Epping Forest District Local Plan Report on Site Selection

E1.6 Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment

| Issue | March 2018

EB805W

Legend - Stage 4/Stage 8.4 Traveller Maps



Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4





Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-006-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment	Legend
ARUP	Date: March 2018	in Epping Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aeroarid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.	
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:15,000 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	This legend show

Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4

Ν

E101

Parish Boundary

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

		5
Site F	Reference:	E 12
Paris	h:	Epping
Size (ha):	0.59
Addre	ess:	South of Standards Hill, north-west of Epping rail line
ary use:		Traveller
Site n	otes:	Trees lined to north, east and south. No boundary to west.
Sourc	ce of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
Site const	raints:	No constraints identified.
Comr feedb	nunity ack:	Feedback was received on EPP-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Pitches:

<u>6</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt Greater London Brentwood

Client	
Epping Fores	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
E 12	Rev 2
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crowr Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorr	

DS, USDA, USG



Note of the second se			_	
United and advanced with working of a set of a local biology of a local b	Criteria			
Index and any set of a	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	with other sites).	
Landing for a field of the set of the s	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Junification (and control and interface)Image: and the problem interface of problem inter	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
National and production under an and production under an analysis of anomal of a statistic content relation of a statistic content relatistic	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Under production for any of the state of	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Interfactor Winds and Carl Back State St	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 wholly within a Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat, and is adjacent to another habitat. It is within 3 buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect a BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
11 mode in11 mode in<	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 at indication integration10Image a number of integrationimage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The is a number interface on the time of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The is and integration of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 is made a number of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 ison of integration0The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 ison of integration1The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 ison of integration1The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 ison of integration1The ison of integrationImage a number of integration1 ison of integration1The ison of integration<	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Name (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a)	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
unique rational material data in the set of the se	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
11 bits of the nearest basis 10 intering containing the senset in a containin a containing the senset in a containing the	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		
11 Lubarce in weerst hald be donied. (1) 12 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 12 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 13 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 14 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 14 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 15 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 16 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 17 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 18 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 18 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 19 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 10 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 10 Detache in weerst hald be donied. (1) 11 Detache in hald be dotied. (1) 12 Detache in hald be dotied. <	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	low, low or medium.	
24 Colume to employment locations 0 Reference to employment locations 0 33 Obtaine to employment locations 0 Reference to call an employment stationation. Image: Stationation to call an employment stationation. 34 Obtaine to call an employment locations 0 Reference to call an employment stationation. Image: Stationation to call an employment stationation. 35 Obtaines to call an employment locations 0 Reference to call an employment stationation. Image: Stationation to call an employment stationation. 35 Obtaines to call an employment locations 0 Reference to call an employment stationation. Image: Stationation to call an employment stationation. 37 Obtaines to named. Infraction to an edu docom from the nearest escationary school. Image: Stationation to call an employment stationation. Image: Stationation to call an employment stationation. 37 Obtaines to named. Off engreyn 0 Reference to stationation. Image: Stationation. Image: Stationation. 38 Obtaines to stationation. 0 Peoployment of the ele sould involve the loss of platic open states. Image: Stationation. Image: Stationation. 31 Obtaines to stationation. 0 Preference to call an employment station. Image: Stationation. Image: Stationation. 32 Obtaines to stapen station. 0 <	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)		
Sci standard in equipyinent locurationVContract of the set of the	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
as to balk at loads at least set. (1) Image: Control to balk at least set. (1) as D balance to nearest (inferty/marky set)od (2) Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school. Image: Control to nearest secondary school Image: Contro	3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
Construction Construction Construction Construction Construction S0 Datance to nearest secondary school Construction Construction Construction Construction S0 Datance to nearest secondary school Construction	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
So biland to mease scole and yound CP Contract of meases (CP sugery 0 Set is between 1000m from the nearest GP sugery 0 3.7 Difference to nearest (CP sugery 0 Set is between 1000m from the nearest GP sugery 0 3.8 Access to Strategic Read Network 1 No applicable. 100% greenfield set. 250m from an existing settlement (Epping). 4.1 Brownfield and Geenfield Land CP Montry of the set is greenfield and the is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield set. 250m from an existing settlement (Epping). 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to move the loss of public gen space. No open space is located in the set area. Development with the improve the loss of public gen space. 5.1 Londscape sensitivity 0 Set elisa within an area of high londscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape and unlable to about development without generation thankscape and unlable to about development without generation thankscape and unlable to about development without generation thankscape and unlable to about development development. 5.2 Determent character sensitivity 0 Development unlikely to have an effect on settoment character. Set is naturative screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settement character. 6.1 Toography constraints 0 Generation thankscape and unlable to about development. In the settement chara	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
A. Clearaterie in features of studgey 0 Image: Clearaterie of features of studgey 0 B. Access to Strategic Road Network NM Mode applicable. 100% greenfield aller, 250m from an existing settlement (Epping). A. I Bownfield and Greenfield Land Col Modepment of the site synchrifeld is nothing worker the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 100% greenfield aller, 250m from an existing settlement (Epping). A.3 Capacity to improve access to open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not invoive the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not invoive the loss of public open space. S.1 Landscape sensitivity Col Sete first within an area of high landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape area willensable to change. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not invoive the loss of public open space. S.2 Settlement character sensitivity Col Development will write with an area of fing landscape area willensable to change. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not indicace sensitivity con assessed as the hybric sensitive order of the worker of the site. S.2 Settlement character sensitivity O Development is writely at many produid development witer of the indicace of protected trees of the open any constraints of the allocarch in the site area. Set is naturally screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the set	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
A A Decision of strategic router reteriors Image: Contract reteriors	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. In continued and Celemined Land Celemined Land<	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2 Impact on aglicultural land Lef Product on aglicultural land Lef 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscope sensitivity Cel 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 ist. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is naturally screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively inpact on the settlement character. 8.1 Topography constraints Cel Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Site is naturally screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively inpact on the settlement character. 8.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Impact on registration of development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees in or adjacent to the site on its eatent boundary. However the used could be migrated by care in design and layout. 8.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	()	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 250m from an existing settlement (Epping).
A. A capacity to improve access to open space 0 International access and open space 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity C:> 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 isite. Development would be likely to adversely affect the wider landscape character. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is naturally screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints C:> Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Site is naturally screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Impact on the site. 6.2 a Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Impact on the site. Impact on 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 highway. Access could be achieved by creating a new road link to Standards Hill. 6.4 Access to site 0 No contamination issues	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).	
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 is naturally screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints (4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		No open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
2.5 Settement character sensitivity 0 International constraints 1 6.1 Topography constraints (··) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. International constraints 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. International constraints 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. International constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the eatent of development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site eastern boundary. However the impact could be mitigated by care in design and layout. 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 on its eastern boundary. However the impact could be mitigated by care in design and layout. 6.4 Access to site 0 Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway. Access could be achieved by creating a new road link to Standards Hill. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues 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.	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.
6.1 rdpographity Constraints C Provide the state of the state	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is naturally screened on three sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character.
6.24 Distance to gas and bit pipelines 0 Fund and 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 on its eastern boundary. However the impact could be mitigated by care in design and layout. 6.4 Access to site 0 Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway. Access could be achieved by creating a new road link to Standards Hill. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	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.	
6.4 Access to site 0 Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway. Access could be achieved by creating a new road link to Standards Hill. 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.	
6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)		
6.5 Contamination constraints 0 Not applicable. Not applicable.	6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access could be achieved by creating a new road link to Standards Hill.
6.6 Traffic impact Not applicable.	6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
E102	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E102



North Weald			
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0011-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assess ment in Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers	Legend
	Date: March 2018	in Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers	Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0011-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assess ment	Legend		
	Date: March 2018	in Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers	Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4		
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: 1:25,000 @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.		

E103

Ν

	5
Site Reference:	GRT-I_09
Parish:	Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers
Size (ha):	2.97
Address:	Lakeview, Moreton
rimary use:	Traveller
	Travelling Showpeople site north of Village with 9 yards and central area for maintenance and storage. Vacant yard in the north of site. Tree lined to all boundaries.
Source of yield:	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one yard.
Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

Yards:

<u>1</u>

eshunt Greater London

Epping Fores	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
GRT-I_09	Rev 2
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council

GeoEye, Earth

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.	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	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 BAP priority habitat 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 partially within a Local Wildlife Site 250m buffer. 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	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Potential impact on setting of Moreton Conservation Area directly to the south through intensification of site. Possible mitigation through sensitive site layout and good landscaping/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.	Majority of the site is far enough away from motorway to not have a significant impact.
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	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from 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 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 previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Moreton).
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 open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Site adjacent to existing open space which could provide opportunities for improved access to allotments.
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.	The proposed number of pitches is not likely to adversely affect the character of the area. Subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area and listed buildings.
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 Harlow 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.	Site was a domestic landfill site, which may not be economically feasible to redevelop.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E104
		•	© Arup



Croated mile	

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0017-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment	Legend
	Date: March 2018	in Nazeing	Traveller sites assess
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: 1:25,000 @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 ful

Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4

Ν

E105

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

	Site Reference:	GRT-E_07
	Parish:	Nazeing
	Size (ha):	0.50
	Address:	Stoneshot View, Nazeing
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Vacant field. Hedgerow to north, east and south. Existing traveller site adjacent to eastern boundary.
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

Pitches:

<u>5</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt Solution Greater London

