heritage assets (*) Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should conside and scape and settlement patterns. Possible mitigated. 1.8b Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation. 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, ow or medium. The site lies mostly within a Green Belt parcel of very high sensitivity but is partially developed. Journal of the north (which maintains the g and Roydon). 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 more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location. 3.4 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rown, large village or small village.	impact on historic design/materials.
1.3a Impact on hemage assets (-) be mitigated. Iandacape and settlement patterns. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality 1.8b Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is Iandacape and settlement patterns. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site is outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality. The site lies mostly within a Green Belt governed on the nearest rail or tube station. 2.1 Level of ham to Green Belt (-) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. The site lies mostly within a Green Belt parcel of very high sensitivity but is partially developed buffers to the north (which maintains the g and Roydon). 3.1 Distance to the nearest rul/tube station (-) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop (-) Site is more than 1000m from a bus stop. Image: Site is more than 1000m from a bus stop. 3.3 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village. Image: Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	impact on historic design/materials.
1.90 impact of air quality 0 unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation. 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality. 2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt (-) Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium. The site lies mostly within a Green Belt parcel of very high sensitivity but is partially developed. 3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station (-) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. The site lies mostly within a Green Belt to the north (which maintains the g and Roydon). 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop (-) Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop. Image: Content of the intervent of the interven	
1.3 In plact of air quarity 0 Image: Constraint of a quarity 0 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 buffers to the north would limit harm to the wider Green Belt to the north (which maintains the g and Roydon). 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. Image: Constraint of the issue is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location. 3.3 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
2.1 Develor infaith to Green Beit (-) low, low or medium. buffers to the north would limit harm to the wider Green Beit to the north (which maintains the g and Roydon). 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 0 Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location. (-) 3.4 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/orimage school (-)	
3.1 Distance to the hearest fail/fube station (-) 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop (-) 3.3 Distance to employment locations 0 3.4 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	nd existing planted p between Nazeing
3.2 Distance to hearest bus stop (*) 3.3 Distance to employment locations 0 3.4 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations 0 3.4 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the pearest infent/orimany school	
Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/orimany esheet	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (-) 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, 1,200m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land () Development of the site 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.	n space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) 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 opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which i character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the	
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 Hoe Lane.	
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.	

Site Reference:	SR-0135A
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.40
Address:	Stoneyfield, Hoe Lane, Nazeing

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens

Baseline yield: 12 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on NAZ-1 which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:12



t Local Plan
1
rch 2018
9
v 2

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLoren, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmrylidia, & OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibde, GeeEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dwennigs.</u> <u>12</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard 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	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials. Historic landscape and settlement pattern should be considered.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	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 Winston Farm Lane.
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 site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B429
			l © Arup

Site Reference:	SR-0135B
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.72
Address:	Ridge House, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens

Baseline yield: 21 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on NAZ-1 which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:21



Epping Forest District Council	
Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0135B	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk
	i copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS

u-contains US data © crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METT, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmryIndia, © OpenStretMaps contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGibce, GeeEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USCS, AeroGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Instruction of mathematication Instruction Action Action 14 Impact of control brack and the off mathematication of the instruction	<u>Dweilings: 21</u>	Aerou-Kub, Kuk, and the GIS User Community			
Induction of the state of th	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
United and mathematical states and a sequence of the sequence	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0			
In input of the constraint of th	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0			
Added SectionCCC14 mere or figmer starting interpretation10Interpretation for starting starting interpretationTeams and starting interpretation interpretationTeams and starting interpretationTeams and starting interpretation14 mere or figmer starting interpretation0InterpretationTeams and starting interpretationTeams and starting interpretation15 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationTeams and starting interpretationMere interpretation15 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationTeams and starting interpretationMere interpretation16 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationTeams and starting interpretationMere interpretation16 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationTeams and starting interpretationMere interpretation17 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationTeams and starting interpretationMere interpretation17 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationTeams and starting interpretationMere interpretation18 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationInterpretationMere interpretation19 mere and starting interpretation0InterpretationMere interpretation<	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
Initial controlIIII12 special control0IInitial controlDescription of the special control in the spec		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
Landom Fund Section (1998)Pain and a strategies of a landom fund section (1998)Random fund section (1998)Landom Section (1998)Random Section (1998)Random Section (1998)Landom S	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
United and whete setNN17 No. 40No.Restance of the formation of the set of	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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
InitiationNoteNoteNote1 Initiation10initiation of the state of the st	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.		
Interfact and additionInterfactadditionadditionaddition14 interact or addition10Image addition addition addition addition addition additionImage additionImage addition14 interact or addition0Image additionImage additionImage additionImage addition14 obtaine in a new addition0Image additionImage additionImage additionImage addition14 obtaine in a new addition0Image additionImage additionImage additionImage addition14 obtaine in a new addition0Image additionImage additionImage additionImage addition14 obtaine in a new addition0Image additionImage additionImage additionImage addition14 obtaine in an addition additionImage additionImage additionImage additionImage addition15 obtaine in an addition additionImage additionImage additionImage additionImage addition16 obtaine in addition additionImage additionImage additionImage additionImage addition16 obtaine in addition additionImage additionImage additionImage additionImage addition16 obtaine in additio	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
Interfact and endormIP<IPIPIP<IP<IPIPIPIP<IPIPIPIPIPIPIP<IP<IPIP<IPIPIPIPIPIPIPIPIPIPIP<	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)		quality design/materials. Historic landscape and settlement pattern and setting of GII* LBs to south-west should be	
1 is in standard0Image: Information of the standard of the s	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0			
A Looked tool balance in a source in all tool balance in addition too in a search all to 3. De status	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
A Loticities for the referst in incluse inters CV 2D Decret for everet is a step CV Rear bank in 1000m time is the holp. 3D Science to encret is a step CV Rear bank in 1000m time is the holp. 3D Science to encret is a step CV Rear bank in 1000m time is the holp. 3D Science to encret is a step CV Rear bank in 1000m and 4000m time is the holp. 3D Science to encret is a step CV Rear bank in 1000m and 4000m time is the nearest time interpretary strood. 3D Science to encret is step CV Rear bank interpretary strood. Rear bank interpretary strood. 3D Decret to encret is step CV Rear bank interpretary strood. Rear bank interpretary strood. 3D Decret to encret is step CV Rear bank interpretary strood. Rear bank interpretary strood. 3D Decret to encret is step CV Rear bank interpretary strood. Rear bank interpretary strood. 3D Decret to encret is step CV Rear bank interpretary strood. Rear bank interpretary strood. 3D Decret to encret is step CV Rear bank interpretary strood. Rear bank interpretary strood. 4D Decret to encret is step CV Rear bank interpretary strood. Rear Bank interpretary strood. <tr< td=""><td>2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt</td><td>(-)</td><td></td><td></td></tr<>	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)			
A Under to ferent is story 10 31 Defands to energy well beatoms 00 32 Defands to energy well beatoms 00 41 Defands to boat meables 00 32 Defands to boat meables 00 33 Defands to boat meables 00 34 Defands to boat meables 00 35 Defands to boat meables 00 36 Defands to nerget well wells 00 37 Defands to nerget wells 00 36 Defands to nerget wells 00 37 Defands to nerget wells 00 36 Defands to nerget wells 00 37 Defands to nerget wells 00 30 Defands to nerget wells 00 30 Defands to nerget wells 00 31 Defands to nerget wells 00 30 Defands to nerget w	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 Journal of etypopping to column (1) Interact of etypopping to column 3.4 Defaured to local animities 0 Site between 1000m and 4000m from here results in here previde y athout Interaction of etypopping to column 3.5 Defaured to nearest inferoprimary school 0 Site between 1000m and 4000m from here results in here previde y athout Interaction of etypopping to column 3.6 Defaured to nearest issection y school 0 Site between 1000m and 4000m from here reserved to suggry. Interaction of etypopping to column 3.7 Defaure to nearest issection y school 0 Site between 1000m and 4000m from here reserved to suggry. Interaction of etypopping to column 3.7 Defaure to nearest issection y school Not applicable. Not applicable. Not applicable. 3.1 Defaure to nearest issection y school Not applicable. Not applicable. Not applicable. 4.1 Depaule to move access to quest y column 0 Defetypered of the school priority of novie the loss of plable cope space. No public com space is boated in the school priority of novie the loss of plable cope space. 4.1 Depaule to improve access to quest y column 0 Defetyperent institution of applicit of dualand column. No public com space is boated in the school plable cope space. 5.1 Section efficience in applicable con in place in a applicable contropperent without significant dualan	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.		
A statution for dural infinition Col For infinition in the nearest infinity intervention 3.5 Belance to reverse infinity intravised Col Set between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infinity intravised. Infinition 3.6 Delance to reverse infinity intravised Col Set between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest isocondary school. Infinition 3.7 Delance to reverse infinity intravised Col Set between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest Eccondary school. Set between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest Eccondary school. 3.7 Delance to reverse (P surger) Col Not splicable Not splicable Set between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest Eccondary school. 3.8 Delance to reverse (P surger) Col Not splicable Not splicable Set between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest Eccondary school. 3.8 Delance to reverse (P surger) Col Not splicable Not splicable Set between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest teccodary school. 4.1 Boondaid and Greenfield Land Col Not splicable to and motion the nearest feel school and 4000m from the nearest feel school and 4000m from the nearest feel school and 4000m from technol school and 4000m	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.		
3.3 Strained of interdict intercepting strategy 0 Interdict on intervent in	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
2.5 Diffunction to inderest electrology solution (-) Performance 3.7 Diffunction to nearest QP surgery 0. Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest QP surgery. Image: Comparison of the site surgery is the site surgery i	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.		
A. Detailed in the state of suppry 0 Interaction of the state of suppry 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network M Med aplicable. Strategic Road Network	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
a. A Access to Strategic Kook Network Image: Contract Contend Contract Contract Contract Contract Con	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
A. I brownied and Greened Lind Image: Constraints <	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.2 minuted of egriculation and of egric efrom encode of egriculation and of egriculation and of egric 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 6/d Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development the area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oll pipelines 0 Ges or oll pi	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, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.3 dapaddy to improve access to open space 0 International indext open space International international internatindext open space International internat	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		
1.1 claruscape sensitivity (1) 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 opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.1 Topography constraints (1) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: Conservation Area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Conservation Area. 6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (+) Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane. 6.6 Totific innext Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane.	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.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 If a character sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.1 Topography constraints (+) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose and constraint to the site. Image: subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Gas on oil pose a constraint to the site. Image: subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.8 Torfice impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)			
6.1 Holdgraphy Constraints (*) International and the state of	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.	
6.2b 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, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane. 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 Trafficiencent Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Expected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be mitigated.	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.		
0.2 Distance to power links 0 Image: constrained to power links 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 adjacent to the site. Although protected trees either on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Externation Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Externation (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact of Thee Preservation Order (TPO) 0 adjacent to the site. incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Winston Farm Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Existing access off Winston Farm Lane.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.4 Access to site (+) -	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0			
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) 6.6 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Winston Farm Lane.	
6.6 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. B430	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)		Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
	6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B430	

Site Reference:	SR-0136
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	1.05
Address:	Burleigh Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens and Nursery
Baseline yield:	32 dwellings
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph
baseline yield:	
0:4-	None
Site constraints:	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>

Feedback was received on NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details. <u>32</u>

