

Report on Site Selection

ARUP

Epping Forest District Council

Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0003-Rev1

Date: September 2016

Scale: 1:15,000 @A3

Content

Residential Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in Epping

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo and the GIS User Community.

Legend

- Stage 2 Sites
- Parish Boundary



Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0069
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.92
Address: Land at Ivy Chimneys Road, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural field


SLAA yield: 56 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 56



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0069** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within Lowland Meadow and Deciduous Woodland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer of Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site. Adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site (infilled pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0069/33
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 12.47
Address: Land South of Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Open land.


SLAA yield: 376 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Site capacity is reduced by about a third due to overhead electricity lines cutting through the site. Also site SR-0069 covers circa 20% of the site (56 dwellings) as such the yield is reduced to avoid double counting.

Site selection adjustment: Capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (56 dwellings) to account for overlapping site.

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

Dwellings: 250



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0069/33** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(--)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
6.2b Distance to power lines	(-)	Power lines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation 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.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0071
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 14.43
Address: Land at Standards Hill, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural/vacant fields


SLAA yield: Approx. 100-300 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 7-21 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 300



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0071** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(--)	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated. The site encompasses areas of Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main feature, and is partially within a Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat. It is likely to directly affect the whole BAP priority habitats, which may not be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private. No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. An existing site masterplan identifies opportunities to provide new public open spaces in the development proposal.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. This area is of high character sensitivity and development could detrimentally impact the open and semi-rural character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on small part of site (infilled ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0087
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 2.8
Address: Pound Field, Bell Common, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Horse paddocks


SLAA yield: 84 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph



SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 84



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0087** Issue **P1**
 
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(--)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect. Site partially located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and adjacent to another. It is within three buffer zones. The site may directly affect the Deciduous Woodland habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(--)	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated. The whole site encompasses a portion of Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site may directly affect some of the features and species of this LWS. Within this portion the features and species of the LWS are unlikely to be retained in their entirety.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to Epping Forest.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	(-)	Power lines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0113A
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 26.08
Address: Land South of Brook Road, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural fields


SLAA yield: 150 - 200
SLAA source for baseline yield: Identified by developer

SLAA site constraints: Circa 1/3 of the site is covered by SR-0113 (NLP ref 22). As such the yield is reduced proportionally to avoid double counting.

Site selection adjustment: Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping site).

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

Dwellings: 200



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0113A** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
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.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0113B
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 6.78
Address: Land to the South of Brook Road, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Open land.


SLAA yield: 200 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 26 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 200



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0113B** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within a BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced. Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium. Nearly the entirety of the site is located within a low sensitivity Green Belt parcel which makes limited contribution to Green Belt purposes. If the site was released it would have limited harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. The key characteristics of the wider landscape character zone extend across the whole site. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. It could comprise an extension of the settlement limits in an area of high character sensitivity.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site. Only 0.12% of the site is affected by the BPA oil pipeline. This results in negligible sites and therefore is not considered a constraint to development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Access from Brook Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Electric Sub Station / In filled Pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0132Ai
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5.93
Address: Land north-east of Woodbury Down, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Large swathe of land between Epping and Harlow. Could support a new settlement development or smaller development plots adjacent to existing settlements (e.g. urban extensions to Epping).


SLAA yield: 174 dwellings at 30 dph net.
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on promoter material.

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: Site capacity based on promoter material.

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

Dwellings: 174



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0132Ai** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential and employment development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure and air quality likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated. The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Wintry Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a portion of the Ancient Woodland buffer zone, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning or compensation Woodland plan.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within the Deciduous Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer of Wintry Wood, Lindsey Street LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	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. All of the site is located within a high sensitivity parcel, which makes a relatively strong contribution to maintaining the historic setting of Epping. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of 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 would comprise modest urban extension which would not detrimentally impact the character of the settlement.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Access from Woodbury Down and Frampton Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0132Bi
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 36.04
Address: Land north-east of Bury Lane and south-west of Lindsey Street (B181), Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Large swathe of land between Epping and Harlow. Could support a new settlement development or smaller development plots adjacent to existing settlements (e.g. urban extensions to Epping).


SLAA yield: 720 dwellings at 30 dph net.
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on promoter material.

SLAA site constraints: None


Site selection adjustment: Site capacity based on promoter material.