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

DS, USDA, USG



UnderstandIndexMode and the second sec					
IntervalueImage and the state of	Criteria	Score		Qualitative Assessment	
Inductionindindex <t< td=""><td>1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0			
Initial controlII10 main control10Moder control control controlModer control control control11 main control10Moder control controlModer control control11 main control10Moder control controlModer control control11 main control10Moder control controlModer control control11 main control10Moder controlModer control12 main control10Moder controlModer control13 main control10Moder controlModer control14 main control10Moder controlModer control15 main control10Moder controlModer control15 main control10Moder controlModer control15 main control10Moder control<	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		The proposed development does not exceed Impact Risk Zone consultation thresholds and is unlikely to result in any adverse effects.	
Lan Luca device for each of the sector of	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.		
An integra production of an any series of a set of	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
Landow Hand weak weak weak weak weak weak weak weak	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.		
Link Look White outNoReplace the form of the second	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within a BAP priority habitat buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
Link or and the second of th	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 a Local Wildlife Site 250m buffer. The site may indirectly affect the Local Wildlife Site, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.	
Name Control Control Control Control 10 instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions 10 Instant inductions Instant inductins Instant inductins Instant i	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.		
Definition and anothologyImage: a main any metal provide and a plane angles.Image: a main any metal provide and any metal plane any metal plane and any metal plane any metal pl	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Located adjacent to Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area and within wider setting of Grade I Listed All Saint Church (elevated position with long views). Possible mitigation through good landscaping/screening.	
13 Hole of addition14Immediate the field of the f	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0			
A Letter faith Inf 1 Wry rgat. Method with the second of the second of the second of the second. 31 Glarance for the reased stables alsone Gel Site method was alsone from a bus site. Gel 32 Glarance for every the state of the second	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
A 1 denies of indice since taking and 10 In advance since taking and a since taking and a since taking and and optime taking and	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()			
2.1 Indicating the release of a single state of the sin	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.		
A Substrate to the properties in control 00 Interesting of the properties in	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.		
A For Market Code in minimum Op Operation of the sense information of the sense informati	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.		
3.3 Detailed in the final manufacture yout 0 Interview of the final manufacture yout 3.6 Detained in final manufacture yout 0.0 Site in one than 400m from the nearest excordary school Interview of the final school in the final	3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.		
3.0 detailed in the feature stochasty studie 10 Information of the feature stochasty studie 3.7 Detailed to the feature stochasty studie 60 Site is note than 4000m from the nearest QP suppey. Information of the feature stochasty studie 3.8 Access to Stategic Road Network 10 Not applicable. Not applicable. 4.1 Boxinfeld and Greenfield Land 60 Not applicable. Not applicable. 4.2 Impact on agricultural land 60 Development of the site south involve the bas of the best and most ventable agricultural land (grides 1.3). Information of the site south involve the loss of public open space. 4.3 Capacely to improve access to open space 0 Development within or adjuscent to a setting - development within or adjuscent to a setting - development within south involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development within or adjuscent particle and state area of modernal landscape sensitive. 6.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Setting and state development. The site shares charadet sensitive and found the reareative development. 6.1 Looport point in the site and prove landscape and ontapication to be setting and state and prove prove access to open space is located in the site and prove prove access to open space is located in the site and contapication of particity and the setting and state and the state and the set and th	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.		
3.7 Detailed indexts of subject (a) Not applicable. (b) 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network (c) Not applicable. (c) 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (c) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versalle agricultural land (grades 1-3). (c) 4.2 Inpact on agricultural land (c) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versalle agricultural land (grades 1-3). Not open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 4.1 Landscape sensitivity (c) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (c) Bereforment unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the wider area of moderate landscape sensitivity. 6.2 Settlement duracter sensitivity (c) Bereforment culturater sensitivity. The site strates character is bereforment would not be existing settlement character. Site is adjecent to Nazeing and South. Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposed development whould not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on of adjecent to the acces of the site on or pose a constraint to the site. 6.2 Distance to gas and all pipelines (c) Poer insed on or pipe aconstraint to the site. Interpresence of protected	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.		
3.8 Access to strategin root remotify Image: Control of the step service of the	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.		
A. I brownied and Greenies Land Image: Constraints	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.		
4.2 Impact of agriculture and effect	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, 1,300m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).	
4-3 Capitally in inprove access to open space 0 Part of the transmission of the transmissin transmitere or transmission of the transmission of th	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 (-) and able to absorb development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is adjacent to Nazeing and South Consentation Area. Therefore, the proposed development has the potential adversely affect the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Site is adjacent to Nazeing and South Consentation Area. Therefore, the proposed development has the potential adversely affect the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Site is adjacent to Nazeing and South Consentation Area. Therefore, the proposed development has the potential adversely affect the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required. 6.2 a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Ges or oil pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. Site is adjacent to Nazeing and South Consentation Area. Therefore, the proposed development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or would require upgrade. Existing unmade access of Hoe Lane is considered unsuitable. The extension to the site would need to be served the access to site would require upgrade. <td>4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space</td> <td>0</td> <td>Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.</td> <td>No open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.</td>	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (-) Index of the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required. 6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development. Index of the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required. 6.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Index of the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required. 6.2 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. Existing unmade access off Hoe Lane is considered unsuitable. The extension to the site would need to be served the access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site will likely be required. 6.4 Access to site 0 Not applicable. Not applicable.	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)		The site shares characteristics with the wider area of moderate landscape sensitivity.	
0.1 Hodgraphy Constraints C/2 Index of the function of the street o	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is adjacent to Nazeing and South Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposed development has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area. Sensitive design would be required.	
6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (-) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access of Hoe Lane is considered unsuitable. The extension to the site would need to be served the access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site will likely be required to access to the existing traveller site. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 Not contamination issues identified on site to date. No optential contamination identified.	6.1 Topography constraints	()	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.		
0.20 Distance to power lines 0 Image: construction power lines 0 Image: construction 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. Existing unmade access of Hoe Lane is considered unsuitable. The extension to the site would need to be served would require upgrade. 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 existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site would need to be served the access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site would need to be served the access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site would need to be served the access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site would need to be served the access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site would need to be served to be served to be constrained by the presence of protected traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site would need to be served to be constrained to be constrained by the presence of protected traveller site. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 Not applicable. Not applicable.	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 (TFO) 0 adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (-) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site will likely be required 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 (*) would require upgrade. the access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site will likely be required 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0			
6.5 Contamination constraints U c C Traffe impact Not applicable.	6.4 Access to site	(-)		Existing unmade access off Hoe Lane is considered unsuitable. The extension to the site would need to be served by the access to the existing traveller site. As a result, reconfiguration of the existing traveller site will likely be required.	
	6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.	
E106	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E106	

	Site Reference:	SR-0168
	Parish:	Nazeing
	Size (ha):	2.11
	Address:	Green Leaves Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Waltham Abbey, EN9
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Greenleaves Mobile home site with 15 existing pitches. Open land in the centre of the site.
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	Feedback was received on NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Pitches:

<u>15</u>

eshunt Greater London

Enning Fores	t District Council
11 0	
Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
SR-0168	Rev 2
	Epping Forest
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council



		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.	The proposed development lies outside of the Impact Risk Zone and therefore Impact Risk Zone requirements are not applicable.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
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.	Site is partially with the buffer zones for Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchards. 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 Zones 2, 3a and 3b covering 8% are located along the western site 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.	Within wider landscape setting of Nazeing and South Roydon CA. Development; should consider impact on historic landscape. Possible mitigation through appropriate layout and high quality design/materials. Not likely to impact setting of GII LBs.
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.	80% 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.	No 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 regeneration area and is proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Although protected trees are present on western boundary of site, it is likely that the protected trees could be incorporated into the layout, subject to reasonable care, without 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 (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E107

		-
	Site Reference:	T-I_02
	Parish:	Nazeing
	Size (ha):	1.17
	Address:	James Mead, Waltham Road, Long Green, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2LU
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Hardstanding and outbuildings. Existing traveller site with two pitches to be assessed for intensification.
	Source of yield	2016 EFDC Officer assessment for number of pitches.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community	

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

Pitches:

<u>5</u>

Hertford sshunt sshunt Greater London

Client	
Epping Forest	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
T-I_02	Rev 1
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council
	copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS,





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	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to an area of Deciduous Woodland and within two BAP priority habitat 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.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Conservation Area due to distance and existing built form in between.
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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 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.	70% greenfield site, 1000m 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	(+)	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 open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to allotments.
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.	Intensification of the existing traveller site in this location adjacent to the village is not likely to further impact on settlement character, however site could be improved by the addition of screening.
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 Waltham Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E108

	Site Reference: T-SR-0171		
	Parish:	Nazeing	
	Size (ha):	2.58	
	Address:	Land at The Meadows, Carters Mead, Waltham Road, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2LX	
use	:	Traveller	
	Site notes:	Vacant field site identified through dismissed appeals and withdrawn applications	
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.	
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.	
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	

<u>15</u>

Pitches:

Hertford Brentwo

Client	
Epping Forest	District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
T-SR-0171	Rev 1
ARUI	C Epping Forest District Council
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMa	copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto ap contributors, and the GB User Community OsEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, User Community



		0		
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	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 wholly within an area of Deciduous Woodland a portion of an area of Deciduous Woodland. The site is likely to directly affect a portion of 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 Galleyhill Wood Complex 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 and existing built form in between.	
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	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, 1000m 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.	Large scale traveller site development on edge of village is likely to impact on rural character, however impact could be mitigated through sensitive design and screening with trees and hedgerows.	
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.	While the majority of the site is visually important developing woodland, the limited extent of tree protection, largely on boundary trees, implies that, subject to care in the layout it need not be a significant constraint on the proposed development.	
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access can be achieved from Waltham Road to the site.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.	
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E109	
		1	© Arup	



Burg Lindsey S	treet	STATE PREM	
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0018-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment in North Weald Bassett	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.	Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:25,000 @A3	USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerognd, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community. 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.