Lea Hertford Brent

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0136	Rev 2

Client

E. Deutome, intermap, increment Part (2019) RE, Deutome, intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, daster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo enStreeMap aconthutous, and the GIS User Community al/Globe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, d the GIS User Community Source: Esri, Dig AeroGRID IGN



némII <t< th=""><th><u>bironingoi</u></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>	<u>bironingoi</u>			
Initial Information International State Stat	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Number of the second	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
Animal water w	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
definitioniii14mmin type from the interview0iii </td <td>1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland</td> <td>0</td> <td>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.	
InterfaceImage: Control of Con		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Data de senting sour de la mainComposition de la mainInternational de la mainInternational de la main1 baren a routa de la main12ParadoParadoParado1 baren a routa de la main12ParadoParadoParado </td <td>1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land</td> <td>0</td> <td>Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.</td> <td></td>	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Charge ControlControlControl12 Res of the Control of the Co	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.	
Interface Interface Interface Interface Interface 11 between undergroups 32 Schoolen Aufbach Schoole	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.	
La minute instantionRef inginenotify dequested.notify dequested.notify dequested.10 max in value of degres and information and informati	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Link in the index is a real of general set of gene	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	be mitigated.	Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials. Impact on historic landscape and settlement pattern should be considered.
B intra duringCInformation of the method of the meth	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
A lot men to were and P1 exc. or make. 11 Statuse to the were and the status and to the status and the status	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		
3.1 Method your metry mixed with metry 0 Performance Performance 3.2 Defaults for metry mixed with metry 0.0 Resonance and statute Performance Performance 3.3 Defaults for metry mixed with metry 0.0 Resonance and statute Performance Performance 3.4 Defaults for metry mixed with metry 0.0 Resonance and statute Performance Performance 3.5 Defaults for metry mixed with metry 0.0 Resonance and statute Performance Performance 3.6 Defaults for metry mixed with metry 0.0 Resonance and statute Performance Performance 3.7 Defaults for metry mixed with metry 0.0 Resonance and statute Resonance and statute Performance 3.7 Defaults for metry mixed with metry 0.0 Resonance and statute Resonance and statute Performance 3.7 Defaults for metry mixed with metry mixed with metry metry statute Resonance and statute Performance Performance 3.7 Defaults for metry mixed with metry mixe	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	low, low or medium.	
3.2 Users to there the strate of the ere based on the strate state and the strate state of the ere based on the strate state and the strate state is and the ere strate is anot the ere strate is and the ere strate is anot the	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 Joaching and entryfield clocking 0 Information in the name of the state in the name of the state in the state	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3 - Defaulte Under Handback Image: Control of the	3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.3 Defande to Humiter	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.0 Udentitie 0 Indentitie Vectorality Sectoral (1) Information on the relatest CP surgery (2) 3.7 Distance to nearest CP surgery (2) Set is between 1000n num the relatest CP surgery (2) 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network (2) More policials (2) More policials 4.1 Becomfield and Greenfield Land (2) More policials (2) Destigament on substratest web only possible (2) 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (2) Destigament on the relatest of the site substratest on out versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). (2) (2) 4.1 Capacity to improve access to open space (2) Destigament indications is policity open space. (2) (2) 6.2 Settiment character settistity (4) Setel settiment indications is policity open space. (2)	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.7 Description of inferences of subject y 0 Inference of the subject y 0 3.8 Access to Stratigic Road Network 0.4 Not applicable. 50% greenfield set, 500m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazaing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 0.4 Modeplicable. 50% greenfield set, 500m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazaing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land 0.4 Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most wrastle agricultural land (grades 1-3). Inferences of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0.0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Inferences of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 6.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0.0 Sterefield sets of would prove development within an area of medium indicape area resident of the indicape area resident of the adjucces of the adju	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.5 Access to statigic road network Image: Construction of the static statigic road network Image: Construction of the static stat	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4.1 Brownied and Greenies Land 1 4.1 Brownied and Greenies Land 1 4.2 Inpact on agricultural land 1 Performant of the sile would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grodes 1-3). Including a performant of the sile would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grodes 1-3). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Performant without significant character sensitivity. Including a performant without significant character change. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Performant without significant character. Site is identified as a potential coportunity area. Low denoty development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential coportunity area. Low denoty development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Performant is wist in the site but potential for mitigation. Site is identified as a potential coportunity area. Low denoty development without significant character change. 6.2 Distance to gas and all pipelines 0 Rear on all pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Include and pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Impact on the subability of the subabilis development would be constrained by the presence of	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2 Inpact of agricultural and1011114.3 Capacity to improve access to open space0Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.1115.1 Landscape sensitivity60Site fails within an area or medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change1115.2 Settement character sensitivity0Development is unlikely to have an effect on settement character.Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development years, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.6.1 Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.111Site a constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines0Ges or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.1116.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)(4)The intersity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated in the suitability of the site for development6.4 Access to site(4)Suitable access to site already exists.Xisting access of Winston Farm Lane.6.5 Contamination constraints(4)Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.Xisting access of Winston Farm Lane.6.5 Contamination constraints(5)Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depo). Potential adverse impact thing adverse impact that could be mitigated.6.5 Contamination constraints(6)Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.Potential con	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, 900m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.3 capadoty to improve access to open space 0 International constraints 1 International constraints	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()		
S.1 Landscape sensitivity (r) and able to absorb development without significant character change. S.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.1 Topography constraints (r) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: Conservation Area. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Conservation Conservation Area. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (r) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either 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 and the site site of development and the site of development and the site of development and the site site of development and the site of development and the site of development and the site site of development and the site of development and t	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 If a character sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.1 Topography constraints (e) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose and constraint to the site. Image: subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area. 6.2 b Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: subject to gas and oil pipelines 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (e) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either 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 (e) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Winston Farm Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (f) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)		
C. 1. HOUGRIGHTY CONSTRAINTSC.6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines0Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.6.2b Distance to power lines0Power 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 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 development6.4 Access to site(+)Suitable access to site already exists.Existing access of Winston Farm Lane.6.5 Contamination constraints(+)Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0		Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.
B.2.a Distance to gas and on pipelines0An an	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)		
6.20 Distance to power times 0 Image: constrained to power times 0 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 could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.4 Traffic impact Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time. Existing access of Winston Farm Lane.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0		
6.3 Impact on the Preservation Order (TPO) (*) the site. the site. the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development 6.4 Access to site (*) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Winston Farm Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (*) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.6 Traffic impact 0 Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time. Existing access off Winston Farm Lane.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0		
6.4 Access to site (*) 6.5 Contamination constraints (·) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.6 Traffic impact 0.0	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.5 Contamination constraints (-)	6.4 Access to site	(+)		
	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)		Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
	6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B431

	-
Site Reference:	SR-0150
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	1.43
Address:	The Fencing Centre, Pecks Hill, Nazeing, EN9 2NY
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Fencing centre (open storage and glasshouse/warehouse storage)
Deceline vield.	42 dwollings
Baseline yield:	43 dwenings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>

Feedback was received on NAZ-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details. <u>43</u>



Epping Forest District Council	
Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0150	Rev 2
ARUI © Contains OS data © Crown	

database ngm (2016) icrement P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN vey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto , and the GIS User Community ar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, Iby Eye, Earths



<u>Dweinings.</u> 45			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	70% brownfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	The relevant site character context is partially urban but in part countryside, which is moderately sensitive to the impacts of development. The form and extent of development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impacts.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run-down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is a fencing centre and is identified as a potential opportunity 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 off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Builders Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B432
		•	© Arup

Site Reference:	SR-0152
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	1.11
Address:	Lakeside Nursery, Pecks Hill, Nazeing, EN9 2NW

 Primary use:
 Residential

 Site notes:
 Open storage yard near nurseries

Baseline yield: 7 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:7



Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0152	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBae, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapminidia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digital/Globe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within a Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh buffer and partially within two other 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 Lee Valley Central 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield), adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run-down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is an open storage yard behind existing housing. 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	()	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 North Street.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination on western part of site (Infilled Gravel Pit). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B433

Site Reference:	SR-0160
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	3.04
Address:	Fernbank Nursery, Nazeing Road, Nazeing, Essex

Primary use: Residential Site notes: Nursery

Baseline yield: 73 - 122 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>73</u>

<u>Dwellings:</u>



strict Council
strict Local Plan
Date
March 2018
Issue
Rev 2
Epping Forest District Council

abase ngm (2016) ament P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, F. Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop nd the GIS User Community Beographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS,



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat and 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 Lee Valley Central 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 opportunity area. It is located on the edge of the existing settlement. However, low density development is proposed which reflects 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 by Nazeingbury Parade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, Infilled Gravel Pit and 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.	B434
			© Arup

	-
Site Reference:	SR-0166
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.42
Address:	Spinney Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens
Baseline yield:	13 dwellings
•	
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
basenne yielu.	
Site	None
constraints:	
	None
Site selection	None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>

Feedback was received on NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details. <u>13</u>



Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0166	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk

s contains to a use & crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, Ebelorne, Intermap, increment P Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmri/Idla, & OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Comunity Source: Earl, DigitalGibde, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard 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	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials. Historic landscape and settlement patterns and setting of Grade II* LBs to south-west should be considered.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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.	80% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	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 Winston Farm Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Car Breakers). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B435
	•	•	© Arup

	5
Site Reference:	SR-0172
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.27
Address:	Vine Cottage, Betts Lane, Nazeing, EN9 2DA
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Small field and two cottages.
Popolino violdu	10 dwellings comprising 4 market homes and 6 affordable homes
Baseline yield.	to dwellings comprising 4 market nomes and 6 anordable nomes
Source for	Indicated in Call for Sites
baseline yield:	
Site	None
constraints:	
Site selection	None
adjustment:	

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>10</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London

Client	
Epping Forest	District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0172	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk
	copyright and database right (2016) ie, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBae, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapminidia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalCitote, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, AeroGRDI, ON, and the GIS User Community



Nome information of the second seco				
Induction for the set of the	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
OnlocationVRequest setu to diskImage and setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationationDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskDesign and setu to diskRelationation of the setu to diskRel	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
uninclementationvvand control of the second	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Balance State	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Control Question Unit Unit UnitControl Question UnitControl Question UnitRestand Qu		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Hamback Hold Hold Hold Hold Hold Hold Hold Hold	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Interface of the Source of t	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 habitat, and these effects may not be mitigable.
Initiation<	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.	
100 Minister100 Minister <th< td=""><td>1.7 Flood risk</td><td>(++)</td><td>Site within Flood Zone 1.</td><td></td></th<>	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Non-Nucleon With With With With With With With With	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	be mitigated.	mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials and by considering impact on Locally Listed
1 in Fund with the Grant with the G	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
A Location from more calification Get Figs may from the source calification Get B Datator from more calification Get Bet in the source calification Get B Datator from more calification Get Bet in the source calification Get B Datator from more calification Get Bet in the source calification Get B Datator from more calification Get Bet in the source calification Get B Datator from more calification Get Bet in the source calification Get B Datator from more calification Get Bet in the source calification Get B Datator from more calification Get Bet in the source calification of the source c	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		
Control for the method in proceeding in thick we had in the orige intervent that is the proceeding or sensitivity of the sensif sedifficuation of the sensitivity of the sensitivity	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	very high.	
2 Junction is statesting is soon 60 94 a root in a root in a soon in a so	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.3 District the steppinghet roccom 40 4.1 Detanot to local anerlies 0 Bits battere to 100m and 4000m from there rearest infragionary school. Image: Comparison of the comparis	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
Calculation Control Control Control 13 Distance to nearest infant/primary school Sine is between 100m and 400m from the nearest infant/primary school. Incomplete infant/primary school Sine is between 100m and 400m from the nearest isocordary school. Incomplete infant/primary school Sine is between 100m and 400m from the nearest isocordary school. Incomplete infant/primary school Sine isocordary school	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.3 Distance to rearest tencordary school 0 Image: Control of tenters there is the reaction of tenters to the reaction of tenters tencordary school Image: Control of tenters tencordary school	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
As balance in feature statuting sta	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
A. I character in the intervence of strategies O Intervence of a strategies Road Network Not applicable. A. Reservence of strategies Road Network Mot applicable. 70% greenfield site, 2,100m from an existing settlement (Lover Nazeing). A. I ferrentifield and Greenfield Land Co Motoprint of the site is greenfield land that is nether within nor adjacent to a settlement. 70% greenfield site, 2,100m from an existing settlement (Lover Nazeing). A. I capacity to improve access to open space. Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Interventifield site, 2,100m from an existing settlement (Lover Nazeing). A. I capacity to improve access to open space. Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid proteintial adverse impact A. I capacity to improve access to open space. Development could detext trom the existing settlement character. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid proteintial adverse impact S. I capacity to improve access to open space. Development could detext trom the existing settlement character. Ste is within a very low density area with settlement development would not be constrained to the avec. S. I capacity to improve access not approve traines O Recenter area densitient of any development would not be constrained to the alter. <tr< td=""><td>3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school</td><td>(-)</td><td>Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.</td><td></td></tr<>	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
a A Access to strategic road network Image: Constraints	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. I provinted and ordermies Lind CP Performed or the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land CP Development unikely to involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity CP Site fails within a rans of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to charage The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity CP Development cultural character. Site in within a very low density area with scattered development and ut. Therefore, development a likely to affect the pradominanty rural character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Rover lines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Comparison of the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Rover lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Comparison of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The infantsity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or affected to site. Existing access from Betts Lane. 6.4 Access to site 0 No contentimation susses identified on site to date.	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
**. Impact of agricultural and C*	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, 2,100m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.3 Capacity to iniprove access to their space 0 For the number of the space of the spa	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
0.1 Landscape sensitivity 01 and able to absorb development without significant character change. on the wider landscape character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 01 Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Set is within a very tow density area with scattered developments around it. 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. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Rover lines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Rover lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 Reventines of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. Existing access from Betts Lane. 6.4 Access to site 0 No contamination sites identified on site to date. No polential contamination identified. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination site is identified on site to date. No polential contamination identified.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Control of the area. the predominantly rural character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Control of the area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose an constraint to the site. Image: Control of the area. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Control of the area. 6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. Existing access from Betts Lane. 6.4 Access to site (c) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access from Betts Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No polential contamination identified.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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.	
0.1 Holography Consumins 0 Set Particular Set Part	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)		
6.24 Distance to gas and on pipelines 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 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access from Betts Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
0.20 Distance to power lines 0 Image: Comparison of 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 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 from Betts Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0		
6.3 Impact on The Preservation Order (TPO) 0 adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access from Betts Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.4 Access to site (+) 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified. 6.5 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	adjacent to the site.	
6.5 Contamination constraints 0 6.6 Troffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.6 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.5 Contamination constraints	0		No potential contamination identified.
	6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B436