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

Dwellings: 720



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0132Bi** Issue **P1**



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential and employment development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure and air quality likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. The site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated. There is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the centre of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(-)	The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated. A small part of the site directly abuts Buffer Land to the south. The site links the Buffer Land to the wider countryside beyond. There is potential for the impacts to be mitigated through sympathetic masterplanning of the westernmost part of the site.
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 and partially within a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and is partially within two buffer zones. The site may directly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. The site encompasses a small portion of Swaines Green LWS. The site may directly affect some of the features and species of the Swaines Green LWS. These features and species may not be retained in their entirety, but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high. Nearly the entire site is located within a high sensitivity parcel, which makes a relatively strong contribution to maintaining the historic setting of Epping. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to Epping Forest Buffer Land.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on Epping Ridge, and would be highly visible, and could impact views of historic Epping, such as church spire. Promoter material proposes soft landscaping to minimise the visual impact on nearby residential areas.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Access from Lindsey Street and Bury Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0132Bii
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 8.72
Address: Land north-east of Bury Lane and south-west of Lindsey Street (B181), Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Large swathe of land between Epping and Harlow. Could support a new settlement development or smaller development plots adjacent to existing settlements (e.g. urban extensions to Epping).

SLAA yield: Capacity not indicated by promoter, and has been estimated.


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph.

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 446



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0132Bii** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential and employment development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure and air quality likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's. The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. The site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is not within any BAP priority habitats or buffer zones. It is unlikely that there will be indirect effects on the BAP priority habitats.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	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. All of the site is located within a high sensitivity parcel, which makes a relatively strong contribution to maintaining the historic setting of Epping. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on Epping Ridge, and would be highly visible, and could impact views of historic Epping, such as church spire. Promoter material proposes soft landscaping to minimise the visual impact on nearby residential areas.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade. Access does not currently exist, however could be provided through development of site SR-0132Bi.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0132Ci
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 8.92
Address: Epping Sports Club, Lower Bury Lane

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Land to the West of Bury Lane, and Epping Sports Club - promoter indicated potential relocation.

SLAA yield: 65 dwellings, including the relocation of Epping Sports Club.


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on promoter material.

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: Site capacity based on promoter material.

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

Dwellings: 65



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0132Ci** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's. The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland. The site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated. There are 34Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The trees are located in the centre of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer for Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	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. Part of the site is in a very low sensitivity Green Belt parcel, which is largely enclosed by development and separated from the wider Green Belt by planted buffers. As it is proposed to relocate recreation uses to the higher sensitivity part of the site,
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opporrtwellingy to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Promoter proposes relocation of Epping Sports Club including cricket, bowls and tennis courts. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. There are protected trees on and adjacent to the site, but the percentage of the site area affected is limited, and they would not be a significant constraint.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off Lower Bury Road into eastern part of site, and from Bury Lane to western part of site.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0153
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 14.75
Address: Land north of Stewards Green Road, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural fields


SLAA yield: 400 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 400



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0153** Issue **P1**

ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, inclemens P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer of Steward's Green Lane LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zone 2, totalling less than 1%, is located on the southern site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	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. Almost all of the site is located in a medium sensitivity Green Belt parcel; planted buffers along the eastern edge limit intervisibility with the countryside. If the site was released it would have limited harm to purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Preliminary masterplan proposes no new public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the housing 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. The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Adjacent to main roads.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (In filled Ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0192
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.63
Address: Land adjacent to Mill House Farm, Bell Common, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Area of green space (lawn)


SLAA yield: 19 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 19



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0192** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(--)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect. Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(--)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated. The site is wholly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the buffer land. The site is likely to cause direct loss which cannot be mitigated within the site.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is adjacent to two BAP priority habitats, and with five BAP priority habitat buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is adjacent to Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced. Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 95% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. The site is adjacent to an area of high sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the adjacent highly sensitive landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Currently a private area of green space screened with mature vegetation/trees giving limited views towards the site. The proposed dwelling density reflects those adjacent to the site and is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access from Theydon Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0194
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.78
Address: Littlefields, 60 Stewards Green Road, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing dwelling house and garden


SLAA yield: 20 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 26 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 20



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0194** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0208
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5.93
Address: Theydon Place, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Fallow fields and paddocks