Pitches:

<u>2</u>

		-
	Site Reference:	GRT-I_03
	Parish:	North Weald Bassett
	Size (ha):	0.39
	Address:	Small Meadow, Thornwood
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Pitches in north-west corner of site, with remainder of site vacant. M11 at western boundary, North Weald Bassett Airfield to west, and local road to north. Vacant scrubland site to south.
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



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

Eye, Earth



Source: Eart Digital/clobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USDS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community		AeroGRID, ION, and the GIS User Community	
Criteria Score		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.	The proposed development does not exceed Impact Risk Zone consultation thresholds and is unlikely to result in an 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	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.
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, and it is unlikely that the risk could be mitigated.	The site is close to the M11. Given the proposed use of the site for traveller accommodation it may not be possible mitigate air quality impacts.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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	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 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.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is 6000m from an existing settlement (Thornwood Common).
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 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	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	The proposed number of pitches is not likely to adversely affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Weald Hall Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E111

		-
	Site Reference:	GRT-N_06
	Parish:	North Weald Bassett
	Size (ha):	3.00
	Address:	West of Tylers Green, North Weald Bassett
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Vacant agricultural field. Tree lined to all boundaries. Road adjacent to northern boundary, agricultural fields to all other boundaries.
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	Feedback was received on NWB-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Pitches: 15

Hertfrord Harlow Shunt Schurt Greater London

Job Title	
Epping Forest	District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
GRT-N_06	Rev 2
ARUI	D Epping Forest District Counci

S. NRCA



IndexImage: Section of the				
University of the state of t	Criteria Score		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Uniform ConstraintsNoRestance sequence <br< td=""><td>1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></br<>	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0		
unincluster•••12 mg: discussion0Marking transmission0Marking transmission012 mg: discussion0Marking transmission0Marking transmissionMarking transmission12 mg: discussion0Marking transmission0Marking transmissionMarking transmission12 mg: discussion0Marking transmission0Marking transmissionMarking transmission13 mg: discussion0Marking transmissionMarking transmissionMarking transmission13 mg: discussion0Marking transmissionMarking transmission <td>1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Unified and the control of the cont	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
An index of each of ea	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Home week week week week week week week we	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Initial continueImage: Control of Control	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 minute1 minute <t< td=""><td>1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites</td><td>0</td><td>Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.</td><td></td></t<>	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.	
14 migra tend1617116 migra tend1611116 migra tend161111116 migra tend161111111116 migra tend16111111111117 migra tend1611111111111117 migra tend1611 <td>1.7 Flood risk</td> <td>(++)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	1.7 Flood risk	(++)		
One interactingImage: A stream is a strain filt of processed by length of the strein of the of properties in the length of the strein of the stre	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)		Unlikely to impact on setting of Scheduled Monument due to distance.
Indication of the indication of the instance o	1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
A 1 decide this market deal as the sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is this market data back sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is this market data back sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is this market data back sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is this market data back sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is this market data back sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is the sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is the sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is the sector. 0 Rest between 1000m and 4000m from the market dial back sector. B 1 datace is the sector. 0 Rest back sector. 0 B 1 datace is the sector. 0 Rest back sector. 0 B 1 datace is the sector. 0 Rest back sector. 0 B 1 datace is the sector. 0 Rest back sector. 0 B 1 d	1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	could be mitigated or reduced.	The site is close to the A414 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
A Lossoch is presented mit situet mitten P 33 Decreve to reverset tox steps 40 Six information of a low total low total a low total low total of a low total of a low	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	0		
24 Johnson to seeply must location10101133 Datance to seeply must location096 is more have 1000m and loss has 2400m from names jow end lisk have 2400m from names jow end lisk have 1000m1144 Datance to cal seeply must location096 is bateen 1000m and 4600m from names it low, large tilges or anall vilge.1153 Datance to cal seeply must location096 is bateen 1000m and 4600m from names it low, large tilges or anall vilge.1154 Datance to call seeply first provide second sec	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0		
a Landace de representation a Intervention Intervention b Delance la local arealities 0 Sile is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or anall illage. Intervention 3 Delance la nearesti 0 Sile is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or anall illage. Intervention 3 Delance la nearesti 0 Sile is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school. Intervention 3 Delance la nearest GP surgery 0 Sile is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. Intervention 3 A Delance la nearest GP surgery 0 Sile is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. Intervention 3 A Delance la nearest GP surgery 0 Not speciase. Intervention Intervention 4 I floancella Lance 0 Monty of the sile surgerine (Lance while a selfine area. Intervention (Lance while a selfine area. Intervention (Lance while a selfine area. 4 I floancella Lance 0 Poelsymmet of the sile surgerine (Lance while a selfine area. Intervention (Lance while a selfine area. Intervention (Lance while a selfine area. 5 I floance la nearest on anal delation while a selfine area. Declaramet and and comparison on a selfine area. Intervention (Lance while a selfine area. Intervention (Lance while a	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
A - Userand ID of a - Marcel Information ID - Marcel ID	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 rearest intensignancy solution 0 Performance Performance 3.6 Distance to rearest excordary school 0 Set is more than 4000m from the nearest scoondary school Performance 3.7 Distance to rearest GP surgery 0 Set is between 100m and 400m from the nearest scoondary school Performance 3.8 Distance to rearest GP surgery 0 Rearest to Strategic Road Network 10 Not septicable 3.4 Distance to rearest GP surgery 0 Reformance Performance Performance 4.1 Rewrited and Greenfield Land 10 Notagest end on specification in the state scoondary school Performance 4.2 Leptact on specific Road Network 10 Overlagment of the site swelch mode was state segricultural land (grades 1-3) Performance 4.1 Rewrited and Greenfield Land 10 Overlagment unitably to invoke the loss of the best and most versatte segricultural land (grades 1-3) Periodicable school de devinance 5.1 Landscope sensitivity 10 Betlepment unitably to invoke the loss of the best and most versatte segricultural land (grades 1-3) Periodicable school devinance 6.2 Selsterest dramacter statestivity 10 Betlepment unitably to invoke the loss of the best and most versatte segricultural land (grades 1-3) Periodevinance 6.1 Troopog	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
a distance is neares (CP sugery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP sugery. Image: Comparison of the supersect of th	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.1 Is larged to financial Centrality 0 Interaction of the state of the st	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.4 Access to Strategic Road Velocity Image: Content of Strategicon Road Velocity Image: Content of Stra	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
A. Brownied and celement Link (H) Performed of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (H) Development unlikely 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 unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No 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 meturn landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settement character sensitivity 0+ Development is unlikely to have an effect on settement character. Site is naturally screened on all sides. It is therefore not sikely to negatively impact on the settement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0+ Development willing on the site. Site is naturally screened on all sides. It is therefore not sikely to negatively impact on the settement character. 6.2 Distance to power lines 0+ Reservation of publics on ot pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraints on on pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (H) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to development would be constrained by or suitable vehicular access. 6.4 Access to site	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
*** instact of agliculturation Cert	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	100% greenfield site within an existing settlement (North Weald Bassett).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 International indexcape sensitivity International indexcape sensitivity 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 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 naturally screened on all sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No lopography constraints are identified in the site. International inthe interatinal international international internation	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).	
3.1 Landscape 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 naturally screened on all sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Constraints on the settlement character. 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 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (4) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to However, the impact could be mitigated by care in design and layout. 6.4 Access to site (4) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access of A414. Would need upgrade to allow for suitable vehicular access. 6.5 Contamination constraints (4) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on site. (Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.6 Totamination Not applicable. Not applicable. Not ap	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 International character sensitivity 0 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. International character sensitivity 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. International character sensitivity 6.2b Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. International character sensitivity 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. International character sensitivity 6.3 Inpact 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. The extent of development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (r) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access of fA414. Would need upgrade to allow for suitable vehicular access. 6.5 Contamination constraints (r) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.6 Torfic internation Not applicable. Not applicable.	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 Perturbation Perturbation Perturbation 6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines 0 Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Perturbation 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Perturbation 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (A) The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. The extent of development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees in and adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (A) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Existing access of A414. Would need upgrade to allow for suitable vehicular access. 6.5 Contamination constraints (A) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination in the northern 60% of the site (Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is naturally screened on all sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character.
6.24 Distance to gas and on pipelines0Addition of the set on the	6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2 Distance to power lines 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (·) f.4 Access to 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 of A414. Would need upgrade to allow for suitable vehicular access. 6.5 Contamination constraints (·) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.4 Traffic insert Not applicable. Not applicable. Not applicable.	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 Thee Preservation Order (TPO) (*) the site. However, the impact could be mitigated by care in design and layout. 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 off A414. Would need upgrade to allow for suitable vehicular access. 6.5 Contamination constraints (*) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination in the northern 60% of the site (Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.5 Contamination (*) Not applicable. Not applicable.	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. 6.5 Contamination constraints (*) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. 6.5 Traffic impact Not applicable. Not applicable.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	the site.	However, the impact could be mitigated by care in design and layout.
6.5 Containing of Constraints (*) nitigated.	6.4 Access to site	(-)		Existing access off A414. Would need upgrade to allow for suitable vehicular access.
6.6 Traffic impact E112	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	
	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E112

		,
	Site Reference:	NWB 209
	Parish:	North Weald Bassett
	Size (ha):	0.50
	Address:	South of Weald Hall Lane, east of M11
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Partially tree lined to east and south. Trees lined to west with boundary to M11. Existing traveller site to northern boundary.
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.