Site Reference: Parish: Size (ha): Address:	: SR-0191 Nazeing 0.68 Royd, St Leonards Road, Nazeing
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Existing dwelling house and garden
Baseline yield: Source for baseline yield:	6 to 8 dwellings Indicated in Call for Sites
Site constraints:	Flood risk would mean only 4/5 of site is developable. Also circa 90% of the site is covered by SR-0507, with only the access left this means the site has a zero yield when avoiding double counting.
Site selection adjustment:	Capacity partially reinstated for site selection assessment, however 20% reduction remains to account for flood risk.
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

Dwellings:

<u>8</u>

elles Hertford shu Brentw

Client Epping Forest District Council Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan Drawing Status Date March 2018 lssue Drawing No Issue Rev 2 ARUP Epping Forest District Council

ght and database right (2016) srmap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, nce Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo tributors, and the GIS User Community Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, , Earthsta



Instruction of mathematical structure Col Instrument of the structure of the structur				
1 Interface1 InterfaceImage: Image: Im	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
LatisticationLatisticationLatisticationLatisticationListication10Interference descent sets solit.LatisticationListication10Interference descent sets solit.Latisti	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
La index index, inclusion Image of the product of t	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
VielderGodyVielderGod	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Change and stands		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
11 Plane on the state of the state of the state balance o	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Control Control Control 1276-0417a 10 Result information of the control Second information of the control of the cont	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 BAP priority habitat buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
12 Probin 000000000000000000000000000000000000	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.	
Lake informationColColCol12. But speed on an extractingColThe amendment information in a multiple state information information information in	1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 36% of the site falls within Flood Zone 2 of which 20% is in Flood Zone 3a and 8% in Flood Zone 3b. The location of the higher Flood Zones in the north-eastern part of the site are such that the south-western part of the site could be developed.
I a financial status V Automa is much diposed to do in segion Initial status 1 Dispace of al quality 0 Note and the status of the status o	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
Lating	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0		
21 Edited with the finate of lates in the finate of lates in the finate of lates in the matrix of a lates in the ma	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		
11 Joarding in the fielder all nucle tainon 0 Image: Comparison 0 12 Dilation the fielder all nucle tainon 10 Re units of tainon 10 13 Dilation the membry handle tails on tainon 10 Re units of tainon 10 13 Dilation the membry handle tails on tainon 10 Re units of tainon 10 14 Dilation the membry handle tails on tainon 100 Re in this tainon 10 14 Dilation the membry handle tails on tainon 100 Re in this tainon 10 15 Dilation the membry handle tails on tainon 100 Re in this tainon 10 15 Dilation the membry handle tails 100 Re in this tainon 10 16 Dilation the membry handle tails 100 Re in this tainon 10 17 Dilation the membry handle tails 100 Re in this tainon 10 18 Dilation the membry handle tails 100 Re in this tainon 10 10 Dilation the membry handle tails 100 Re in this tainon 10 10 Dilation the membry handle tails 100 Re in this tainon 10 Re in this tainon 12 Dilation the membry handle tails an oxit tainon 10 Re in this tainon<	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	low, low or medium.	
12 Unified to Number data stap (e) Intervent to end provide the stap of the state of the stap of the st	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 Justice delipopinistic scalaries (H) Functional control of a statution of the intervent tool, large value or small value. 3.4 Distance to local america. (H) Set is the site han 1000m from nearest tool, large value or small value. 3.5 Distance to nearest infervirprinary school (H) Set is the site han 1000m from hereeret (infertiprinary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest infervirprinary school (H) Set is the site han 1000m from the secret (infertiprinary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest a secondary school (H) Set is the site han 1000m from the secret (infertiprinary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest a secondary school (H) Set is the site han 1000m from the secret (infertiprinary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest a secondary school (H) Set is the site han 1000m from the secret (infertiprinary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest a secondary school (H) Mapping the site school from the secret (Infertiprinary school. 4.1 Inconclicat and Gisenthicit Land (H) Mapping the site school from the lease of the best of plate control is plate control is under school school from the secret school is under school from the secret character of the sets. 5.1 Lindocope ev	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.4 Detailed is ford antifiction (1) Control (1) State is the informative school (1) 3.5 Detailers to nearest informity school (1) State is an antificative school is school (1) 3.6 Detailers to nearest excentary school (1) State is an antificative school is school (1) 3.6 Detailers to nearest GP argery (1) State is an antificative school is school (1) 3.6 Access to Strategic Read Network (1) Met applicable. (1) 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (1) Met applicable. (1) 4.2 Impact on agrinulting and (2) Development of the site word involve the loss of the best and most versalle agricultural tand (grades 1-3). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to gran space. Antigligite part of the site contains public com space. The proposals could be crifiqued to avoid loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscope sensitivity 0 Beelogment unikely to have an after on space. Antigligite part of the site contains public com space. The proposals could be crifiqued to avoid loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscope sensitivity 0 Beelogment unikely to have an after on space. Antigligite part of the site contains public com space. The proposals could be crifiqued to avoid loss of public comes. 6.1 Toporgaphy constates 0 Bee	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.5 Desired of present interprinting unity strotcol (*) (*) Set of the next of the nex	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.4 Detailed is the lenses sectionary school (*) Image: Control of the section of the interest GP surgery 3.7 Detailed to the setters sectionary school (*) Site is set than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery. Image: Control of the setters sectionary school Site is set than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Control of the setter school of the sette	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.7 Jostimite B interfet Greining (r) Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (r) Mojority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 80% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeling). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (r) Development of the site would involve the loss of he best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development of the site would involve the loss of public open space. Antegligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Strefets within an area of fow iondicage sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodated the accent is urban and development is unikely to adversely affect the wider landscape are able to accommodate the character. Low density development is proposed within reflects the sensitium of the area. 6.1 Topography contraints 0 Development would be potentia for mitigation. Low density development is proposed within reflects the sensitium of the area. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Cas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Imported the site or or adjacent to the site or adjacent to the site or or adjacent to the site or adjacent to the site or adjacent to the site or or adjacent to the site or or adjacent to the site orout adjacent proposest, subject to no esting access through the pi	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.6 Access to Strategic Hoat Network Image: Contract of the state is greenfield land within a settlement. 60% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nizzeing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (+) Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 60% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nizzeing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (+) Development of the site so of public open space. Anegigible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate the sensitivity of the sensitivity adversely affect the wider landscare. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Low density development is proposal whith reflects the semi-cural character of the area. Therefore, development of Rel Reg b have an impact on the character of the area. 6.1 Topographic constraints 0 Development would be constraint exat in the site bud potential for mitigation. Impact on the character of the area. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Gas on oil pipelines do not pose ary constraint to the site. Impact on the site could be incorporated into the development is unlikely to have a significant adverse impace on the site for development is unlikely to the site to be created through third party land aregreement in place, or existing access to th	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
1.1 biolominate and understand (*) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 impact on agricultural land (*) Development of the site would involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate the area creater. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape area. The proposal which reflects the semi-ural character of the area. Therefore, 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-ural character of the area. Therefore, development 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. Impact on adjustent to the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Impact on adjustent to mail adverse mpact on the site could be incorporated into the development it building to the well multiply of the site for development. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (*) The Intensity of site developmene	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
1.2 implication algorithm Left Production algorithm 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodat development is unikely to adversely affect the wider landscape area able to accommodat. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unikely to adversely affect the wider landscape area able to accommodat. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unikely to have an effect on settlement character. Low density development is proposed which reflects the semi-ural character of the area. Therefore, development 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. 8.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or nil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. 8.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (r) The intensity of also development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care. 8.4 Access to alle (r) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitiggated. Existing track off St. L	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	80% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
A. Suppletly to improve access to open space 0 Step open. space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Step fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development site. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape are able to accommodate development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape are able to accommodate development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape are able to accommodate development is proposed which reflects the semi-trual character of the 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-trual character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (c) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Interview and the site. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Interview and adverse impact on the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (c) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the suitability of the site for development the site. 6.4 Access to site (c)	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
b.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 development without significant character change. 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 proposed which reflects the semi-rural character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (c) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Ges 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) (c) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development proposed. 6.4 Access to site (c) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Existing track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access through third party land. 6.5 Contamination constraints (c) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.4 Totating impact Site be	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 1 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. 1 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. 1 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 1 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 could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to car 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 (-) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Existing track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access through third party land. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0		The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
0.1 htpography Constraints (1) Index of the state of the stat	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.
6.28 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 For the article integrated of a single integrated of a sin	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.20 Distance to power lines 0 Image: constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to cat 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 could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to cat 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 Existing track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access through third party land. 6.5 Contamination constraints (·) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Largefinianeed Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Potential contamination (within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 impact on the Preservation Order (1PO) (+) the site. the site. 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 (-) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Existing track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access through third party land. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Existing track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access through third party land.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0		
6.4 Access to site (-) would require upgrade. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.6 Exrefine impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) 6.6 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.4 Access to site	(-)	would require upgrade.	
	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)		Potential contamination (within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
	6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B437

Site Reference:	SR-0212
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	6.00
Address:	Lea Bank Nursery, Sedge Green, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5JS
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Glasshouses

Baseline yield: 180 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>180</u>



Job Title	
Environ Econot Dist	
Epping Forest Dist	rict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0212	Rev 2

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmylindia, OpenStineeMpp contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGiobe, Geolye, Earlhaur Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, AnorORHD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh 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.	Over 99% of the site is located in Flood Zone 1, with less than 1% in the north-west of the site in Flood Zone 2. This can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Scheduled Monument, Conservation Area, or Grade I Listed Building due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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, 1,000m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouse area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, infilled pit / pond, electric sub station, 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.	B438
		•	© Arup

	-	2-1
Site Reference:	SR-0213	Hertf
Parish:	Nazeing	5
Size (ha):	4.85	
Address:	Bettina Nursery and Ashley Nursery, Sedge Green, Roydon, CM19 5JS	1A
Primary use:	Residential	eshur
Site notes:	Existing nurseries/glasshouses	4
		4
Baseline yield:	146 dwellings	
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph	Client
baseline yield:		Ерр
		Job Tit
		Ерр
Site constraints:	None	Drawir
constraints:		lssu
		Drawin
Site selection	None	SR-0
adjustment:		Δ

Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
feedback:	near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>146</u>

Hertford Breatwood

Job Title	
Epping Forest District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0213	Rev 2
ARUI	

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Conp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Madater NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Jagan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, & OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, IgoliaGilobe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 identified as a potential regeneration area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouses area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, car repairs and respraying, within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B439
L	ļ	1	©Arut

Site Reference:	SR-0232
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	3.36
Address:	Low Hill Nursery, Sedge Green, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5JR

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 101 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
<u>Dwellings:</u>	<u>101</u>

Lea Hertford Brent

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0232	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest
ΑΚΟΙ	