SLAA yield: 100 dwellings


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (care village on 2.2ha parcel of site - SR-0118 boundary - remainder open space)

SLAA site constraints: Masterplan identifies Local Wildlife Site as open space surrounding development - recent application identified 60 dwellings as housing

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 60



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0208** Issue **P1**



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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.
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.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	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.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(--)	Development is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0229
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.6
Address: Epping London Underground Car Park and land adjacent to station, off Station Road, CM16 4
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Car park and builder's yard


SLAA yield: 220 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 137 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 220



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0229** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's. The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer for Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape. Site is a car park and identified as a potential regeneration area. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the area subject to sensitive design reflecting the historic character of the town.
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. There are protected trees on and adjacent to the site, but the percentage of the site area affected is limited, and they would not be a significant constraint.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Station Approach Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Railway Station, Goods and Coal Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0333Bi

Parish: Epping

Settlement:

Size (ha): 14.78

Address: Epping, south-west area

Primary use: Housing

SLAA notes: Broad area south-west of Epping between settlement, M25 and railway line

SLAA yield: 693 dwellings


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Overhead power lines reduce capacity by 1/4. Circa 10% of the site is covered by 95% of SR-0466 (44 dwellings) and 95% of SR-0445 (27 dwellings). SR060/333b covers circa 50% of the site (194 dwellings). Yields omitted to avoid double counting.

Site selection adjustment: Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Capacity been reassessed for each parcel based on 30dph. Overhead power lines reduce capacity by 25%.

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

Dwellings: 332



Client

Epping Forest District Council

Job Title

Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue

Drawing No

SR-0333Bi

Issue

P1

ARUP

Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(--)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(-)	Gas or oil pipelines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
6.2b Distance to power lines	(-)	Power lines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation 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.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0333Bii
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.44
Address: Epping, south-west area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad area south-west of Epping between settlement, M25 and railway line


SLAA yield: 693 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Overhead power lines reduce capacity by 1/4. Circa 10% of the site is covered by 95% of SR-0466 (44 dwellings) and 95% of SR-0445 (27 dwellings). SR060/333b covers circa 50% of the site (194 dwellings). Yields omitted to avoid double counting.

Site selection adjustment: Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Capacity been reassessed for each parcel based on 30dph.

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

Dwellings: 13



Client
Epping Forest District Council


Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No: **SR-0333Bii** Issue: **P1**

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 China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(--)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect. Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated. The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the buffer land, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning or compensation Woodland planting.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is adjacent to an area of Deciduous Woodland, and within four buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer for Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(--)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, and it is unlikely that the risk could be mitigated. The site is very close to the M25 and it would be difficult to 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 high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. The key characteristics of the wider landscape character zone extend across the whole site. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is in Bell Common. The proposed density reflects the character of the area but sensitive design of the development could be required as this area is of very high character sensitivity.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Access from car park off Ivy Chimneys Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Stable). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0333Biii

Parish: Epping

Settlement:

Size (ha): 4.76

Address: Epping, south-west area

Primary use: Housing

SLAA notes: Broad area south-west of Epping between settlement, M25 and railway line

SLAA yield: 693 dwellings


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Overhead power lines reduce capacity by 1/4. Circa 10% of the site is covered by 95% of SR-0466 (44 dwellings) and 95% of SR-0445 (27 dwellings). SR060/333b covers circa 50% of the site (194 dwellings). Yields omitted to avoid double counting.

Site selection adjustment: Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Capacity been reassessed for each parcel based on 30dph. Overhead power lines reduce capacity by 25%.

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

Dwellings: 107



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0333Biii** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Inclemens P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geomatics, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(--)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use is likely to have a significant effect. Site located within 400m of Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Risk of urbanisation (e.g. from fly tipping, fires, invasive species etc.) and runoff.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated. The site is partly within the 250m buffer for Epping-Ambresbury Ancient Woodland. The site may directly affect a small area of the buffer land, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning or compensation Woodland planting.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(--)	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated. The site encompasses almost a whole area of Deciduous Woodland and an area of Lowland Meadow. The site is likely to directly affect the BAP priority habitats. There are likely to be effects that may not be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. The site encompasses a portion of the Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site may directly affect some of the features and species of the LWS. These features and species may not be retained in their entirety, but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced. Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 60% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. Site shares characteristics with the adjacent areas of high and moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site is on the edge of the existing settlement. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	(--)	Power lines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Access from Ivy Chimneys Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Builders Yard / Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0334
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 16.44
Address: Epping, north-west area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad area north-west of Epping