Pitches:

<u>5</u>

I database right (2016) increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Inrey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopc s, and the GIS User Community tar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, nce Su

Lea Hertford

Client

Job Title

Drawing Status

Drawing No

lssue



OneUse the set of t				
International processioninternational processioninternational processionChaser advancementcolinternational processioncolChaser advancementcolinternational processio	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
ContentContentContentContentLangene decord and and a statusAnalysis and	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).	
Lanking warmVVV <th< td=""><td>1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites</td><td>0</td><td>Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs.</td><td></td></th<>	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs.	
Landow constraint of a constra	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
NameNameNameNameName12 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName13 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName14 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName15 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName16 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName16 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName16 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName17 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName18 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName19 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName10 hear of NameNameNameNameNameName	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Interpretation of the second	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Number of the second	1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
Linka	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 developsColColCol13 begins on selecting00The base in an index developsThe base in an index develops14 begins on selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops15 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops16 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops17 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops18 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops19 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops10 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops11 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops12 begins of selecting00The base index developsThe base index develops <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.	
Link instanceLink </td <td>1.8a Impact on heritage assets</td> <td>(+)</td> <td>Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.</td> <td>Unlikely to impact on setting of Scheduled Monument due to distance.</td>	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.
14 Notes at summerApple 4 subs (manual of a local standard standard of a local standard standard sta	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.	
1 I used rest30No. to ar adam.90No. to ar adam.1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool and ADM in the status of to Loo adaM.Incomposition of a law status1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status of to Loo adaM.Incomposition of a law status1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status of the status of the statusIncomposition of a law status1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status of the statusIncomposition of the status1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the statusIncomposition of the status1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the statusIncomposition of the status1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the statusIncomposition of the status1 Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the statusRel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the status2 I Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the statusRel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the status2 I Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the status adox of the statusRel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status2 I Decares to researce rathule status30Rel belaves to Cool ad ADM in the status adox of the status adox of the stat	1.9 Impact of air quality	()		
1.1 Indicate the inference inferenc	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	low, low or medium.	
A Detare to encly or encly or encly Get If is more than 4000 more encly things or shall be presented to the start of t	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
A Detarce to local amonities Col A Detarce to local amonities Col B Detarce to needed information on the material information on the meaner local inf	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
An Order Note of each end of a least that it is th	3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
a. Detailed to the field infinitional statude col a. A Detailed to the field infinitional statude col b. Detailed to the field infiniti	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.1 Delance in neurosci Constrainty stratica (1) Information of the strates secondary stratica 3.7 Delance is nearest CP suppry 0. Sie is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest CP suppry Information of the strates secondary stratica 3.8 Access to Stategic Road Network 1 Not applicable. 100% greenfield strat, 800m from an existing settlement (fromewood Common). 4.1 Brownfeld and Greenfield Land () Development of the site wood involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not move the loss of public open space. 4.1 Endocrept existing constraints 0.0 Development unlikely to move the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not move the loss of public open space. 6.1 Landscape enviritivity 0.0 Stelstary will not marke the loss of public open space. Site is located and space to an existing at a used for parting tailers / canves, and some distance from the settement. 6.2 Settement character sensitivity 0.0 Revelopment is unlikely to have an effect on settement character. Site is located and point and and and point and and open any constraint to the site. 6.2 Departy constraints 0.0 Revelopment is unlikely to have an effect on settement character. Site is located and and and and and and and and point and and and and and point and and and point and and and point an and and and point and and and and and and and a	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
a) Detained interface of sugley i	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
A Letter us draftight road retention Image: Contract of the set and most versalle agricultural land (grades 1-3). Image: Contract of the set of the	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4.1 Both the diric Greenine Latin 10 All and a control of the set would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Lappact on agricultural land 0 Development utilikely to involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not lunvolve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Berlopment utilikely to involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not lunvolve the loss of public open space. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Berlopmant utilikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is located adjacent to an existing site used for parking trailiers / caravans, and some distance form the settlement. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Development utilikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is located adjacent to an existing site used for parking trailiers / caravans, and some distance form the settlement. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Development utilikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is unikely to impact affect character. 6.2 Distance to gas and oli pipelines 0 Desparabical constraints exist in the site. Impact on the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (IPO) 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Access to site could be achieved through thind party land and agreement in place, areasiting asite co	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4-2 Inject of agricultural and1011014.3 Capacity to improve access to open space0Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.No open space is located in the site area. Development will not 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 accommodate5.2 Settlement character sensitivity0Development windui significant character change.Site is located adjacent to an existing site used for parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement. Site is unlikely to impact airfield character.6.1 Topographic constraints0Ges or call pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.Site fails within a set development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on streis in like site infect of the safe.6.2 Distance to power lines0Set or call pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site.Site fails on the site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or sonatraint to the site.6.3 Inpact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)0The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on would require upgrade.Constrained on site to date.No optential constraints action of a new role6.4 Access to site0No contamination issues identified on site to date.No optential contamination identified.6.5 Contamination constraints0No contamination issues identified on site to date.No potential contamination identified.6.6 To the site.Not applicable.No applica	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 (Thornwood Common).
10 capacity of improve access to open space 0 Note access to open space 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site falls within an area of low indicacepe sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodel Improve access to development without significant character change. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is located adjacent to an existing site used for parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement site is unlikely to impact atifield character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Implement without significant character is an uncertainter of site is caravans, and some distance from the settlement site used for parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement site used is an uncertainter of parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement site used is an uncertainter of parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement site used is an uncertainter of an existing site used for parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement site used is an uncertainter of an existing site used for parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement site. 6.1 Topographic constraints 0 Power lines do not pose an constraint to the site. Implement without dignificant character without d	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 development without significant character change. I 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is located adjacent to an existing site used for parking trailers / caravans, and some distance from the settlement. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Topographic constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation. Image: Constraint of the site constraint exist in the site but potential for mitigation. 6.2 a Distance to gas and ol pipelines 0 Geas or oll pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Image: Constraint on 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 constraints or would require upgrade. Access to site could be achieved through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access to site could be achieved through third party land to the north and would require a construction of a new road constraints 6.4 Access to site 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified. 6.5 Enformation 0 Not applicable. Not applicable. Not applicable.	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
3.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Intervalue of the setting	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.	
0.1 Hobgraphy constraints (-) Index of the set of	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	
B2.2 Distance to gas and oil pipelines0A function of the state	6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2 Distance to power lines 0 Image: Contract of power lines 0 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 0 The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or 6.4 Access to site (·) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access Access to site could be achieved through third party land to the north and would require a construction of a new road connecting to Weald Hall 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	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.3 impact on nee Preservation Order (PO) 0 adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (-) Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access to site could be achieved through third party land to the north and would require a construction of a new road connecting to Weald Hall 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 (*) would require upgrade. connecting to Weald Hall Lane. 6.5 Contamination constraints 0 No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified. 6.6 Tefficiencest Not applicable. Not applicable. Image: Content in the second	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 0 Not applicable.	6.4 Access to site	(-)		
6.6 Traffic impact E113	6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E113





Nazeing Roa			
	St Leonards Road		
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0019-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment in Roydon	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.	Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 N Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:20,000 @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.

	Site Reference:	GRT-I_08	ŀ
	Parish:	Roydon	
	Size (ha):	0.14	
	Address:	Sons Nursery, Hamlet Hill	1 11
			e
use	:	Traveller	
	Site notes:	Existing traveller site with two pitches. Road to southern boundary, residential garden to east. No boundary to surrounding vacant hardstanding site to north and west.	1-1-1
	Source of yield	Assumption based on planning application.	С
			E
			J
	Site	No constraints identified.	E
	constraints:		D
			D
	Community feedback:		D G

Pitches:

<u>2</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest Di	istrict Local Plan			
Drawing Status	Date			
lssue	March 2018			
Drawing No	Issue			
GRT-I_08	Rev 2			
ARUP				
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri Chrai (Hong Korg), swissti Maomvindia, © DeneStreetMas contributors, and the GSI User Community				

USGS

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earth AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Comm



Criteria	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.	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	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 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.	Within wider landscape settings of Grade I Listed Netherhall Gatehouse and Grade I Listed All Saints Church but unlikely to impact due to scale of site and 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.	Majority of the site is far enough away from motorway to not have a significant impact.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	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 within a settlement.	95% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Roydon Hamlet).
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 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.	The site shares characteristics with the wider area of moderate landscape sensitivity.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	The proposed pitch is not likely 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.	Existing access off Hamlet 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		Not applicable.	E115
			@Arup

	Site Reference:	GRT-N_01
	Parish:	Roydon
	Size (ha):	2.57
	Address:	Paradise Farm, Hamlet Hill
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Vacant field, tree lined to all boundaries. Storage yard and access to Hamlet Hill on western boundary.
Source of yield: Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.		Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



<u>10</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest District Local Plan				
Drawing Status	Date			
Issue	March 2018			
Drawing No	Issue			
GRT-N_01	Rev 2			
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council			
	copyright and database right (2016)			





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.	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.	The site is partly within the 250m Ancient Woodland buffer for Totwellhill Bushes Ancient Woodland. The site is unlikely to directly affect the Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	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, and within two buffer zones. The site is likely to indirectly affect the habitat, but effects are 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 a Local Wildlife Site 250m buffer. 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	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Within wider landscape setting of Grade I listed Netherhall Gatehouse and Scheduled Monument, also within wider setting of Grade II listed Eagle House to north west. Impact on settings to be considered. Possible mitigation through landscaping/screening.
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 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	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 (Roydon Hamlet).
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 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.	The site shares some of the characteristics of the wider character area of moderate sensitivity.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	The proposed number of pitches is not likely 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	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access could be achieved off Hamlet Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination in northern corner of the site (Farmyard / Depot / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E116
	I	1	©Arut