Eye, Earth

Source: Esri, Dig AeroGRID, IGN

DS, USDA, USGS



Number Anderson Anderson Anderson Op Indexter Anderson Anderson Deckson Anderson A	<u>Dwellings: 101</u>	AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community			
Linking <t< td=""><td>Criteria</td><td></td><td>Score</td><td>Qualitative Assessment</td></t<>	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
Answer No. No. No. No. 12 impact and read works of the second and general second general second and general second and general second	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0			
Linking Linkin	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 SSSIs.		
Normalization Normalization Normalization Normalization 14 reparts from the larget Ref Bet starts in reparts of prominent barber Ref	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
Number Number Number Number 12.10000000 P Hinde and experimental		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
Number Number Number Number Number Linger of number 10 Information constructions Reserved in the state of number of constructions of c	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
I mit all wild wild wild wild wild wild wild wi	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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and Deciduous Woodland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
I I RADIA I Mail 1 Ide repaid of reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de repaid of reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de repaid of reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de repaid of reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de repaid of reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de repaid of reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de repaid of reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refer of reflex surses 00 1 de reflex surses 00 Refererlex s	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 Lee Valley North LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.	
Listing of a length state1011Definition (a length state)10Definition (a length state)20Definition (a length state)20Defin	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
International control of particle in the set of the se	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on Scheduled Monument, Conservation Area, or Grade I Listed Building due to distance.	
1 = the stand with a stand	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0			
21 Update limits of setter limits 10 100 all limits of setter limits 0 85 is before a 100 all limits of setter limits 0 31 Datamate the nearest nutrition statup 00 85 is a within 400 m to be satured if or labe status 100 all limits the nearest nutrition statup 00 85 is a within 400 m to be satured if or labe status 100 all limits the nearest nutrition statup 00 85 is a within 400 m to be satured if or labe status 100 all limits the nearest nutrition statup 00 85 is a within 400 m to be satured if or labe status 100 m to be satured if or labe status	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
1 Optimized for the first standard standard 20 12 Optimized for the released link data stap 81 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 81 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 80 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 81 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 81 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 81 bits bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 81 bits bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 90 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 90 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 90 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link data 90 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link writher 400m of a but step. 90 bits writher 400m of a but step. 3.1 Optimized for released link writher 400m of a but step. 190 greenfield step. 600m from an existing settlement Lower hazaregi. 3.1 Optimized for released link writher 400m of the step. 190 greenfield step. 600m from an existing settlement Lower hazaregi. 4.1 Shound but writher 400m of the step. 19	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()			
12 J bitsince is empoyment locations 10 Find match is staged 10 3.3 Distance is empoyment locations 0 Site increment 1000 minute stages and polyment state/solution. Incremental solution is an employment state/solution. 3.4 Distance is empoyment locations 0 Site is between 1000m and exponent tool non namest born large stigger or small stillapp. Incremental solution and exponent state/solution. 3.6 Distance is evenerating stypinary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest fide stiggery. Incremental solution and exponent state/solution. 3.6 Distance is evenerating school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest fide stiggery. Incremental solution. 3.7 Distance is evenerating school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. Incremental solution. 3.6 Access to Strategic Road Network 0 Mapping of the site is greenified bard is an effer and mod versatile agriculture iand (grapps -1). Incremental solution. 4.1 Brownford and Coererised Land 0 Development Linkely to mole the loss of public open space. No public open space is located in the site area. Development with mapping reservation on aread (grapps -1). 3.1 Indicase evenishify 0 Development Linkely to mole the loss of public open space. No public open space is located in the site area. Development cureat and within area adgr	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
12.5 Account of unpyonishin Account 0 Image: Count of unpyonishin Account 0 3.4 Status 0 Bit is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest lead lighting Status 13.5 Datases to local anemates 0 Bit is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest lead lighting Status 13.6 Datases to local anemates 0 Bit is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest lead lighting Status 13.6 Datases to local anemates 0 Bit is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest lead lighting Status 13.7 Datases to local anemates 0 Bit is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest lead lighting Status 14.1 Brownfed and Greenfed Land 0 More applicable. 100% greenfield and, 800m from an existing estimater (Lower Nazahg). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land 0 Moreopremet of the site and prove threads of the land data is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield and, 800m from an existing estimater (Lower Nazahg). 4.3 Lighting to improve access to open space 0 Decorporation (How lead on the site and prove threads of the land data is neither within on adjacent to associate and the loss of public open space. No public open space is located in the site anse. Development (Lower Nazahg). 4.3 Lighting to improve access to open space 0 Decorporetin trais access of the land data is neither wit	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.		
3-1 Description for whereast inframply many school 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inframply many school. 3.5 Distance to rearest excendary school 00 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inframply many school. 3.6 Distance to rearest excendary school 00 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inframply many school. 3.7 Distance to rearest QP surgery 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest QP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Nedvork. 10 Not applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 40 Nearest is greenfield and multi is nether within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield ells, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Neareling). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 40 Development of the site is greenfield and multi is nether within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield ells, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Neareling). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 40 Development within on and not be tota of public open space. No public open space is located in the site area. Development within on real rout building ellement daracter. 5.1 Landschape sensitivity 00 Between rout building ellement daracter. Site is destified as a potential opportunity area. It is for anyop from main settlement area is hout on the reasent of public open space. 5.1 Landschap sensitivity 00 <	3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location.		
3.15 basissie to instruction to material intergrammaly should 0 Interfact on provide the interest intergrammaly should 0 3.6 Defaunce to nearest GP surgery 0 Site in ore than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. Interfact on provide the interest of the surgery. 3.6 Access to Strategic Road Network. Interfact on and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. Interfact on an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Load O Montport of the site ore than 4000m from the test on a discort to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, 600m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land O Development of the site ore table on provide the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development interface on agricultural land (grades 1-3). 5.1 Landscape sentitivity 0 Set first whim an array of fow landscape are able to accommodate 6.1 Landscape sentitivity 0 Set endettement character. Set is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is for away from main settlement and within an existing settlement character. 6.1 Landscape sentitivity 0 Set on opportunity area. It is for away from main settlement and within an existing settlement character. 6.1 Landscape sentitivity 0 Ges orid pipprisen may originant character. A	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
3.6 Distance to rearrest GP surgery 0 Sie between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Sie between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network 1 Not applicable. 100% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lowr Nazeing). 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, 800m from an existing settlement (Lowr Nazeing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 100% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lowr Nazeing). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development without isouf the best of public open space. No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 6.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Beefels within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is for away from main settlement and within an existing getternent character change. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE mode consultation zone along the northerm site boundary. M is possible out to board mean	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.		
3.7. Detailed in features of soliphy 0 Interfact on the set of the set	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.8 Addees to shalebig road readors Image: Control of the set of	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
4.1 browmed and Greemen Land Left Provide a constraint of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land Left Development of the sile would involve the loss of public open space. No public open space is located in the sile area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 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 sile area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glate area. Development may contribute to urban spraw and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Development may constraints are identified in the site. Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. Mis a possible due to location of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint on the si	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
** 2 minute on agricultural and end 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 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glas area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the char due area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glas area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the char due area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. Mis is possible due to location of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development affected area. 6.2b Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultatio	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, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
A.3. Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Interview access to open space 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glas area. Development may contribute to urban spraw and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character area. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glas area. Development may contribute to urban spraw and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Potential constraints are identified on the site but there is potential for mitigation. Spossible due to location of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development affected area. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Is possible due to location of the affected area. 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. Access off Sedge Green. 6.4 Access to site	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		
5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines (c) Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation. Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. M is possible due to location of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development 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, as a result of their locations it is likely that they incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access of Sedge Green.	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.	
0.1 Settletiletit Character Sensitivity (r) area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the charatter sensitivity 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. Miss possible due to location of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development affected area. 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. Mis possible due to location of the affected area. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 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, as a result of their locations it is likely that they incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access of Sedge Green.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0			
6.1 Hopography constraints 0 An example Approximately 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. Mise possible due to location of the affected area. 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 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. Mise possible due to location of the affected area. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site site as a result of their locations it is likely that they incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 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, as a result of their locations it is likely that they incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access of Sedge Green.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouse area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area.	
6.24 Distance to gas and oil pipelines (+) is possible due to location of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development affected area. 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, as a result of their locations it is likely that they incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access off Sedge Green.	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		
6.20 Distance to power lines 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 7 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access off Sedge Green.	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 22% of the site is located in HSE middle consultation zone along the northern site boundary. Mitigation is possible due to location of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development for affected area.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 adjacent to the site. incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Access off Sedge Green. 0 Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery and Haulage Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
0.4 ACCess to site (*) Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery and Haulage Denot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery and Haulage Denot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitig	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.	
6.5 Contamination constraints Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery and Haulage Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access off Sedge Green.	
	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery and Haulage Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact 0 Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time. B440	6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B440	

Site Reference:	SR-0238
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	3.37
Address:	Stoneshot Farm, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RN

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 24 dwellings comprising 12 market homes and 12 affordable

Source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
<u>Dwellings:</u>	<u>24</u>

Lea Hertford shu Brenty

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0238	Rev 2
ARUI	
πιυ	

Client

), NPS, NRCAN Kong), swissto GIS us DS, USDA, USGS



Normal Section Marka Section Se	<u></u>				
In Institutional year, and the set of t	Criteria	Score			
Index and with the second se	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0			
Januar de la construction de la con	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 SSSIs.		
Additional ControlColColCol14 read on Caper formal MarkenColSo - Addition and Caper Society Society and Society	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
ConstructionColConstructionColConstructionCol11 space in March States and LawColMarka States and LawDefine and Marka States and LawDefine and Marka States and LawDefine and Marka States and Law11 space in March States and LawColMarka States and LawDefine and Marka States and LawDefine and Marka States and Law11 space in March States and LawColMarka States and LawDefine and Marka States and LawDefine and Marka States and Law12 space in Marka States and LawColMarka States and LawDefine and Marka States and LawDefine and Marka States and Law13 space in Marka States and LawColMarka States and LawDefine and Marka States and LawDefine and Marka States and Law13 space in Marka States and LawColMarka States and LawDefine and Marka States and LawDefine and Law14 space in Marka States and LawColMarka States and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law13 space in Marka States and LawMarka States and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law14 space and LawDefine and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law15 space and LawDefine and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law16 space and LawDefine and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law17 space and LawDefine and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law18 space and LawDefine and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law19 space and LawDefine and LawDefine and LawDefine and Law<	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
InductionImage	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
on the controlVVInterpretation12 boddsRefRef status of the control of the con	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.		
run nurun nurunrun1 al modulum tay minute set of a bar and and the set of a bar and	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.		
out input or investoryICinvestoryICinvestory18. Input or investory10.The 1 is a nuclear induct of private allocation of the sits, target of an expection input of private allocation of the sits, target of an expection input of private allocation of the sits, target of an expection input of private allocation of private allocation of the sits, target of an expection of private allocation of the sits, target of an expection of the sits, target o	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
Non-Index constraintsIPProcessar was for devenue on the devenue of management13 makes of a constraintIPResultance of each of the one devenue of the devenue of th	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.		
In Function durationColConstraint of the interfactor of the other sector	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0			
A L Note and used one data Model Name Name Name 3 1 Debate to the merrecipility station Get Bet note that station Get Bet note that station Get 3 1 Debate to the merrecipility station Get Bet note that station Get Bet note that station Get 3 1 Debates to the merrecipility station Get Bet note that station Get Bet note that station Get 3 1 Debates to the merrecipility station Get Bet note that station Bet note that station Bet note that station in the nearest station station static station station Get Bet note that station static station static station static static station static	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
Control for the matrix introlocation CP 20 Detains for measers in micro and the set for 200m from an employment solucation. Image: Control for measers in micro measere in micro measers in micro measers in micro measere	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()			
A clusters to serging with length of the serging with leng	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
a Definition (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) 3 Definition (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) 3 Definition (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) 3 Definition (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) 3 Definition (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) 3 Definition (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (description in detailing segments) 3 Definition (description in detailing segments) image: constraint (descriptin in detailing segments) image	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.		
A distinct for local attention O Interaction 15 Distances to nearest inflat/primary school 0.0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school. Interaction is nearest inflat/primary school 0.0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest is school 29 surgery. Interaction is nearest inflat/primary school 0.0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest is school 29 surgery. Interaction is nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest 09 surgery. Interaction is nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest 09 surgery. Interaction is nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest 09 surgery. Interaction is nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest 09 surgery. Interaction is nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary school Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest inflat/primary sch	3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location.		
a Definition to realized to realized secondary school image: constraints and secondary school image: constraints an	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.		
a loadinate is reteries sectionary doubt (1) Interview of the sectionary doubt (1) 3.7 Definition to rearest QP suggery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the maneret GP suggery. Interview of the sectionary doubt	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.		
A. Clearing in Instancts Or Strategic Road Network Not applicable. Mot applicable. A. B. Access to Strategic Road Network Not Mot applicable. Software in the strategic Road Network Software in the strategic Road Networe Networe Road Road Network Software i	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3 A Access to studiegh root Network Image: Contraction of the state studie and Contraction of the state studie and inclusive the loss of the best and most versalle agricultural land (grades 1.3). 0% greenfield sile, 1,500m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land Image: Contraction of the state would involve the loss of the best and most versalle agricultural land (grades 1.3). Image: Contraction of the state would involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space. Image: Contraction of the state would involve the loss of public open space. Image: Contraction of the contraction of the state would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity Image: Contraction of the state would involve the loss of public open space. State fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to character State fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to character 5.2 Settement character sensitivity Image: Contraction of the state would be contracter of the state. State fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - character state within an existing disadvapes ence. 6.1 Topography constraints Image: Contraction of the state. State fails within an existing estitution the state. State fails within an existing estitution of the state. 6.2 Distance to power lines Image: Contraction of the state. State fails within an exist and exist on contractint to the sile.	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
A. I provinted and creating and creatin	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
*** Impact of agliculture fails Impact of agliculture fails Impact of agliculture fails 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Pevelopment unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Impact of agliculture fails Impact of aglicu	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	60% greenfield site, 1,500m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 International constraints 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (c) Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouses area. Development may contribute to urban spraw and therefore is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. International constraints on the site of the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Res or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. International constraints to the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. International constraints to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (c) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the suite for development 6.4 Access to site (c) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (c) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Farm / Ind	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		
5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) and able to absorb development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site below settlement and within an existing glasshouses area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Rower lines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraint to the site. 6.2 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) (-) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the evelopment 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 in the adjust. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mittgated. Detenti	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.		
9.2.5 Setuential Character setisivity (1) Intervention of the setise of the set of the setise of the set o	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)			
0.1. hppgraphy consumines 0 Performance Performance 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (-) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access of Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Potential contamination (Farm / Industrial dwellings). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouses area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore is likely to have a negative effect on 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) (·) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Farm / Industrial dwellings). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.4 Treffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Existing access off Hoe Lane.	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		
6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Image: constrained to power lines 0 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 could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Hoe Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints (·) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Farm / Industrial dwellings). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Londing impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Existing access off Hoe Lane.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact of the Preservation Order (FPO) (*) the site. the site. <td>6.2b Distance to power lines</td> <td>0</td> <td>Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.</td> <td></td>	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.4 Access to site (+) 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Farm / Industrial dwellings). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)			
6.5 Containing to instraints (-) 6.5 Troffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.		
6.6 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. B441	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)		Potential contamination (Farm / Industrial dwellings). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
	6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B441	