SLAA yield: 500 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: TPO's/LoWS cover half of site and would reduce capacity accordingly.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 250



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No: **SR-0334** | Issue: **P1**

ARUP | **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, InceMap, Inc., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, Swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated. There are 3 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The trees are located in the west of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(-)	The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated. Around 40% of the site is within Epping Forest Buffer Land. However, the revised yield accounts for this constraint, and there is the potential to mitigate impacts through the sensitive masterplanning of the remaining part of the site.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. The site encompasses a Deciduous Woodland BAP priority habitat and is adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site is likely to directly affect the whole of the BAP priority habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. The site encompasses the majority of Swaines Green LWS. The site may directly affect all of the features and species of the Swaines Green LWS. These features and species may not be retained in their entirety, but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium. The majority of the site is located within low/very low sensitivity Green Belt parcels. Retention of the existing dense tree buffer along the site's northern edge would limit harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(--)	Development may involve the loss of public open space with no opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation. The public open space is entirely located in the site area. Whilst the capacity has been reduced to 50% of the site area, this would still result in loss of public open space, with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. The key characteristics of the wider landscape character zone extend across the whole site. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Site on the edge of the settlement. The number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring development. Sensitive design and layout of development is likely to be required.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(--)	The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees, either on or adjacent to the site. The extent of the protected tree cover on or adjacent to the site would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Access points off of Lower Swains and Coronation Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination over parts of site (Smallholding / infilled brick pits). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0343
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 8.29
Address: Land east of Garnon Cottage, Bower Hill, Epping

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural field


SLAA yield: 249 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 249



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0343** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0345
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.4
Address: Coniston Court, Bower Hill, Epping, CM16 7BH

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing residential development


SLAA yield: 20 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 50 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 20



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0345** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is within Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Access is suitable.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination over part of site (Railway Embankment). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0346
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.33
Address: Tower Road Allotments (east)

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Allotment site. Duplicate of assessment for SR-0132 (Sites assessed as one, with two boundaries to reflect ownership division)


SLAA yield: 10 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 10



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0346** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, inclemens P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geomatics, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, Swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is wholly within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone, and adjacent to a Lowland Meadow buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer for Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement. 100% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(--)	Development may involve the loss of public open space with no opportunity for on-site off-setting or mitigation. The public open space is entirely located in the site area. Development would result in loss of public open space (allotments covers 96% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is an existing allotment enclosed by detached houses. The proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site. The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade. Both access points (Tower Road and Lower Bury Road) are between buildings and may not have sufficient width. This could be overcome either by creating a new access by incorporating another property or by a one way system or similar.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).


Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0347
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.43
Address: Epping Sports Centre, Nicholl Road
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing sports centre building and car park

SLAA yield: 35 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 80 dph and ground floor leisure (e.g. gym)
SLAA site constraints: None
Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 35



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0347** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
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.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(--)	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0348
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.56
Address: Cottis Lane Car Park


Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Pay and Display car park

SLAA yield: 45 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 80 dph and ground floor retail
SLAA site constraints: Upper floors could be residential or office uses


Site selection adjustment: None

Community feedback: None

Dwellings: 45



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0348** Issue **P1**



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's. Below IRZ consultation threshold
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. Site is partially within the buffer zone for Wood Pasture and Parkland. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape. Car park site within settlement area, identified as potential regeneration area. Redevelopment provides an opportunity for intensification / enhancement of character, subject to sensitive design reflecting the historic character of conservation 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. There are protected trees on and adjacent to the site, but the percentage of the site area affected is limited, and they would not be a significant constraint.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Existing car park access is suitable.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Ironworks). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(--)	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0349
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.42
Address: Bakers Lane Car Park

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Pay and Display car park


SLAA yield: 34 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 80 dph and ground floor retail

SLAA site constraints: Upper floors could be residential or office uses

Site selection adjustment: None

Community feedback: None

Dwellings: 34



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0349** Issue **P1**



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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0404
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.79
Address: Institute Road Allotments, Coopersale

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 24 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 24



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0404** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(--)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is 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.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(--)	Development may involve the loss of public open space with no opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0405
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.72
Address: Coopersale Cricket Club and Coopersale and Theydon Garnon Primary School Playing Fields
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 52 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph



SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 52



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0405** Issue **P1**
 
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(--)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is 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.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0406i
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 28.44
Address: Land South of Coopersale, east and west of Houlbons Hill

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 1235 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Circa 50% of the site is covered by SR-0438 (19.83ha) and as such is omitted from the yield.