		-
	Site Reference:	T-E_02
	Parish:	Roydon
	Size (ha):	0.25
	Address:	Tomary, Hamlet Hill, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5JY
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Existing authorised traveller site with 12 pitches and existing authorised traveller site with one pitch on adjacent site (Richard's Farm).
	Source of yield	2016 EFDC Officer assessment for number of pitches.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



<u>2</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest	District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date		
Issue	March 2018		
Drawing No	Issue		
T-E_02	Rev 1		
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council		
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorn GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL,	copyright and database right (2016) ne. Internap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissto acarditivutes, and the OEL bace Comercuity		

USGS

urce: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthst



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	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, Grade I Listed Building, Grade II* Listed Building or Scheduled Monument due to distance and existing built form in between sites.
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 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	(-)	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, 1500m from an existing settlement (Broxbourne).
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 site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Proposed traveller site development is small in scale and adjacent to other traveller pitches therefore it is not likely 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	(-)	would require upgrade.	There is no existing access to the site. Access would be required through third party land on to Hamlet Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm / Depot / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E117
			©Arup

	Site Reference:	T-E_10	
	Parish:	Roydon	
	Size (ha):	0.21	
	Address:	Rose Farm, Hamlet Hill, Roydon, CM19 5JU	
use	:	Traveller	
	Site notes:	Hardstanding and outbuildings. Existing traveller site with one pitch with temporary permission. To be assessed for regularisation of authorised temporary permission and intensification.	
	Source of yield	2016 EFDC Officer assessment for number of pitches.	
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.	
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	



<u>2</u>

Hertford Hertford Hertford Harlow Har

Epping Forest Di	
Epping Forest Di	istrict Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
T-E_10	Rev 1
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council
GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordna	right and database right (2016) lermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCA ance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swissi orchutors, and the GIS Liese Compunity

Eye, Earth

, 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	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 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 settings of Conservation Area, Grade I Listed Building or Scheduled Monument due to distance and existing built form in between sites.
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 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	(-)	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	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, 1500m from an existing settlement (Roydon).
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	()	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 site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Regularisation of traveller site is not likely to impact on settlement character in this location. The site is located in a predominantly rural 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.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Stables / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E118
			©Arup

Pitches:

<u>4</u>

3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery

3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network

	Site Reference:	T-E_11
	Parish:	Roydon
	Size (ha):	0.43
	Address:	Ashview, Hamlet Hill, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5LA
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Area of hardstanding. Existing traveller site with one pitch to be assessed for regularisation of authorised temporary permission and intensification.
	Source of yield	2016 EFDC Officer assessment for number of pitches.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



Epping Forest	t District Council
Job Title	
Epping Forest	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
lssue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
T-E_11	Rev 1
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorn GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL,	n copyright and database right (2016) me, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAI Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisst lan contributes, and the GIS Lisar Community.

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geograp AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

hics, 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.	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 three BAP priority habitat 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.	Unlikely to impact on settings of 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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	

Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.

0

Not applicable.

4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, 1500m from an existing settlement (Roydon).
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 be likely to find high vulnerability, at least in part of the site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so not likely to adversely affect the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Regularisation of traveller site is not likely to impact on settlement character. The site is located in a predominantly rural area and is largely screened from the road.
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 Hamlet Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Smallholding / Scrapyard / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E119
			•

	Site Reference:	: T-SR-0533
	Parish:	Roydon
	Size (ha):	0.73
	Address:	The Conifers, Netherall Road, Glen Faba Road, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5JW
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Area of hardstanding and outbuildings identified through pre- application enquiry
	Source of yield	2016 EFDC Officer assessment for number of pitches.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.



Pitches:

<u>1</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt State State

Client			
Epping Forest District Council			
Job Title			
Epping Forest	District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date		
lssue	March 2018		
Drawing No	Issue		
T-SR-0533	Rev 1		
ARUI	C Epping Forest District Council		
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm	copyright and database right (2016) ne, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, Ordnance Survey, Est, Japan, METL Est, China (Hong Kong)		





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).	Residential development between 400m and 2km from Lee Valley Special Protection Area. Evidence from the Habitats Regulation Assessment (2016) indicates that in-combination effects from urbanisation or recreational pressure are unlikely.
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	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to an area of Deciduous Woodland, and is in its 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	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site is partially within a small part of the Lea Valley North LWS, and wholly within the relevant 250m buffer zone. The site may directly affect the Local Wildlife Site, but mitigation in the form of considered masterplanning could be implemented.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 68% of the site is in Flood Zone 2, with the remainder falling into Flood Zone 1. Flood Zone 2 is located in the majority of the north and western site boundary but flood risk can be mitigated 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, Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monument due to distance and scale of proposal.
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 more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	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	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	65% brownfield site, 1000m from an existing settlement (Roydon).
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 open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of open space. Site adjacent to existing woodland and could provide opportunities to improve access.
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 site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is in a rural location outside of any settlement, and screened from the road by trees. Proposed traveller pitches are of a scale that would not impact on the rural 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 Glen Faba Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Works / Proximity to Landfill). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E120
Ĺ	I	1	©Arut

		-
	Site Reference:	T-X_14
	Parish:	Roydon
	Size (ha):	2.57
	Address:	Roydon Lodge Chalet Estate, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5EF
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Subdivided plots with some areas of hardstanding. Part-authorised existing traveller site with some pitches with authorised temporary permission. To be assessed for regularisation
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	Majority of the site to the north, east and west constrained by Flood Risk Zone 3b (60%) and Flood Risk Zone 3a (69%). Capacity adjusted proportionally to account for constrained part of the site to remove it from the developable area.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



<u>8</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council

Job Title Epping Forest District Local Plan



© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources Eerl, HERE, DeLorme, Internary, Increment P Corp. CEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Ceoßase, IGN, Karlaster NL, Ordnanco Survey, Esri, Japan, METL, Esri Chran, (Hong Kong), swisstopc Mapmyridia, C. OpenStreetMay, contributors, and the GIS User Community Source: Esri, DigitalGobe, 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	0	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination	Residential development between 400m and 2km from Lee Valley Special Protection Area. Evidence from the Habitats	
		with other sites). Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed	Regulation Assessment (2016) indicates that in-combination effects from urbanisation or recreational pressure are unlikely. No requirement to consult with Natural England for residential development.	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs.			
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland O Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.			
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.		
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 five BAP priority habitat 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 3a or Flood Zone 3b and not likely to be suitable for development.	Some 99% of the site in Flood Zone 2, of which some 69% and 60% is in Flood Zone 3a and 3b respectively. 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.	Unlikely to impact on settings of Conservation Area, Grade I Listed Building or Registered Park and Garden due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.		
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.		
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	The Stage 1 assessment assessed the area as contributing strongly to the Green Belt purposes. Regularising the remaining development on this site may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt in terms of increasing sprawl and coalescence with Harlow.	
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	(+)	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.	75% greenfield site, 100m from an existing settlement (Roydon).	
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 site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Regularisation of existing traveller site away from settlement not likely to affect settlement character.	
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.		
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.		
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Of the many trees on site, the single protected tree affects only a limited area and so, subject to care in the layout would not be a significant constraint.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Access would be required via a private road from High Street.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.	
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E121	



Born Road	
	And in the

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0022-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment	Legend	
	Date: March 2018	in Stapleford Abbotts	Traveller sites assessed	
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: 1:15,000 @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 lege	

Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4

Ν

E122

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

		-
	Site Reference:	GRT-E_09
	Parish:	Stapleford Abbotts
	Size (ha):	0.40
	Address:	Pond View, Stapleford Abbotts
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Vacant field, triangular shape. Tree lined to south, laneway along northern boundary, existing traveller site adjacent to eastern boundary.
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



<u>4</u>

Client

Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest	District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	Date March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
GRT-E_09	Issue Rev 2	
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council	
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm	copyright and database right (2016) le, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NF Ordnance Survey, Esti Janan, METL Esti China (Hong Ko	



© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016)
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN,
GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo,
MapmyIndia, C OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS,
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.	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	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	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	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	(+)	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 (Stapleford Abbotts).
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 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.	The proposed number of pitches is not likely to adversely affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	()	There is no means of access to the site and no likely prospect of achieving access.	The site is served by a single track and therefore access is not considered to be suitable to support the scale of development proposed.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E123

		-
	Site Reference:	GRT-I_05
	Parish:	Stapleford Abbotts
	Size (ha):	0.42
	Address:	Pond View, Stapleford Abbotts
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Tree lined to south, east and west. Laneway along northern boundary. Traveller use in south-east portion of site, remainder of site vacant field.
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



<u>2</u>

Hertford Brentw Client

Epping Forest District Council				
Drawing Status	Dat			
Issue	March 2018			
Drawing No	Issue			
GRT-I_05	Rev 2			
ARUI	P Epping Forest District Council www.oppingforestdc.gov.uk			
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorn	i 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			



Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
ternationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
ationally 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 the adverse effects.
Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
oping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
AP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
ocal Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
neritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
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.	
quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	Majority of the site is far enough away from motorway to not have a significant in
n 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.	
he nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
		Site is within 400m of a hus stop	

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.	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	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	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.	Majority of the site is far enough away from motorway to not have a significant impact.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site 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 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	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.	85% greenfield site, adjacent to a settlement (Stapleford Abbotts).
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 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.	The proposed number of pitches is not likely to adversely affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	()	There is no means of access to the site and no likely prospect of achieving access.	The site is served by a single track and therefore access is not considered to be suitable to support the scale of development proposed.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Smallholding / Made Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E124