Site Reference:	SR-0245
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	2.84
Address:	Coronation Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 86 dwellings

Source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

Site constraints: None

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>86</u>

<u>Dwellings:</u>

Lea Hertford Brenty Client

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0245	Rev 2
ARU	_

GS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, ina (Hong Kong), swissto the GIS ommunity S/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS , Earth



<u>Dweinings:</u> <u>86</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within wider landscape setting of Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should consider impact on historic landscape. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	The site lies mostly within a Green Belt parcel of very high sensitivity but is partially developed and existing planted buffers to the north would limit harm to the wider Green Belt to the north (which maintains the gap between Nazeing and Roydon).	
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	0	Site is more than 1600m and less 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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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, 1,200m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	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 lane off Hoe Lane.	
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.	B442	
			© Arup	

Site Reference:	SR-0266
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	2.34
Address:	Oldfield Spring, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, EN9 2RW

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 73 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site TPOs would reduce capacity by c.1/3 constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:49



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
lssue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
SR-0266	Rev 2	
	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestde.gov.uk	
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorn	ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong	

Sources Et al, HEFE, Diskum opyrigin an Assause per Conr. GEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GosBase, IGN, Kidsater NH, Intermop, Incerement PConr., METI, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Maganyindia, & OpenSith Map cantinibation and the GIS User Community. Source Etri, DigitalGlobe, GeGE;e Estatisar Geographics, CNES/Aibus SS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within a 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	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should consider impact on historic landscape and settlement pattern. As site is currently open landscape, any development here could harm the significance of the Conservation Area.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	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	0	Site is more than 1600m and less 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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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, 1,500m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 adjacent assessed landscape sensitivity zone extend to this site. 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	()	Development is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	Site is far away from main settlement and within Conservation Area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore it could significantly alter the character of the settlement.	
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	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, subject to care in layout. The extent of the trees would be likely to significantly constrain the number of dwellings which could be accommodated.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Hoe Lane.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.	
		Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.		

Site Reference:	SR-0270
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.37
Address:	Halston Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 11 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified. constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is
near to this site.Dwellings:11



Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0270	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

© Contains US data V Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources, Est. HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METT, Est China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmiridia, © OpenStreetMpc onthitudins, and the GIS Let Comunity Source: Est, DigitalGibbe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alribus DS, USDA, USGS, ArcoGRD, ION, and the GIS Let Community



Notestick interference Notestick interference Notestick interference 12 Inspace in calculation Notestick Notestick interference Notestick 12 Inspace in calculation Notestick Notestick Notestick Notestick 12 Inspace in calculation Notestick Notestick Notestick Notestick Notestick 12 Inspace in calculation Notestick				
111112at a det etc.1212at a det etc.12 <td< th=""><th>Criteria</th><th></th><th>Score</th><th>Qualitative Assessment</th></td<>	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Landom relationiRequest in the states interview in a large grant in a largeLandom relationGRecellement for the states interview in a large grant in a largeLandom relationGRecellement for the states interview in a large grant in a large grant in a large grant in the states interview in a large grant in the states interview in a large grant in a large grant in the states interview inte	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
LaterationLowComparisonMatchingComparisonComparisonComparisonMatchingComparisonComparisonComparisonLaterationC	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 SSSIs.	
Number Number Number StatesImage: Number Number NumberImage: Number <br< td=""><td>1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland</td><td>0</td><td>Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.</td><td></td></br<>	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
CharacterizationControlControlControl11 Order to find out of the find of the set o		0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1 International section forms 0 International section forms 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International section forms 1 1 Status (Mitch Status) 0 International sect	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
CalculationCalculationCalculationCalculationCalculationCalculationCalculation17 ProduitsRefR	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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
Control Control Link input of intelling steps 20 Description intelling steps 20 Descriptin intelling steps	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.	
Like Index Method Kaladis Method Register Method Register Method Register Method Register Like Index of an undex Register 0.0 Proce Kan and Like All All All All All All All All All Al	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Lab maps of a number · unteen a a mult of yourset to stringegroef. 13 maps of an path 0 0 14 maps of an path 0 14 maps of an path 0 0 14 maps of an path 0 11 benefit on stringer 0 0 0 0 0 11 benefit on stringer 0	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)		Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area, within wider landscape setting. Development here should consider impact on historic landscape. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.
1 studied 1 interest interest with any class 2 interest of the net of the n	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0		
21 Indexident beam Outline from Colume to the Insert index Section 1000 in the Section 10000 in the Section 1000 in the Section 10000 in the Section 10000 in the Section 1000 in the Section 10000	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
Instruction due to device set infract/or due to	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)		
12 Underside is instruct at a tap 0 Interval is a construct at a tap 0 33.D balance is employment licitations 0 Rise is within 1600m of a employment sublocation. Image: Construct at a tap Image: Construct at a tap 34.D balance is one employment licitations 0 Rise is within 1600m of a employment sublocation. Image: Construct at a tap Image: Const	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
12.0 Joint of engloying in Codering (1) For end of the provide of	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.4 Lensing in Use an interface 0 Interface 0 3.6 Detained in Use an interface 0 Bet is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infrafryinnay school. Image: Comparison of Comparison	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.5 Distance in the sense interprinting strictor 0 Performance in the nearest secondary school 10 3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school 0 Set is more than 4000m from the nearest Secondary school 1 3.7 Distance to nearest GP suggery 0 Set is more than 4000m from the nearest GP suggery. 1 3.8 Distance to nearest GP suggery 0 Set is more than 4000m from the nearest GP suggery. 1 3.8 Distance to nearest GP suggery 0 Set is more than 4000m from the nearest GP suggery. 1 3.8 Distance to searest GP suggery 0 Set is more than 4000m from the nearest GP suggery. 100% greenfield set, 000m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land 10 Majority of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 100% greenfield set, 000m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space. 0 Development united you involve the loss of public open space. 100% greenfield set. 000m from settlement (Lower Nazeing). 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 60 Bevelopment character: character. The propertial are for higher domaty development than the neighbouring development. Therefore, development character. 6.1 Topographical constraints 0 Reven three 6 on of pose any constraint to	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.4 Detained in the interiest according working (*) Contract on a contract (Contract 4000m to m the nearest GP surgery. 3.7 Detained to metrest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m to m the nearest GP surgery. Image: Contract 400 mm to metrest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network 1mm Not applicable. Image: Contract 400 mm to metrest GP surgery. 4.1 Browniedd and Greenfield Land (*) Maprity of the site is greenfield tand that is neither within nor adjucent to a settlement. ToD's greenfield site. 600m from an existing settlement (Lown Nazering). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to gen space 0 Development unlexly to involve the loss of public gen space. Image: Contract 4000mm to mail addition of the sets and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to gen space 0 Development unlexly to involve the loss of public gen space. Image: Contract 4000mm to mail addition of the sets and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (*) Set fails within a nies of medium indicacepe sensitivity - characteristics of the landscrape are resilient to character. Image: Contract 4000mm to mail addition of the sets and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (*) Development could detact from the existing settlement character. Image: Contract 40000mm to the neighbouring development.	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.7 Dealine to the relates of studgey 0 Not applicable. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network 1. Not applicable. 100% greenfield site, 600m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (-) Mapply of the site is greenfield tand that is nether within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, 600m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versalle agricultural land (grades 1-3). 1 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space. 0 Development unikely to involve the loss of public open space. 1 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Ste fils within an area or modulum indicage sensitivity - dimarciprises of the landscape are resilient to change. The propositis are for higher density development than the neighbouring development. Therefore, development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development than the neighbouring development. Therefore, development than the neighbouring development. Therefore, development than the neighbouring development. 6.1 Tapography constraints (-) Response to pass and on popen approximation to the site. Image: provide table to advelopment. 6.2 Delations to power lines 0 Gas or oll pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: provide table to advelopment. <t< td=""><td>3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school</td><td>(-)</td><td>Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.</td><td></td></t<>	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.6 Access to strategic hoad retention Image: Control of the state is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, 600m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land Image: Control of the state would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 100% greenfield site, 600m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Image: Control of the state would involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity Image: Control of the state would would would be expected to the state character. The proposition are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development and be able and be expected to would significant character. The proposition are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is and be character and undis space and character. 6.1 Topography constraints Image: Constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: Constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2 Distance to gas and oll pipelines 0 Bow on pipe a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint of the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The information on site, which could be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. Existing access down a small track - would need t	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
1.1 strowneo and createries Land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Cepacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site fails within an area of metium landscape sensitivity - character sites of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Sattlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract form the existing settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 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 contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be employed by link part land and agreement in place, or existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widering. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contaminat	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
12 minute on agricultual and 14 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development culd detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development it in the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development ikely to affect the character of the area. 8.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 8.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. 8.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 8.3 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 afjacent to the site. 8.4 Access to site (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 8.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 8.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 8.6 Tortitial instant	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 (Lower Nazeing).
1.3. Capacity to improve access to open space 0 International control open space 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (e) Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (e) Development could detract from the existing settlement character of ange. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (e) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development fikely to affect the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (e) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. 6.2 b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (e) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening. 6.5 Contamination constraints (e) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
1. Latitude generativity (*) and able to absorb development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (*) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints (*) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (*) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening. 6.5 Contamination constraints (*) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that 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. Setuenterin character sensitivity (e) Topography constraints (e) Topography constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.1 Topography constraints (f) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: Constraint 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. Image: Constraint exist in the site. 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint exist in 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 down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening. 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 Existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening. 6.5 Contamination constraints (f) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.4 Traffic impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)		
0.1 Hopography Constraints (*) Index and one of the state of	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.24 Distance to gas and dir pipelines 0 Power lines 0 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 1 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. 1 6.4 Access to site (-) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
0.20 Distance to power lines 0 Image: 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 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 down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening. 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 image: Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 impact on the Preservation Order (1PO) 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 Existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion. Existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening.	6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
0.4 Access to site (*) would require upgrade. 6.5 Contamination constraints (*) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.6 Exception impact Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		
6.5 Containing on constraints (-)	6.4 Access to site	(-)		Existing access down a small track - would need to be upgraded with widening.
	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 site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B444

: SR-0298
Nazeing
16.84
Lower Nazeing, West Area
Residential
Broad Area West of Nazeing
407 duellinge
497 dwellings
Assumption based on 30 dph
Flood risk would reduce capacity by circa 1/4. Also circa 80% of the
site has potential landfill contamination, further reducing site
capacity.
None

Community
feedback:The
neaDwellings:99

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

Client

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0298	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Counci

Sources: Eari, HERE, DeLorme, Infernag, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GenBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordance Survey, Esi Japan, METI, Eari China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MagmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributions, and the GIS User Community Source: Eari, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