Site selection adjustment: Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping site). Multi-parcel site, which has been split out based on baseline yield proportionally split between sites based on site size.

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

Dwellings: 911



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0406i** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Inc./Swisstopo, GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, Swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(-)	The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	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.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0406ii
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 10.11
Address: Land South of Coopersale, east and west of Houbbons Hill

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 1235 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph



SLAA site constraints: Circa 50% of the site is covered by SR-0438 (19.83ha) and as such is omitted from the yield.

Site selection adjustment: Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping site). Multi-parcel site, which has been split out based on baseline yield proportionally split between sites based on site size.

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

Dwellings: 324



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0406ii** Issue **P1**
 
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Inclemens P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geomatics, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, Swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.
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.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0438A
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 19.72
Address: Land adjoining Standards Hill and Houblons Hill, Coopersale, Essex, CM16 7QL
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural land including pond.

SLAA yield: Up to 630 dwellings or 39,660sqm of employment.


SLAA source for baseline yield: 50:50 employment and housing. Housing indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 64 dph) and for employment based on 0.4 plot ratio.

SLAA site constraints: Four Tree Preservation Orders on site may reduce site capacity marginally.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 618



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

Drawing Status
 Drawing No
SR-0438A
 Issue
P1



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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	(-)	The effects of the site on Epping Forest Buffer Land can be mitigated.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	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.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0445
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.2
Address: Greenacres, Ivy Chimneys Road, Epping, Essex, CM16 4EL

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Includes a dwelling but mainly grazing land.


SLAA yield: 36 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Circa 25% reduction as overhead electricity lines run through site.

Site selection adjustment: None


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

Dwellings: 27



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0445** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (all planning applications, except householder), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is adjacent to an area of Deciduous Woodland, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer for Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Site lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced. Parts of the site are very close to the M25 and therefore mitigation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. The key characteristics of the wider landscape character zone extend across the whole site. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposed density reflects the character of the area but sensitive design of the development would likely be required as this area is of very high character sensitivity.
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	(-)	Power lines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Off Ivy Chimneys Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site. Minimal adverse impact with opportunity to enhance.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0466
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.96
Address: Broadbanks, 23 Ivy Chimneys Road, Epping, Essex, CM16 4EL

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Residential dwelling, stables and ménage.


SLAA yield: 59 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Circa 25% reduction in capacity as overhead electricity lines on site.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 44



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0466** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's. The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Although the site is in close proximity to Buffer Land, it is severed from these by England's Lane and has limited visual/physical linkage.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is adjacent to Bell Common/Ivy Chimneys LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 60% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to Epping Forest Buffer Land.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is currently horse paddocks that are naturally screened on two sides. The proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the housing 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	(-)	Power lines may constrain part of the site but there is potential for mitigation.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Off Ivy Chimneys Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0484
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 3.64
Address: Land to the east of Houlblows Hill, Coopersale, Essex, CM167QL

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Farming.


SLAA yield: 109 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph for housing

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 109



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0484** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0555
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5.64
Address: St Margaret's Hospital Site

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: St Margaret's hospital complex, including several hospital buildings and associated parking.


SLAA yield: 169 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph



SLAA site constraints: A marginal decrease to take account of the Listed Building on site.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 165



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0555** Issue **P1**
 

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(--)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland. The proposals would likely result in direct loss or harm to Ancient Woodland or cannot be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(--)	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0556
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.26
Address: Civic Offices, High Street, Epping.

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: EFDC Council offices, including car parking.