	Site Reference:	T-E_12
	Parish:	Stapleford Abbotts
	Size (ha):	0.67
	Address:	Valley View, Curtis Mill Lane, Stapleford Abbotts, Essex, RM4 1HS
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Existing unauthorised traveller site with one pitch to be assessed for regularisation and additional vacant land adjacent to be assessed for expansion of site
	Source of yield	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

Pitches:

<u>6</u>

Hertford Sentine Schurt Sch

strict Council
strict Local Plan
Date
March 2018
Issue
Rev 1
Epping Forest District Council



		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 (any development that could cause dust), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
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 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	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 more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	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	(-)	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	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, 1000m from an existing settlement (Bournebridge).
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 site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is in a rural location outside of any settlement, and screened from the road by trees and hedgerows. Proposed traveller pitches are of a scale that would not impact on the rural 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 Curtis Mill Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E125
		•	©Aru



Ν

E126



Ongar Road			
	3		

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0023-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment		
	Date: March 2018	in Stapleford Tawney		Trave
ARUP		Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.		Parisł
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:15,000 @A3	Contains Ordnance Survey & Royal Mail Data (c) Crown Copyright & Database Right 2016 EFDC License No: 100018534 2016	This legend sh	ows only k
			This legend sh	ows only k

veller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4

ish Boundary

y key map symbology. A full legend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

		-
	Site Reference:	T-X_15
	Parish:	Stapleford Tawney
	Size (ha):	2.84
	Address:	Birchfield, Epping Lane, Stapleford Tawney, Essex, RM4 1ST
use	:	Traveller
	Site notes:	Existing traveller site to be assessed for regularisation, although site had injunction and withdrawn application
Source of yield: Assump		Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
	Site constraints:	HSE Inner Zone affects the middle part of the site (53%). Capacity adjusted proportionally to account for constrained part of the site to remove it from the developable area.
	Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



<u>14</u>

Hertford Harlow eshunt Creater London Brentwood

Job Title	
Epping Fores	t District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
T-X_15	Rev 1
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016) Sources: Earl, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEDCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadopenter NL, Ordnance Survey, Earl Japan, ME'TL Earl China (Hong Kong), swisstopc Mapmyindia, © ApositiseretMap contributoris, and the GS User Community Source: Earl, DigitalGibob, GeoEye, Earhthar Geographica, CNESAirbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Criteria Score		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.	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.	The site is located at the edge of the 250m buffer for the Shales More Ancient Woodland. The site is therefore unlikely to affect Ancient Woodlands due to the separation distance.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	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 four BAP priority habitat 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.	The site is wholly within the Shales More 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 2 and exception test not required.	Some 19% of the site in Flood Zone 2. Flood Zone 2 is located along the western site boundary and flood risk can be mitigated 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 Conservation Area or Registered Park and Garden due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	()	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, and it is unlikely that the risk could be mitigated.	The site is close to the M25. Given the proposed use of the site for traveller accommodation it may not be possible to mitigate air quality impacts.
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 more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	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	(-)	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, 3000m from 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.	Site characteristics are such that a detailed assessment would likely find high vulnerability, at least in part of site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is in a rural location outside of any settlement, and screened from the road by trees. Proposed traveller pitches are of a scale that would not impact on the rural character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	()	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	All of site is in HSE middle consultation zone and inner zone affects the middle part of the site (47%). Limited potential for mitigation. HSE guidance advise against development in inner zone.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access could be achieved from Epping Lane to the site.
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		Not applicable.	E127
<u>i</u>	I		© Arup





		Debden	unndomRoad market and a second
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0024-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment in Theydon Bois	
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.	Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 N Parish Boundary
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:17,500 @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.

Pitches:

<u>14</u>

	-	V V
Site Reference	: GRT-N_12	Hertfo
Parish:	Theydon Bois	5.0
Size (ha):	1.48	
Address:	Abridge Road, Theydon Garnon	eshun
Primary use:	Traveller	T
Site notes:	Vacant agricultural field. Tree lined to all boundaries. Road adjacent to western boundary. Abutting residential properties to east, west and south.	2
Source of yield	d: Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.	Client Eppi
Site constraints:	No constraints identified.	Job Titl Eppi Drawing
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.	Drawing GRT



Epping Forest	Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title			
Epping Forest	District Local Plan		
Drawing Status	Date		
lssue	March 2018		
Drawing No	Issue		
GRT-N_12	Rev 2		
ARUI	Epping Forest District Council		
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, G	copyright and database right (2016) e, Internap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCA Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swiss		

Eye, Earth

USGS



		Aerockiu, isik, 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.	Site is over 1km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Potential for in combination recreational effects.
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	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 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.	Majority of the site is far enough away from motorway to not have a significant impact.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be 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 more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 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, 650m from an existing settlement (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	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No 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 naturally screened on all sides. It is therefore not likely to negatively impact on 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)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The extent of development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees in or adjacent to the site on its eastern boundary. However the impact could be mitigated by care in design and layout.
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access could be achieved off Abridge Road. Site also runs adjacent to Coopersale Lane, which is very narrow and not suitable for larger vehicles over 7.5 tonnes.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Within 440m of infilled pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E129
			© Arup

St Leonards Road Massilli 1 Holyfield (538) A -Grooted Mile WA 81 GRT-N_07 Si-enview IN^{ay} Meridian AR - Applie Back **J26** M25 Honey Lane 100 Weed Adden HIII Coppice Row -Golding'S Hill-WA 42 -Holison A Rectoryliane Concontin

C, Beshunt Mash

Waltham Cross

Leavalley/Roa	tings Head Hill	Range,sRoad	
Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0027-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment	Legend
ARUP	Date: March 2018	in Waltham Abbey Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEve, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA,	Traveller sites assessed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4
Epping Forest District Council	Scale: 1:30,000 @A3	Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community. 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:	GRT-N_07	
Parish:	Waltham Abbey	
Size (ha):	4.41	
Address:	Yard/car park at rear Lea Valley Nursery, Crooked Mile, Waltham Abbey	
Primary use:	Traveller	
Site notes:	Derelict nursery site with vacant hardstanding. Residential development to west and south, vacant scrubland north, east and south.	
Source of yield: Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.		



Pitches:

<u>15</u>

Hertford Hertford eshurit Greater London

Client		
Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest	District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
GRT-N_07	Rev 2	
ARUI	Definition Epping Forest District Council	
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL,	copyright and database right (2016) ie, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, MET, Esri China (Hong Kong) as cantibutes and the CPB Unce Communicht	