<u>Dweilings: 99</u>		Xerouxiu, isir, and the use user community		
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	()	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.	The site is covered and encompasses a whole Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat. It is within three buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat 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.	The site is adjacent to Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.	
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 29% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which circa 17% is in Flood Zone 3a and 3b. Flood Zones 3a and 3b are located in the south-western corner of the site and can be avoided through site layout.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.		
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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 with no opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	The public open space is largely located in the site area. Development would result in loss of public open space (public open spaces covers 81% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.	
6.1 Topography constraints	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.	Access could be gained off Nazeing Road.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential severe contamination on site, where assurances would have to be sought from the developer that remediation would not harm site viability.	Part of site on Landfill is likely unsuitable; would need to demonstrate that risks could be mitigated (extensive investigation and long term gas monitoring). Remainder of site (former stud smallholding) need to demonstrate risks could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B445	
			© Arup	

Dwellings:

<u>90</u>

0.00 00.000	
Site Reference:	SR-0299
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	12.07
Address:	Lower Nazeing, South-west Area
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Broad Area south-west of Nazeing
Deceline vield:	256 duellinge
Baseline yield:	350 dwellings
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph
baseline yield:	
Site	Flood risk would reduce capacity by circa 3/4. Also circa 15% of the
constraints:	site is covered by SR-0507 (55 dwellings) as such this is omitted
	from the yield.
-	
Site selection adjustment:	Capacity partially reinstated for site selection assessment to account for overlapping site (55 dwellings).
aujustinent.	
Community	The Original states that a second back of the state of the second states and the second states of the second state
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



Client	lient		
Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest District Local Plan			
Drawing Status	Date		
Issue	March 2018		
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0299	Rev 2		
ARUF	Epping Forest District Council		
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Or MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap	opyright and database right (2016) Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN ridnance Survey, Esri Japan, METT, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisst contributors, and the GIS User Community Eve. Earthstar Geographics: CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS.		

AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS Use



<u>Dweinings.</u>				
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating 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 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	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 9 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are concentrated at the east of the site. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or translocation.	
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 two Deciduous Woodland habitats, and a portion of BAP priority habitat with no main features habitat. It is within four buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, but mitigation may be able 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 Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.	
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	Some 67% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 50% and 30% respectively is in Flood Zones 3a and 3b. Higher risk Flood Zones affect the north-western part of the site making the south-eastern portion of the site more suitable for development.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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 opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.	Public open space is located in 56% of the site area. Development may involve the loss of some public open space, but there may be opportunities for some on-site re-provision or re-orientation of development.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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.	Considering the scale of the proposed development and its area coverage, it is likely to have a negative affect the semi-rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.	
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Nazeing Road.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural nursery / industrial Boiler Stripping). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B446	
			© Arup	

	-	1
Site Reference:	SR-0300	Hertfo
Parish:	Nazeing	
Size (ha):	19.04	
Address:	Lower Nazeing, South Area	-
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Broad Area South of Nazeing	eshun
Baseline yield:	447 dwellings and 14,900 sqm commercial	4
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial	Client Eppi
		Job Title
		Eppi
Site	None	Drawing
constraints:		Issue
		Drawing
Site selection	None	SR-0
adjustment:		Λ.
		A

Community Fe feedback: sit Dwellings: 44

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

eshunt

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0300	Rev 2
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Lorgringht aftin database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, (GN, Kadaser NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmylindia, & OpenStineetMap, onthiutoirs, and the GIS Buer Community Source: Earl, DightalGibbe, GeoCye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alribus DS, USDA, USGS, ArroGrift), (IN), and the GIS buer Community



<u>Dweinings: 447</u>			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses the whole of a Traditional Orchard BAP priority habitat and is within two buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Adjacent and partially within Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area and adjacent to Grade II LBs to north-east of site. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout (locating development away from LBs) and high quality design/materials.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	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	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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.	The scale of the proposed development, the extent of the site and its location within a Conservation Area is likely to have a negative affect on the predominantly rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints 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.	Existing access via a private road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over parts of the site (Farmyards / infilled ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B447
•	-	•	© Arup

	,
Site Reference:	SR-0301
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	21.84
Address:	Lower Nazeing, North Area
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Broad Area North of Nazeing
Beceline violdu	652 duallings
Baseline yield:	oos uwenings
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph
baseline yield:	
Site	Circa 25% of the site is covered by SR-0434 (150 dwellings) and is
constraints:	already accounted for, reducing yield.
Site selection adjustment:	Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping site).
aujustinent.	
Community	
Community	Feedback was received on NAZ-A which is within or near to this

feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>

Feedback was received on NAZ-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.
653

Client

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0301	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HERE, DuLome, Intermap, Increment P.Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kladster NL, Orthanco Survey, Earl Jagan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapnyindia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalCioba, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 3 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The tree are located at the north edge of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or translocation.
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 almost encompasses a Deciduous Woodland priority habitat and is in 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	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	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within wider landscape setting of Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should consider impact on historic landscape. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints 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.	Existing access from Maplecroft Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over small part of the site (Farmyard / infilled ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B448
L		,	© Arup

Dwellings:

<u>797</u>

		Burd
Site Reference:	SR-0302A	Hertfo
Parish:	Nazeing	5.4
Size (ha):	32.40	100
Address:	Lower Nazeing, south-east area	
		P
Primary use:	Residential	eshur
Site notes:	Broad area east of Nazeing including Hoe Lane and Nurseries and agricultural fields	A
		Z.
Baseline yield:	1,396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm commercial floorspace	
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial	Client Epp i
		Job Tit
		Eppi
Site constraints:	None	Drawin
constraints.		lssu
		Drawin
Site selection adjustment:	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm proportionally split between sites based on site size.	SR-0
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	© Contai Sources: GeoBase MapmyIn



Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0302A	Rev 2
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council

S contains Os Gaida Y Colvin Copyrigin and Gaadade right (2016) Sources: Esht, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esht Japan, METT, Esh China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmylindia, OpenStinerMap, contributors, and the GIS Baer Comunity Sources: Esht, DightalGibdo, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USGS, AnorORHD, IGN, and the GIS Daer Comunity



Dweilings: 797		Aerockiu, icik, and the cits user community	
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within the buffer zone for Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard habitats. 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.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a, covering circa 1%, are located along a portion of the southern boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Adjacent and partially within N&SR CA to south of site. Within wider landscape setting of N&SR CA. Development here should consider impact on historic landscape. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	The majority of the site overlaps a very high sensitivity Green Belt parcel which prevents the merging of Nazeing and Roydon and, to a lesser extent, Harlow. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	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 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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. Considering the scale of the proposed development and its area coverage, it is likely to have a negative affect the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries / Farm / Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B449
			© Arup
Dwellings:

<u>110</u>

0.00 0.000		Burd
Site Reference:	SR-0302B	Hertfo
Parish:	Nazeing	5.4
Size (ha):	4.49	100
Address:	Lower Nazeing, south-east area	-
		P
Primary use:	Residential	eshur
Site notes:	Broad area east of Nazeing including Hoe Lane and Nurseries and agricultural fields	A
		21.
Baseline yield:	1,396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm commercial floorspace	
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial	Client Epp i
		Job Tit
		Eppi
Site constraints:	None	Drawin
constraints:		lssu
		Drawin
Site selection adjustment:	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm proportionally split between sites based on site size.	SR-0
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	© Contai Sources: GeoBase MapmyIn



Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest	Epping Forest District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date		
Issue	March 2018		
Drawing No	Issue		
SR-0302B	Rev 2		
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council		
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorn	copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP: Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong		





<u>Dweinings.</u>				
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
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 the majority of a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and within two buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Due to the configuration of the site the higher Flood Zones (2, 3a and 3b), covering 12%, affects the southern portion of the site and within the context of the whole site can be avoided through site layout.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area, partially within to west of site. Impact on historic landscape should be assessed. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	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 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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design for part of the site located in the Conservation Area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The 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 from Hoe Lane.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries / Farm / Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B450	
			© Arup	

Dwellings:

<u>488</u>

	-
Site Reference:	SR-0302C
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	19.85
Address:	Lower Nazeing, south-east area
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Broad area east of Nazeing including Hoe Lane and Nurseries and
	agricultural fields
Deceline vield.	1 206 dwollings and 46 500 sam commercial floorances
Baseline yield:	1,396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm commercial floorspace
Source for	Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial
baseline yield:	
Site	None
constraints:	
Site selection	Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm proportionally split between sites based on site
adjustment:	size.
Community feedback:	Feedback was received on NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.
ioouback.	and there is appointed by the for further detaile.



Epping Forest District Council	
Job Title	
Epping Forest District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0302C	Rev 2
	P Epping Forest District Council www.epingforestdc.gov.ak copyright and database right (2016) ne. Itermap. increment P Corp. CEBCO, USGS, FAO, NP/

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorne, Intermap, increment P Conp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Goobase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, MET, Leir China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapnynfula, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, OpenStreetMap contributors, end the GIS User Community AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		•	
		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 two Deciduous Woodland habitats and a Traditional Orchard habitat. It is within three buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering circa 10%, are located along the north-western site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within N&SR CA. Currently open landscape; CA designated in part due to survival of historic landscape and settlement patterns so large development here could be harmful. Settings of GII* LBs to be considered.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	The majority of the site lies within medium or very low sensitivity Green Belt parcels. A small part of the site does not meet the Green Belt purposes. If the site was released it would have limited harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	The site is within a Conservation Area. The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site is likely to have a significant negative affect the rural character of the area. Development would contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Hoe Lane.
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.	B451

Site Reference:	SR-0426
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	5.42
Address:	Nurseries to North of Sedge Green

Primary use: Residential Site notes:

Baseline yield: 162 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site None constraints:

Site selection None adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
<u>Dwellings:</u>	<u>162</u>

Hertford River Stat Harlow eshunt Brentwood Greater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0426	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Client

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorma, Intermap, Increment P Conp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GenBase, IGN, Kadatser NL, Ordnance Survey Esri Japan, MET, Lar Chrina (hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, IgniBiolitobe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and Wet Woodland 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 Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 98% of the site is located in Flood Zone 1, with around 2% in the north-western part of the site in Flood Zone 2. This can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 within a existing glasshouses area. The number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to 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.	Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries and 2 x landfills 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.	B452
		l	© Arup

	-
Site Reference:	SR-0427
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	5.63
	Nursery between Nursery Road and Pick's Hill and Lake Road Nursery
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	
Baseline yield:	168 dwellings
baselille yleiu.	Too dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	None
Site selection	None

adjustment:

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	168

Client

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0427	Rev 2
ARUI	

Sources: Est, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, MPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Madatern NL, Ordnance Survey, Est-Japan, METL, Est: Orhan (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Est. (JugitalCitohe, GeoSye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to an area of Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and partially 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 Lee Valley Central 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	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 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.	Although protected trees are present on or adjacent to the site, as a result of their locations it is likely that they could be incorporated into the proposed development subject to reasonable care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Existing access off North Street, which may require upgrading to support development.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / large infilled gravel pit and 3 x landfills 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.	B453

one ountur	Sincy Assessment
Site Reference:	SR-0434
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	5.01
Address:	Land North of Maplecroft Lane, Nazeing
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Greenfield site with the south of the site adjoining Maplecroft Lane which is part of a built up housing area.
Baseline yield:	150 dwellings
Source for	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 30 dph)
baseline yield:	
Site	None
constraints:	
Site selection	None
adjustment:	

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on NAZ-A which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:150

Hertford Hertford Harlow Harlow Brentwood Greater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
	Rev 2

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, (GN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Korg), swisstop Mapmrylidia, © DenStiteetMag. contributions, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGicko, GeoEye, Earltstar Geographics, CNES/Airous DS, USDA, USGS, ArarOGRD, (ION, edite O GL Suber Community



<u>Dweinings.</u> 150	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
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 is within the relevant buffer zone. 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	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within wider landscape setting of Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development here should consider impact on historic landscape. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.		
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.		
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.	
6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	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 off Maplecroft Lane, gated farm access set back from road. Would require improvements.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination on very small part of site. Minimal adverse impact with opportunity to enhance.	
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	B454	
	•	-	© Arup	

Site Reference:	SR-0471
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.56
Address:	Presdale Farm House, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Residential
Baseline yield:	17 dwellings
Source for	Assumption based on 30 dph
baseline yield:	
Site	Circa 10% site omitted as site in Flood Zone 3b.
constraints:	Circa 10% site offitted as site in Flood Zone 50.
Site selection adjustment:	None

adjustment:

Community
feedback:The
nearDwellings:15

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

15

Hertford Breakwood eshunt Greater London

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0471	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Client

Sources: Earl, HERE, Dal, orme, Jraghang, Jurgement P. Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadater NL, Ordnano Burvey, Earl Japan, MET, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Magmyincia, & OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl JoginalCicke, GeoSpe, Earlhstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard 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.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Only 5% of the site is in Flood Zone 2, located along parts of the southern boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Adjacent to N&SR CA to south of site. Within wider landscape setting of N&SR CA. Development here should consider impact on historic landscape. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	The majority of the site is with a very low sensitivity Green Belt parcel. The release of the site would have limited impact on the gaps between Lower Nazeing and surrounding towns, and on the purposes of the wider 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	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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.	80% greenfield site, 700m from an existing settlement (Little Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	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 off Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B455

	-	10-1
Site Refer	ence: SR-0473	Hertf
Parish:	Nazeing	5.4
Size (ha):	7.66	100
Address:	St. Leonards Farm, St. Leonards Road, Waltham Abbey, Nazeing, EN9 2HG	
Primary us	se: Residential	eshu
Site notes	: Agriculture.	Y
		5
		4
Baseline y	rield: 229 dwellings	
Source for	r Assumption based on 30 dph.	Client
baseline y	ield:	Epp
		Job Ti
0:44	None	Ерр
Site constraint		Drawi
		lssu
		Drawi
Site select		SR-
adjustmer	nt:	٨

Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.
Dwellings:	<u>229</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0473	Rev 2

u-comans US data E-Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, BeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo Mapmriyidia, & OpenStinetMap, contributors, and the GIS Leter Community Source: Earl, DigitalGiobe, GeoCye, Earlbard Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, AeroCRib, JON, and the GIS Leter Community



Internationally Protected Sites CP Effects of allocating allo for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for inclusion in checked for inclusion in the stemation on Lea Valley Special Protection Area. 12 impact on Nationally Protected sites CP Bite is write in impact fields. Zone and due to the nature and scale of development proposed is is likely to be cisualisation with Natural England is registered. However, it is it is write in an impact field within or adjacent to Accient Woodand. De to the development type (over CP untal restorted overright, development of the allos. Ellely tope cisualisation with Natural England is registered. However, it is it is write in a majorited to the inclusion proposed is tabled to be cisualisation with Natural England is registered. However, it is it is write in a majorited to the inclusion proposed within the site. 1.1. Impact on Accient Wettern Trees outlied of within or adjacent to Accient Woodand. De to the development type (over CP untal restorted overright). A model of Vettern trees are located within the site. 1.4. Impact on Accient Wettern Trees outlied of within or adjacent to Expect on Coal Wettern Trees outlied on Expect on Accient Woodand. De to the development type (over CP untal restorted overright). A model of Vettern trees are located within the site. 1.4. Impact on Accient Wettern Trees outlied of the proposed is a partial or exited of due to detance of BAP priority Bayets form site. The site is partially within three buffer zones. The site many indrecity affect the labelate. During and the exiteme buffers during and can be avaided through the linker. 1.5. Impact on Accient Wettern Trees outl	
Lineart on Nationally Protocode allels Control Contre Control Control	
12 mplank of Makinally Protocolas uses 12 possible to miligate the effects of the proposed development. consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is they that miligation to reduce the risk would 1.3a Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent Woodland 0 Site is unlikely to impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent Woodland. 1.4 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent or Veteran trees are located within the site. 1.4 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent or Veteran trees are located within the site. 1.4 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent or Veteran trees are located within the site. 1.5 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent or Veteran trees are located within the site. 1.5 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within the site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within the site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within the site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within the site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within the site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within the site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within Andent and BeP priority habitats from site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located within Andent and BeP priority habitats from site. 1.6 Impact on Andent/Veteran Trees outside of Andent/Veteran Trees are located by Impact on	possible.
1.3a inpact on Ancient/Version Trees outside of 0 Noncent or Veteran trees are located within the site. 1.Ab. Inpact on Ancient/Version Trees outside of 0 Noncent or Veteran trees are located within the site. 1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land 0 Site is unikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Impact on Ancient/Veteran trees are located within the site. 1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitas 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 habitats, but inlight implemented to address this. 1.8 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites 0 Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of Iocal wildlife sites from site. 1.7 Flood risk 0 Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildle sites from site. 1.8 Impact on Anchard Wertime To Conservation Area but implemented to address this. Impact on a part of the eastern boundary and can be avoided frough site layout. 1.8 Impact on Anchard Wertime To Conservation Area but impact on Elevation the site. Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.9 Impact on anchaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site. but potential is unhore an a creat of the set site of the	
Abs Impact of Albertiveteriant Trees outside of a set unitative view of the priority Priority Species or Habitats 0 Set is unitative view of the priority Species or Habitats 0 Set is unitative view of the priority Species or Habitats 0 No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of Iocal widifie sites from site. The site is partially within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigat in priority Species or Habitats 0 No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of Iocal widifie sites from site. The priority Species or Habitats 0 Set has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of Iocal widifie sites from site. The priority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, Sa and Sb, covering less than 1%, are a part of the eastern boundary and can be avoided through site layout. 1.8 Impact on heritage assets (+) Set is not likely to affect theritage assets due to their distance from the site. Unikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.8 Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is Unikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.9 Impact of air quality. 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. Impact on a require the set station of the set station of the set station. Impact on a require	
1.4 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 habitats, but nitigat 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 partially within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but nitigat implemented to address this. 1.7 Flood risk. (+*) Site within Flood Zone 1. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering less than 1%, are apart of the eastern boundary and can be avoided through site layout. 1.8 Impact on heritage assets (+) Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site. Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.8 Impact on archaeology 0 Site is an endum likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
1.3 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. 1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites 0 Site within Flood Zone 1. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering less than 1%, are a part of the eastern boundary and can be avoided through site layout. 1.7 Flood risk (#) Site within Flood Zone 1. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering less than 1%, are a part of the eastern boundary and can be avoided through site layout. 1.8a Impact on heritage assets (*) Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site. Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.8b Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is Inlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none. Instance to the nearest rail/tube station Site is between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop. 3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station 0 Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop. Instance to employment locations Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.<	
1.6 impact on Local Windle Sites 0 Najority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2. 3a and 3b, covering less than 1%, are a part of the eastern boundary and can be avoided through site layout. 1.7 Flood risk (++) Site within Flood Zone 1. Najority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2. 3a and 3b, covering less than 1%, are a part of the eastern boundary and can be avoided through site layout. 1.8a impact on heritage assets (+) Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site. Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.8b impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is Interview of the site is in Flood Zone 1. 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site les outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality. Interview and the event of the eastern to unknown as a result of previous lack of the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none. 3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/lube station 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station. 3.2 Distance to mearest to unknown and 1000m of a bus stop. Interview and the option of an employment site/location. Interview and the option of an employment site/location. 3.3 Distance to mearest to unknown and 1000m of a employment site/location. Site between 400m and	can be
1.7 Hood risk (**) Interview of the castern boundary and can be avoided through site layout. 1.8a Impact on heritage assets (*) Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site. Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 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 ar estult of previous lack of investigation. Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area but impact on landscape should still be considered. 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site is solithifed as being at risk of poor air quality. Impact 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. Impact of a bus stop. 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop 0 Site is within 1600m of a bus stop. Impact bit is between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop. Impact bit is between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop. 3.3 Distance to employment locations (*) Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location. Impact bit is between 4000m from the nearest rail within a pareament limpact bit in between 4000m from the nearest	
1.de impact on nemage assets (*) Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is 1.8b Impact on archaeology 0 There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is 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 0 Site is within 1600m of a bus stop. 3.3 Distance to employment locations (*) Site is within 1600m of a employment site/location.	cated along
1.50 impact of air quality 0 investigation. 1.9 Impact of air quality 0 Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality. 2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt 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 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.	,
1.9 impact of air quarty 0 Impact of air quarty 0 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 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.	
2.1 Level of name to Green Bett 0 3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station 0 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop 0 3.2 Distance to employment locations (+) Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.1 Distance to the hearest fail/tube station 0 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop 0 3.3 Distance to employment locations (+) Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop 0 3.3 Distance to employment locations (+) Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations (*)	
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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (-) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (-) Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	,
4.2 Impact on 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 (-) Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. The proposals are for higher density development than the developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.	ighbouring
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 St. Leonards Road.	
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site. Minimal adverse impact with opportunity to enhance.	
6.6 Traffic impact 0 Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	

	5	8
Site Reference:	SR-0486	H
Parish:	Nazeing	
Size (ha):	1.21	
Address:	Leaside Nursery and Sedgegate Nursery, Sedge Green, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2PA	1 11
Primary use:	Residential	e
Site notes:	Nursery.	1
		4774
Baseline yield:	45-55 dwellings	1
Source for	Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 39-48 dph)	CI
baseline yield:		E
		Jc
		E
Site constraints:	Circa 60% of the site has potential contamination which may not be suitable for housing development (landfill). As such developable	D
constraints.		ls
		Dı
Site selection	None	s
adjustment:		
		ľ
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	© Sc Ge Mi

Hertford Bishunt Bishu

Epping Forest District Council	
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0486	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingfrorestde.gov.uk
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMa	copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCA Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swiss ap contributors, and the GIS User Community DéVe, Earthstar Geographics, CMSS/Aribus DS, USDA, USGS,



Criteria			
		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to an area of Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and wholly 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.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 34% of the site is located in Flood Zone 2, covering the northern area, with the remainder in Flood Zone 1. Mitigation possible through design and site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be 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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 200m from an existing settlement (Little Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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.	A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to open land.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	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. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access off Sedge Green Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	()	Potential severe contamination on site, where assurances would have to be sought from the developer that remediation would not harm site viability.	Circa 60% of the site has potential contamination (Landfill site and Horticultural Nursery). Potentially significant adverse impact that may not be possible to mitigate for Housing use. Remaining 40% has potential contamination on site (nursery).
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B457

Dwellings:

<u>55</u>

	···· ·
Site Reference:	SR-0507
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	2.86
Address:	Land at Little Cutlands, Incorporating Wilbea and Royd, St Leonards Road, Lower Nazeing, Waltham Abbey, EN9 2HJ
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Residential curtilage.
Baseline yield:	83 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	Circa a third reduction in capacity because of the location of the site within Flood Zone 3a.
Site selection adjustment:	None
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



Epping Forest Dist	Date
Drawing Status	Date
-	
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0507	Rev 2