SLAA yield: 38 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 38



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0556** Issue **P1**

ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's. The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Site is not touching Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is wholly within a Wood Pasture and Parkland buffer and partially within a BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space. A negligible part of the site contains public open space. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change. The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape. Site is located within the settlement and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore, redevelopment could enhance the character of the area, subject to sensitive design for areas overlapping the conservation area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Builders Yard / In filled Pond / Electricity Sub Stations). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(--)	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0587
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.4
Address: Epping Sanitary Steam and Laundry co. Ltd, 17 Bower Vale, Epping, Essex, CM16 7AS
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Four blocks of existing flats and associated landscaping and access.


SLAA yield: 25
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 49 dph)



SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 25



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0587** Issue **P1**
 

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is 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.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0826
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.3
Address: Garage site north of Charles Street, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None

SLAA yield: 14


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Request for Pre-Application Planning Advice form (dwellings equivalent to 33 dph)



SLAA site constraints: The pre-application request relates to the conversion of the Listed Building, as such no alterations need to be made to the density of the site to take account of the Grade II Listed Grange Hall on site.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 14



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0826** Issue **P1**
 

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0827
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.46
Address: Industrial site north of Bower Terrace, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Development site constructing one residential dwelling. Previously a field.


SLAA yield: 8
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph.

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 8



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0827** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, inclemens P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geomatics, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is 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.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0828
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.09
Address: Green space south-west of Stonards Hill, Epping, Essex.

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Green amenity space, covered with mature trees.


SLAA yield: 14
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 158 dph)



SLAA site constraints: The site is in the Epping Forest Conservation Area but sensitive design could mitigate any negative impacts.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 14



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0828** Issue **P1**
 

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0829
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.63
Address: Tesco Car Park, High Street, Epping, Essex.

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Well used car parking associated with Tesco.


SLAA yield: 96
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 153 dph)



SLAA site constraints: A small area of blanket Tree Preservation Order coverage touches the north of the site. However sensitive design could mitigate impacts to these trees.

Site selection adjustment: None


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

Dwellings: 96



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0829** Issue **P1**
 

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(--)	Moderate peak time congestion expected within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0830
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.07
Address: Site east of Buttercross Lane, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Single dwelling house.


SLAA yield: 11
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to)

SLAA site constraints: The site is in the Epping Forest Conservation Area and there is one Tree Preservation Order tree to the south of the site, but sensitive design could mitigate any negative impacts.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 11



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0830** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a 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.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0831
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.57
Address: Garage site, housing and green at Coronation Hill, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: A number of residential dwellings, garages and associated landscaping and car parking bays.


SLAA yield: 28
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 49 dph)

SLAA site constraints: Circa 10% of the site is covered by SR-0648. As such the yield is reduced to avoid double counting.

Site selection adjustment: Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping site).

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

Dwellings: 28



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0831** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from 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 SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land. Although the site abuts Buffer Land to the north, it is previously developed land enveloped on three sides by existing development. The intensification of development on the site is unlikely to impact the Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is wholly within Deciduous Woodland and BAP priority habitat with no main feature buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer of Swaines Green LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement. 100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Epping).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(-)	Development may involve the loss of public open space but there are opportunities for on-site off-setting or mitigation. Although managed public open space located with the site, opportunities for re-configuration may enable the proposals to be delivered without loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of moderate sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (In filled Pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0832
Parish: Epping
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.19
Address: Tyre Service Centre, Lindsey Street, Epping, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Car service centre/garage (in use)


SLAA yield: 9
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 47 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 9



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0832** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(+)	There is a low likelihood that further archaeological assets would be discovered on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0886

Parish: Epping

Settlement:

Size (ha): 0.01

Address: 169 High Street, Epping, Essex, CM16 4BL

Primary use: Housing

SLAA notes: One commercial dwelling (Forest Carpet Centre) and land/yard to rear

SLAA yield: 6 flats and 136 sqm of commercial floor space


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Request for Pre-Application Planning Advice form (dwellings equivalent to 100 dph)



SLAA site constraints: The site is within the Epping Conservation Area and adjacent to 221 and 223 High Street which are Grade II Listed Buildings. However sensitive design could mitigate any negative impacts.

Site selection adjustment: None


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

Dwellings: 6



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Drawing No **SR-0886** Issue **P1**
 

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(++)	Opportunity to enhance significance of the historical asset/ further reveal its significance / enhance the setting.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below the size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion (e.g. employment site or housing site with capacity of <25 dwellings).