rce: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earth

NPS, NRCAN ong), swissto USGS,



OneUmber of the second sec				
International property of the state of th	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
DistanceSee a sector of the secto	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)		
Lanking water	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Landow construction of the con	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
NameNameNameName12 hear and provide status and a	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
Interfactor definitionControlControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the second definition of the second definitionControlControl19 definition of the	1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
Number of Parkan C Inclusion C 12 Redath Ref Ref<	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.	
LinkaMailMeanMean10 mail10Mean	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 track Lake Lake track Lake trake tr	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
Linking Dis Discription is and an any field in the f	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Site is located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	Unlikely to have significant impact on settings of Conservation Area or Scheduled Monument due to distance and existing built-up surroundings, but possible mitigation through good landscaping/screening.
14 integration6 interface interface interface16 interface interface interface12 later drama terms6 interface interf	1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	archaeological assets on the site.	
1 Indexent of encent of all solution of the set of all solution in the set of all solution is the set of all all all solution is the set of all all all all all all all all all al	1.9 Impact of air quality	0		Majority of the site is far enough away from motorway to not have a significant impact.
1.1 Indication that interferent methods stature CP Performance Performance 1.2 Dubarce to masket than shoot CP Performance Performance Performance 1.3 Dubarce to masket than shoot CP Performance Performance Performance 1.3 Dubarce to masket than shoot CP Performance Performance Performance 1.3 Dubarce to masket than shoot CP Performance Performance Performance 1.3 Dubarce to masket than shoot CP Performance Performance Performance 1.3 Dubarce to masket than shoot CP Performance	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	low, low or medium.	
A Detare to emply rest to des sol 10 Non-net former and sole of the second sole of t	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0		
3.3 bitwind and enclose 0 Interaction in the second s	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.1 Detarbet to data returned: 0 Information of the set	3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.3 Userate to the test minimum is studied 0 Information of the test minimum is studied 0 3.6 Dubates to nearest secondary school 0 0 Six is issue and 2000 from the nearest QP surgery. Information of the secondary school Informat	3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.2 Detailed in Huntris stochasty soldar • 3.7 Detailed in Huntris stochasty soldar • 3.7 Detailed is nearest OP suppry • Se is less than 100m from the nearest QP sugery. 3.8 Detailed and Greenfield Land • Not applicable. Development of the sets would involve the loss of the best and most wnattle agricultural land (grades 1-3). Development of the sets would involve the loss of public open space. 4.1 Indicape evenitivity • Development of the sets would involve the loss of public open space. No open space is located in the sets area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 4.1 Indicape evenitivity • Development unload grid. No open space is located in the sets area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape evenitivity • Development unload grid. No open space is located in the sets area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. 6.1 Tabography constraints • Development unload grid. Sets is on the adjust open space. 6.2 Departed to public open space. • Development unload grid. Sets is on the adjust open space. 6.3 Departed to public open space. • Development unload grid. Sets is on the adjust open space. 6.4 Departed to public open space. • Development on a and of mediu	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 (v) Independence of suglery (v) 3 A Access to Strategic Road Network (v) Not applicable. 100% greenfield and 100% greenfield ate, adjoint of the site is greenfield and adjoint of the site is greenfield and one venatile agricultural land (greenfield). 100% greenfield ate, adjoint of the site agreentield land adjoint of the site is greenfield and one venatile agricultural land (greenfield). 100% greenfield ate, adjoint of the site agreentield land (greenfield). 4.2 Inpact on agricultural land (v) Development of the site on agree of the site agreentield land (greenfield). No open space is located in the site agree. No open space is located in the site agree. No open space is located in the site agree of	3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
A Section of statistic from tention Image: Contract of the section of the sectin of the section of the section of the section	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)		
4.1 Both the diric Greenine Latin (a) All and a control of the set of the set of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (b) Development of the site would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). No open space is located in the site area. Development will on linvolve the loss of public open space. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (c) Site fals within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change. No open space is located in the site area. Development will not linvolve the loss of public open space. 5.2 Settlement character sensitivity (c) Site fals within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints (c) No topography constraints are identified in the site. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement character. 6.2 Distance to gas and oli pipelines (c) Res or al pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Site is on pipelines do not pose a constraint to the site. 6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (c) The internsity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected free either on the site. Existing access of Crooked Mile. 6.4 Constamation constraints (c) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network			
Number of regretation and of the set of the se	4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)		100% greenfield site, adjacent to a settlement (Waltham Abbey).
1-2 Capitally of infproferations 0 Find and the operations Find and the operations 5.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change Site is on the edge of the existing settlement with glasshouses. It is naturally screened from the road and therefore, not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement with glasshouses. It is naturally screened from the road and therefore, not likely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 Notopography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Compact Compac	4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()		
0.1 Landscape sensitivity 0 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. Sike is on the edge of the existing settlement with glasshouses. It is naturally screened from the road and therefore, not ikkely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Comparison of the edge of the existing settlement with glasshouses. It is naturally screened from the road and therefore, not ikkely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Topography constraints 0 No topography constraints are identified in the site. Image: Comparison of the edge of the existing settlement with glasshouses. It is naturally screened from the road and therefore, not ikkely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.2 a Distance to gas and ol pipelines 0 No topography constraints or the site. Image: Comparison of the edge of the existing settlement with glasshouses. It is naturally screened from the road and therefore, not ikkely to negatively impact on the settlement character. 6.1 Infectiones 0 Reserved not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Comparison of the edge of the existing settlement with glasshouses. It is naturally screened from the road and therefore of protected trees either on glass and on the site. Image: Comparison of the edge of the existing access of Crooked Mile. 6.1 Access to site	4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0		
3.2 Settlement character sensitivity 0 Intervent of an activity 10 Intervent of an activity 10 Intervent of an activity Intervent of activity	5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
0.1 Hobgraphy Constraints 0 Addee and addee a	5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0		
6.24 Distance to gas and on pipelines 0 Performan Image: Constraint on pipelines Image: Constraint on pipelines 6.2b Distance to power lines 0 Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site. Image: Constraint on pipelines Image: Constraint on pipeli	6.1 Topography constraints	0		
6.2 Distance to power times 0 Image: Contract of 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. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Crooked Mile. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries / Scrapyard / Shooting Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.6 Turffic insert Not applicable. Not applicable. Existing access off Crooked Mile.	6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0		
6.3 Impact on Nee Preservation Order (1FO) 0 adjacent to the site. 6.4 Access to site (+) Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Crooked Mile. 6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries / Scrapyard / Shooting Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 6.6 Turffic insect Not applicable. Not applicable. Existing access off Crooked Mile.	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 Nurseries / Scrapyard / Shooting Ground). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated. 0.6 Turffic insect Not applicable.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	adjacent to the site.	
b.5 Contamination constraints (-) mitigated.	6.4 Access to site	(+)		
6.6 Traffic impact E131	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	
	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E131

Site Reference	: WA 42		
Parish:	Waltham Abbey		
Size (ha):	1.42		
Address:	South-west side of Avey Lane, opposite the Pynest Green Lane junction		
Primary use:	Traveller		
Site notes:	Trees lined to north and west. No boundary to south and east.		
Source of yield: Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.			



Pitches:

<u>14</u>

Hertford Hertford eshunt Statistics Brentwood Greater London

Client				
Epping Forest District Council				
Job Title				
Epping Forest Dis	strict Local Plan			
Drawing Status	Date			
lssue	March 2018			
Drawing No	Issue			
WA 42	Rev 2			
ARUP	Epping Forest District Council			
© Contains OS data © Crown copyri	ght and database right (2016)			



© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016)
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN,
GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo,
MapmyIndia, C OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS,
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.	Site is located 570m 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	(-)	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 within Wood Pasture and Parkland, BAP priority habitat with no main features and Deciduous 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.	
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	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is 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	(-)	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, 100m from an existing settlement (High Beech).
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 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 site and its immediate context have an urban form, and the wider context shares the characteristics of an adjacent area adjudged to have low landscape sensitivity to change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	The proposed number of pitches is not likely 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	()	There is no means of access to the site and no likely prospect of achieving access.	The site has existing access constraints which would be challenging to overcome and would require upgrade of the existing road. Provision of suitable access for caravans / trailers is not likely.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E132

Site Reference:	WA 81
Parish:	Waltham Abbey
Size (ha):	1.05
Address:	West of Galleyhill Road, south of Breach Barns Lane junction and immediately south of Poultry Farm
Primary use:	Traveller
Site notes:	Trees lined to north. Hedgerow lined to east. No boundaries to south or west.
Source of yield:	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
Site	No constraints identified.



Pitches:

<u>10</u>

constraints:

eshurt schurt sc

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

e GIS U

irbus DS, USDA, USGS



12 Bigs of new Profession Stratus 0 Interpret of Lear Walls State 0 Bet has the field as backets and species could be maned or due to distance of lear insidie sites from state 11 Bigs of an Lear Walls State 0 Bet has the field as backet and to field or distance of the lo distance of lear insidie sites from state Image of the state set of the state set of the state set of the state of the state of the lo distance of the lo distance of the state of the stat				
11 Index and and any Protocol and any Protocol and P	Criteria		Score	Qualitative Assessment
Calibration for individual for addition for the sequence is unit by pose of the sequence is only of the	1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)		Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
Lat Map Lot And each Vector Mark Lat Lat Map Lot And each Vector Mark Lat 13b map Lot And each Vector Mark C Vector Mark Vector Mark Description Descrin Description Description <td>1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0		
Lab regict of whether waters in each share of a water water of share of source of LAP providy blacks from an electron platfix card.Site in an electron platfix card.14 regict of gloing Freek that is card.101010 is a within yound on Egoing Freek that is card.Site in an electron platfix card.13 regict or table? How yound on Second on an electron of LAP providy blacks from an electron water bases that an electron of LAP providy blacks from an electron water bases that an electron of LAP providy blacks from an electron water bases that an electron of LAP providy blacks from an electron water bases that an electron of LAP providy blacks from an electron water bases that	1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
Number of space of each of space of each of space and space of each of the space of each of each of space of each o	1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
La linguad in diversitivity species in duration Via Indexpected to statistics in the process out the relation of boat widtle sites that its Indexpected to statistics in the process out the relation of boat widtle sites that its 11 flagsad in Local Waltes States 40 Site with the process of the relation of boat widtle sites that its Indexpected to statistics in the process of the relation of boat widtle sites that its 11 flagsad in Local Waltes States 400 Site with the flags densities in the flags of the flags excess of the relation of boat widtle sites in the flags of the flags excess of the flags exces of the flags excess of the flags excess of the flags exces of the	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.
11 Indication Code Meetings assets 12 Bits within Flood Zare 1. 12 Bits within Flood Zare 1. 12 Flood rak. 100 Site in clickly to affect heritage assets due to heri datasees from the alter. Incompare of the heritage assets 100 13 Inspect of a varbacology 00 Site in clickly to affect heritage assets due to herit datasees from the alter. Incompare of the varbacology 00 Site in clickly to affect heritage assets due to herit datasees from the alter. Incompare of the and bacology of high databace 13 Inspect of an archaeology 00 Site is calculated of areas alter of perica databace. If the is affects as hery alter of perica databace. Incompare of the ison of the ison of the ison of the databace. 13 Inspect of an archaeology 00 Site is more than a 1000m from the nearest rail of table station. Incompare of the ison of the ison of the ison of the anal table. 13 Databace to heritage to service of heritage to service of the ison of the i	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 habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
In Proce tak Inter 1 file inpact on herizoge steels (H) Note taking a steel of the link by a field theritoge steels of their distance from her line. 1 file inpact of a cacheology (A) Sets outside of areas identify a field to theritoge assets due to their distance from her line. 1 file inpact of a cacheology (A) Sets outside of areas identify a field to theritoge assets due to their distance from her line. 1 file inpact of a cacheology (A) Sets outside of areas identify a field to theritoge asset due to their distance from her line. 2 interest of a cacheology (A) Sets outside of areas identify a field to theritoge asset due to their distance from her line. 2 interest to a cacheology (A) Sets outside of areas identify a field to theritoge asset due to the line of the line of the distonce of the land to distance from the distonce. 2 instance to reaser to their line of the ant 4000m from the reaser statistic. Sets in rore than a 5000m from a los site. 3 instance to local areasitie. (B) Sets instance 1000m and 4000m from the exerces instanting improve statistic. 3 instance to local areasitie for prives and site. Sets between 1000m and 4000m from the exerces instanting improve statistic. 3 instance to reaser infinity improve access in form prives. Sets between 1000m and 4000m from the exerces of Baugers. 3 instance to reaser infinity improve acc	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.	
Item input unit indige assess Item Indication of any place of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of a back of the input of any place and of any place and of a back of the input of any place and any pl	1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1 do implied of inclusionary 0 archaeological assets on the site. 19 lenged of air quality 0 Bite is outside of arreas identified as being at risk of poor air quality. 2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt 0 Bite is writen Green Belt 0 Bite is writen Green Belt over the invest of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very 3.1 Distance to the merest trait/ube station 0 Bite is more than a 1000m from the nearest rial or tube station. Image: Control of the station of the merest rial tube station Image: Control of the station of the merest rial tube station Image: Control of the station of the merest rial tube station Image: Control of the station of the merest rial tube station Image: Control of the station of the merest rial tube station Image: Control of tube station	1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	
1 degrade of a region of the serves of rabins 0 Interpret of the serves of rabins of the serves of rabins 0.0 Set a with information. 2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt 0.0 Sets a with information. 0.0 Sets a with information. 0.0 Sets a with information. 3.1 Datatione to the nearest rabins to station. 0.0 Sets more than a 1000m from the nearest rail of table station. 0.0 Sets more than a 1000m from a bus stop. 3.2 Datatione to melyoyment locations 0.0 Sets in between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large vilage or small silage. 0.0 Sets is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infarity/mary school. 0.0 1.0 3.4 Datatione to nearest (infarity/mary school 0.0 Sets between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infarity/mary school. 0.0 1.0 Sets between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infarity/mary school. 0.0 1.0	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.	
2.1 Level of namin Green level 0 low, low or medium. 3.1 Distance to hearest mailube station 0 Site in orre than 4000m from the hearest rail or tube station. 3.2 Distance to nearest bos stop 60 Site in more than 1000m from a bus stop. 3.3 Distance to employment locations 0 Site in more than 1000m from a bus stop. 3.4 Distance to employment locations 0 Site in profer than 1600m and 4600m from nearest lown, large village or small village. 3.4 Distance to nearest infant/primary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4600m from the nearest infant/primary school. 3.5 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest scondary 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 1 Nit applicable. 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Lond (c) Majority of the site is greenfield and that is neither within nor adjacent to a settement. 10% in greenfield site. Scott from an existing settement (Watham Abbey). 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Lond (c) Majority of the site would involve the loss of the best and most vensatile agricultural land (grades 1-3) 10% in greenfield site. Scott from an existing settement (Watham Abbey). 4.1 Brownfield an agricultural land	1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
3.1 Distance to market landoux station (4) 3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop (6) 3.3 Distance to employment locations 0 3.4 Distance to boal amenifies 0 3.4 Distance to local amenifies 0 3.5 Distance to nearest bus stop 0.8 3.6 Distance to nearest infant/primary school 0 3.7 Distance to nearest secondary school 0 3.6 Distance to nearest of P surgery 0 3.8 between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 0 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network. 1 A.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land (-1) Alignet of the set would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3). 100% greenfield alle, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 4.1 Brownfield an agricultural land (-2) Development of the set 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 without significant character charages sensitivity - characteresties of the loss of the best and most versatile agr	2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)		
3.2 Distance to imployment locations 0 Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m from an employment istel/ocation. 3.3 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from hearest town, large village or small village. 3.4 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 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 secondary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable. Interview access to strategic Road Network 4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, 500m from an existing settlement (Watham Abbey). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Interview access to open space Interview access to open space 5.1 Landscape sensitivity Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Site is proposed for travelier piches. The proposed number of pitches is not l	3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.5 Statute to employment octations 0 Set is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village. 3.4 Distance to local amenities 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 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. 100% greenfield site. 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 4.2 Impact on agricultural land (-) Development of the site would involve the loss of public open space. 100% greenfield site. 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site file site would involve the loss of public open space. 100% greenfield site. 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Site file site would involve the loss of public open space. 100% greenfield site. 500m from an existing settlement opint sunikely to have an effect on settlement cha	3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3-4 Distance to nearest infant/primary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school. 3.5 Distance to nearest secondary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 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 (-) Majority of the site sig greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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 sensibility (-) Site fails within an area of medium landscape sensibility - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.2 Settimenet ebundles sensibility 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	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 nearest secondary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school. 3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 0 3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 1 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Image: Not applicable. Image: Not applicable. 100% greenfield site, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Beter alls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change Image: Characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. Site is proposed for traveller pliches. The proposed number of pliches is not likely have an impact on the character.	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 GP surgery 0 Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery. 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. Intervention and 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, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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). Intervention and the site would 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 6.2 Settlement character change. O Development without significant character. Site is proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an impact on the character.	3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.7 Distance to inearest of subjery 0 Image: Construction of the subjery 0 3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network Not applicable. Image: Construction of the subjery 0 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, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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: Construction 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: Construction of the site would 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. Site is proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an effect on settlement character.	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: Constraint of the state is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey). 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. 6.2 Settlement character change is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an impact on the character.	3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
4.1 Browmfeld and Greenfield Land (-) Performance Performance 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 6.2 Settlement character consiliativity 0. Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.2 Impact on agricultural and (*) 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (*) Site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change 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 constituity 0 Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an impact on the character.	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, 500m from an existing settlement (Waltham Abbey).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space 0 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. 5.1 Landscape sensitivity (-) Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an impact on the character.	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 constituity Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an impact on the character.	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 proposed for traveller pitches. The proposed number of pitches is not likely have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints (-) Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	6.1 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.	6.2a 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.	6.2b 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.	6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0		
6.4 Access to site 0 Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway. Access to site could be achieved off Galleyhill Road.	6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.	Access to site could be achieved off Galleyhill Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints (-) Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential for contamination (Landfill Site Within 250m). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.	6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential for contamination (Landfill Site Within 250m). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact E133	6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E133

EB805W

Ν

E134



Report on	Drawing No.	Content	Legend
		1 martin	
and and a second	and the second s		
	TH		
			cheimsford Road
- 9 C - 5			

Report on Site Selection	Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0028-Rev2	Content Traveller Sites for Stage 4 and Stage 8.4 Assessment	Legend		
Deter Marsh 0040		in Willingale	Traveller sites assesse		
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: 1:17,500 @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		

ed at Stage 4 and Stage 8.4

egend can be found at the beginning of the Appendix.

	-	
Site Reference:	T-I_06	
Parish:	Willingale	
Size (ha):	2.77	
Address:	Greenacres, Walls Green, Bassett's Lane, Willingale, Ongar, Essex, CM5 0QN	
Primary use:	Traveller	
Site notes:	Existing authorised traveller site with two pitches to be assessed for intensification.	
Source of yield: 2016 EFDC Officer assessment for number of pitches.		

Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



<u>13</u>

Criteria

1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites

Hertford Brentwo Client

	st District Council
Job Title	
Epping Fores	st District Local Plan
Drawing Status	Date
Issue	March 2018
Drawing No	Issue
T-I_06	Rev 1
ARU	P Epping Forest District Council
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLo GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster N MapmyIndia, © OpenStreet	wn copyright and database right (2016) nrme, Intermap, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, L, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop Map contributors, and the GIS User Community

Earth



		Score	Qualitative Assessment
S		Effects of allocating site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
		Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs.	The proposed development lies outside of the Impact Risk Zone and therefore applicable.
	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
de of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	

mmunity S/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS

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 lies outside of the Impact Risk Zone and therefore Impact Risk Zone requirements are not applicable.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
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	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m 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 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.	70% greenfield site, 4500m from 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 site. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is in a rural location outside of any settlement, and screened from the road by trees and hedgerows. Proposed traveller pitches are of a scale that would not impact on the rural 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 Bassetts Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Smallholding). Potential adverse impact could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E135

Pitches:

<u>10</u>

	-
Site Reference:	T-X_16
Parish:	Willingale
Size (ha):	1.31
Address:	Steers, Pigstye Green Road, Willingale, Ongar, Essex, CM5 0QF
Primary use:	Traveller
Site notes:	Vacant field. Existing authorised traveller site with three pitches to be assessed for intensification.
Source of yield:	Assumption based on allowing 0.1 ha for one pitch.
Site constraints:	No constraints identified.
Community feedback:	The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.



Epping Forest District Council		
Job Title		
Epping Forest	District Local Plan	
Drawing Status	Date	
Issue	March 2018	
Drawing No	Issue	
T-X_16	Rev 1	
ARUI	Definition Epping Forest District Council	
Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorm GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMa	copyright and database right (2018) e, Interman, Increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, Ordnance Sturvey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstop p contributors, and the GS User Community Osey, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, Jser Community	



		Source: Earl, DigitalGobe, 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	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.	The proposed development lies outside of the Impact Risk Zone and therefore Impact Risk Zone requirements are not applicable.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is located at the edge of the 250m buffer for the Ancient Woodland. The site is therefore unlikely to affect Ancient Woodlands due to the separation distance.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is in the south of the site, and development may directly affect the tree. 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 wholly within a Deciduous Woodland 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 wholly within the Bonsgrove/Luca's Lane 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	(+)	Site is not likely to affect heritage assets due to their distance from the site.	Unlikely to impact on setting of Scheduled Monument or GII listed building to east 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	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 more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m 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 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	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% brownfield site, 4000m from 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 be likely to find high vulnerability, at least in part. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is in a rural location outside of any settlement, and screened from the road by trees and hedgerows. Proposed traveller pitches are of a scale that would not impact on the rural 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.	Majority of site (99%) is in HSE middle consultation zone. Sensitivity level is 2 as less than 30 caravans. 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 Pigstye Green Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Not applicable.	E136
		•	© Arup