© Contains US data U Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLome, Intermap, Increment P Corp., CBBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METT, Esti Chini (Hong Korg), swisstopo. Mapmyrida, B OpenStreetMpc onthibutors, and the GIS User Community Sources: Carl, Constituted, and the GIS User Community AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Original Score Gualitative Assessment 11 Hoad ar Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 12 Hoad ar Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 12 Hoad ar Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 12 Hoad ar Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 4 12 Hoad ar Intended/Prictabal Res 4 The Score Intended/Prictabal Res 1 The Score Intende/Prictabal Res				
Number of instructional predicts data ID Instruction is predicted at the state of instrument is a regregement is made in the predicted base of the instrument is a regregement is a regrege	Criteria Score		Qualitative Assessment	
MathematicalViewResponder Land here by pass are statis.Image: Compact Land here by pass are statis.Link pass on kack in Sound III.View for handwart here and pass in balance of a land here by pass in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the statistical in the pass of here explore in the pas	t on Internationally Protected Sites			
Langed of each end with an each end with an each end with a set of each end with end with a set of each end with end	t on Nationally Protected sites			
View Moduling Implementation Implementation Implementation Implementation 14 Ansate or priper from black Law 2 Resultation or prise angle ad to the two contracted marged or combination of prise addition 13 Instant or back Prices (prices or status) 2 Resultation or prise angle ad to the two contracted marged or combination of prise addition Implementation Implementation </td <td>act on Ancient Woodland</td> <th></th> <td></td>	act on Ancient Woodland			
1 Hunder drapping react monta table111				
1 a third inform rinking signal and mature 0 interms of mature signal and mature 1 d mayor inform rinking signal and mature 0 Bit have of third in that and makets and maket	t on Epping Forest Buffer Land			
Change of a construction construction Construction Construction 17 Proce rat. 101 Rea which Food Zees 2 and exception text or request. See to 14 for the safe is in Proce Zees 2 and exception text or request. 18 largest on hardings assess 100 Rea which Keet to the safe is in Proce Zees 2 and exception text or request. Wile by largest on setting of Conservation Area. 18 largest on actings of the acting assess due to the relation conservation for the safe. Wile by largest on setting of Conservation Area. 19 largest of a changes 0 Real and the largest of a change guest of a change guest of acting and guest may tell action of on a safe guest of a change guest of acting and guest may tell action of a change guest of acting and guest may tell action of on a safe guest of a change guest of acting and guest may tell action of a safe guest of acting and guest may tell action of a safe guest of acting and guest may tell action of a safe guest of acting and guest may tell action of a safe guest of acting and guest may tell action of a safe guest of acting and guest may tell action of a safe guest of acting and guest may tell action of a safe guest may tell action of acting act	t on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	ite is adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features habitat, and is who nay indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address the the second se	within three buffer zones. The	
17 Ploor rak 00 Minimum content c	t on Local Wildlife Sites			
Late reparts in intrage statistic (1) Image to inform the part of	risk			
1.40 standard 0 Indexona a result of previous los of messignitor. ¹ Indexona a result of previous los of messignitor. ¹ 1.9 inpact of air quarky 0 Site is existed of areas demined as being at risk of poor air quarky. Indexona a result of previous los of messignitor. ¹ 2.1 Under of ham to Green Bell 0 Site is existed of areas demined as being at risk of poor air quarky. Indexona a result of previous los of messignitor. ¹ 3.1 Distance to the parent station 0 Site is existen 1000m of a bus stop. Index a build of at rusk of the parent station. 3.2 Distance to messignite to conterns 0 Site is existen 1000m of an engloyment stationation. Index a build of at rusk of the previous los of messignitor. 3.4 Distance to result in existed station board amount of the station of the previous los of member reserved to a bus stop. Index a bus rusk of the previous los of member reserved to a bus stop. 3.5 Distance to result inflationary school 0 Site is existen 1000m from the rearest scondary school. Index a bus rusk of the previous los of member reserved to supprevious los of member reserved to suppreviou	act on heritage assets	ely to impact on setting of Conservation Area.		
1 drapact drait quary 0 International quark 0 21 Lowel of ham to Green Belt (r) Site instructione Bit where the lowel of ham caused by release of the land for development would be very 1.1 Distance to the nearest raik be station 0 Site is where income additioned and dool on from the nearest rai of tabe station. Income additioned	act on archaeology			
21 Determined with the other ball V/V	t of air quality			
3.1 Detained to the meters functions station 0 Image: Control of the station of the bus stop 3.2 Detained to rearest to a stop 0.0 Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop. 3.3 Detained to rearest to basis and the station of the stop stop of the stop of	of harm to Green Belt			
3.2 Ustander to restrict to is stop? 0 Interfact on an employment locations 3.3 Distance to local amenties (+) Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large vilage or small vilage. 3.4 Distance to local amenties (+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest scondary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest OP surgery (+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.7 Distance to nearest QP surgery (+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network // Net applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (+) Development of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 4.3 Capacity to imrove access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.1 Inadocape sensitivity 0 Site full within an amet of too bubbic open space. Anegligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid lose write professal could be avoid on sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape aneable to accommotal The relevant site character co	nce to the nearest rail/tube station			
3.3 Jastance to employment locations (*) Set is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village. 3.4 Distance to local amenities (*) Set is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school. Image: Comparison of the nearest infant/primary school. Image: Comparison of the nearest infant/primary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest infant/primary school (*) Set is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. Image: Comparison of the nearest secondary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest QP surgery (*) Set is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school. Image: Comparison of the nearest QP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable. Image: Comparison of the nearest comparison of the nearest secondary school. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (*) Monity of the site schefield land within a settlement: 75% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development of the site would involve the loss of public open space. Anegligible part of the site contains public open space. Applicable open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Development unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on the odge of the costsing settlement. How do cost of development is unlikely to adversely affect the wild character of the advector filter advect.	nce to nearest bus stop			
3.4 Distance to nearest infantiprimary school (*) Set is less than 1000m from the nearest infantiprimary school. 3.5 Distance to nearest secondary school (*) Ste is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school (*) Ste is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery (*) Ste 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 site greenfield land within a settlement. 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (*) Development of the site 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 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate the area. The relevant site character context is unlikely to have an impact on the character of the area. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints (*) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitilgation.	nce to employment locations			
3.5 Distance to nearest secondary school (r) Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest GP surgery (r) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Not applicable. Image: Not applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (r) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (r) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate daracter context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wid character of the area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wid character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area. 6.1 Topography constraints (r) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	nce to local amenities			
3.5 Distance to nearest GP surgery (+) Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery. 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. Image: Comparison of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (+) Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 75% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Image: Comparison of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid los space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Bite falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - character change. Anegligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid los space. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Bite falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. However, low density development is proposed whic character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. Howevere, low density development is not likely to have an i	nce to nearest infant/primary school			
3.7 Distance of heares CP surgery (r) 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (r) 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (r) Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 75% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (r) Development of the site 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 Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodal: development without significant character change. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wid character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. However, low density development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area. 6.1 Topographical constraints (r) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	nce to nearest secondary school			
3.4 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Contract of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 75% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (+) Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 75% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). Image: Contract of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid los space. 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid los space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development is unlikely to adversely affect the wid character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. However, low density development is proposed while 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. Image: Constrainte constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	nce to nearest GP surgery			
4.1 brownield and Greentield Land (+) Provide and Greentield Land (+) 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site 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 Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development is unlikely to adversely affect the wid character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	s to Strategic Road Network			
4.2 Impact on agricultural and (-) 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 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. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	field and Greenfield Land	greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).		
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Image:	t on agricultural land			
5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 development without significant character change. character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. However, low density development is proposed while 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. Image: Constraint to the site of	city to improve access to open space		red to avoid loss of public oper	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 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.	scape sensitivity		y affect the wider landscape	
0.1 topography constraints (-) Case or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	ment character sensitivity			
G as Or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	raphy constraints			
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Cas of on pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	ance to gas and oil pipelines			
6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	ance to power lines			
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 could be incorporated into the development proposed, su the site.	t on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	yout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of	e site for development	
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 Existing track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access through third party land	s to site	ng track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access throu	n third party land.	
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (pond). Potential adverse impact, but could be mitigated.	mination constraints	tial contamination (pond). Potential adverse impact, but could be mitigated.		
6.6 Traffic impact 0 Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time.	impact		B458	

0	······, ······························	RIVE
Site Reference:	: SR-0599	Hertfo
Parish:	Nazeing	1
Size (ha):	5.00	1
Address:	Old House Farm, Old House Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2LJ	-
		eshun
Primary use:	Residential	
Site notes:	A number of open fields separated by dense tree boundaries.	9-
		++
		1
Baseline yield:	200 dwellings	
		Client
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 40 dph based on edge of settlement location and the fact that the scheme will also include a primary school (this	Eppi
	is an 'other use' not assessed in the SLAA).	Job Titl
		Eppi
Site constraints:	Site is 100% covered by SR-0300. As such the yield is omitted for this site to avoid double counting.	Drawin
constraints.		Issu
		Drawin
Site selection	Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping	SR-0
adjustment:	site).	Δ
		Π

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on NAZ-B which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:200

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0599	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Lorgringht aftin database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, (GN, Kadaser NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmylindia, & OpenStineetMap, onthiutoirs, and the GIS Buer Community Source: Earl, DightalGibbe, GeoCye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Alribus DS, USDA, USGS, ArroGrift), (IN), and the GIS buer Community



			A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	
Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard 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	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Adjacent and partially within N&SR CA and adjacent to GII LBs to north-east of site. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout (locating development away from LBs) and high quality design/materials.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	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	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.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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 an area of historic field patterns to the south of Nazeing, and an area which is highly sensitive to change. Proposed development could negatively impact this historic character, but could be mitigated through layout and design.	
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	(-)	would require upgrade.	Existing access via a private 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.	B459	
		•	© Aruj	

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Site Reference:	SR-0840
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.17
Address:	Retail strip at Nazeing Road, Lower Nazeing, Essex
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	A parade of local shops with residential flats above and associated
	parking and access.
Baseline yield:	8 dwellings
Baseline yield:	o uwenings
Source for	Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 48 dph)
baseline yield:	
Site	The site is located in the Lea Valley Regional Park but as the site is
constraints:	already built up it unlikely to have any negative impact.
Site selection	None
adjustment:	
0	
Community	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is



The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site. $\underline{\mathbf{8}}$

Epping Forest	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0840	Rev 2
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.epping/rorstdc.gov.uk

Sources: Earl, HERE, Dal.ome, Intermap, Increment P. Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeraBase, ICN, Kadater NL, Ornitance Survey, Earl Japan, MET, Isir China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreeMap contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, Digitalcible, Geogreye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.		
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 1.	Over 99% of the site is located in Flood Zone 1, with less than 1% in the far south-east corner in Flood Zone 2. This can be avoided through site layout.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.	
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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.		
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development of the site 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	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 located within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. However, number of proposed houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring areas. Therefore, development is likely to 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.		
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Laundry / Farm). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B460	

	,
Site Reference:	SR-0925
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.47
Address:	Land to the rear of Shadwalkers (Plot 1), Middle Street, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2LH
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Vacant fields, residential dwelling and outbuildings
Baseline yield:	14 dwellings
Source for baseline yield:	Assumption based on 30 dph
Site constraints:	No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on NAZ-B which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:14

Hertford Beshunt Brentwood

Epping Fores	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0925	Rev 1
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council

Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Geoßase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mapmylridia, © OpenStreetMap, contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGiobe, GeoCye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AnorORhD, IGN, and the GIS User Community



	r –		
Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	No requirement to consult with Natural England for residential development.
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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchards buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats but mitigation could 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	()	Site would likely result in the loss of a heritage asset or result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated.	Site contains Grade II Listed Building Shadwalkers and within Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. Development on this site would cause harm to significance and setting of Listed Building.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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.	80% greenfield, 10m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Proposals have the potential to influence landscape character. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	()	Development is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	Site is located in a Conservation Area and encompasses Grade II Shadwalkers. The proposed development is at a higher density than surrounding development and is likely to significantly harm the setting and character of the Listed Building and wider 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 from Middle Street. There is potential to provide further points of access from Old House Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B461

Site Reference:	SR-0926
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	2.45
Address:	Land to the rear of Shadwalkers (Plot 2), Middle Street, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2LH
Primary use:	Residential
Site notes:	Vacant fields and outbuildings
Baseline yield:	74 dwellings

Source for Assumption based on 30 dph baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on NAZ-B which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:74



Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0926	Rev 1

Sources: Earl, HERE, Detome, Intermap, Increment P Com, JEBCO, USCS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnarce Survey, Earl Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, Mamprindia, OpenStreetMapc combistors, and the GIS User Comunity Source: Earl, BigitalGiche, GeoEye, Earthater Geographics, CNES/Alrbus DS, USDA, USDS, AeroGRD, IGN, and the GIS User Comunity



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	No requirement to consult with Natural England for residential development.
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 Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchards buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats but mitigation could 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	(-)	Site is located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within Nazeing and South Roydon CA and Grade II LBs to north and south of site. Outside historic pattern of development but possible mitigation through appropriate density/layout/high quality design and materials. Only small scale development.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	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	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	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.	95% greenfield site, 50m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	Proposals have the potential to influence landscape character. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site in this location within a Conservation Area is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Proposed development may contribute to urban sprawl.
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 from Old House Lane to the site.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Infilled Pond / Piggeries). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	B462
			l Cara Cara Cara Cara Cara Cara Cara Car

Site Reference:	SR-0927
Parish:	Nazeing
Size (ha):	0.57
Address:	Land to the North of Maplecroft and to the East of Pecks Hill, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2NY
Primary use: Site notes:	Residential Vacant field
Baseline yield:	10 dwellings

Source for Indicated in Call for Sites 2016-2017 baseline yield:

Site No constraints identified.

Site selection None adjustment:

Community
feedback:Feedback was received on NAZ-A which is within or near to this
site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.Dwellings:10

Hertford Beshunt Beshunt Brentwood

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0927	Rev 1
ARU	P Epping Fores

© Contains US bata © L'own copyrigin and database right (2016) Sources: Est / HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Est Japan, METT, Est China (Hong Korg), swisstopo, Mapmylindia, © OpenStitentMap contributions, and the GIS User Comunity Source: Esti, Digitalone, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, 104, and the GIS User Comunity



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating 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 SSSIs.	No requirement to consult with Natural England for residential development.
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.	A small area of the site is within an area of Deciduous Woodland, and the site is wholly within the relevant buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation could 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development of the site 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	(-)	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.	Low density development is proposed which reflects surrounding development. Site is unlikely to affect settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access from Maplecroft Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below site size threshold where it would be expected to significantly affect congestion.	B463