

- SR-0232
- SR-0426
- SR-0213
- SR-0010
- SR-0486
- SR-0064
- SR-0152
- SR-0508
- SR-0427
- SR-0298
- SR-0160
- SR-0434
- SR-0166
- SR-0840
- SR-0599
- SR-0300
- SR-0507
- SR-0299
- SR-0191
- SR-0473
- SR-0011
- SR-0212
- SR-0150
- SR-0301
- SR-0270
- SR-0093
- SR-0302A
- SR-0238
- SR-0266
- SR-0116
- SR-0302B
- SR-0245
- SR-0471
- SR-0136
- SR-0135A
- SR-0135B
- SR-0172

Report on Site Selection



Epping Forest District Council

Drawing No. EFDC-S2-0011-Rev1

Date: September 2016

Scale: 1:27,500 @A3

Content
Residential Sites for Stage 2 Assessment in Nazeing

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-0010
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.56
Address: Leaside Nursery, Sedge Green, Nazeing, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing Glasshouse



SLAA yield: 17 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: 17



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0010** 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	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	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
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 is not likely to be able to 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-0011
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 8.3
Address: St. Leonard's Road, Nazeing, Essex (Known as 'Perry Hill')

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural/Grazing Fields

SLAA yield: 249 dwellings


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph, reduced to exclude area subject to planning permission EPF/0937/16 for 60 dwellings, covering 2.23ha of site.

SLAA site constraints: Capacity reduced to exclude area subject to planning permission EPF/0937/16 for 60 dwellings, covering 2.23ha of site.

Site selection adjustment: Capacity reduced to exclude area subject to planning permission EPF/0937/16 for 60 dwellings, covering 2.23ha of site.

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

Dwellings: 182



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

Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0011** 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	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. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b covering 1% is located on the western 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	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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 and the proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Existing access off St Leonards Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site (former Gun Emplacement). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 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-0064
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 2.91
Address: Sedge Green Nursery, Sedge Green, and Chalkfield Nursery, Pecks Hill, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2NX
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Nursery (Glasshouses) with residential dwelling.


SLAA yield: 100 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 35 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: 100



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0064** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. The proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Subject to care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery & within 250m of 3 landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0093
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 3.33
Address: No 3 Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Glasshouse


SLAA yield: 100 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: 100




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

Drawing Status
Issue

Drawing No
SR-0093 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	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.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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 identified as a potential opportunity area. Site is far away from existing settlements with scattered housing around it. Therefore, development is likely to affect the semi-rural character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	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 road from Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

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

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Former Nursery site, open storage


SLAA yield: 45 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: 45



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0116** Issue **P1**



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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 very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
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	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.

The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.

The site lies mostly within a Green Belt parcel of very high sensitivity but is partially developed and existing planted buffers to the north would limit harm to the wider Green Belt to the north (which maintains the gap between Nazeing and Roydon).

90% greenfield site, 1,200m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).

No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.

Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the housing character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.

Existing access off Hoe Lane.

Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0135A
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.4
Address: Stoneyfield, Hoe Lane, Nazeing

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens


SLAA yield: 12 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 NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 12



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0135A** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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 very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Winston Farm Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below 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-0135B
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.72
Address: Ridge House, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens


SLAA yield: 21 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 NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 21



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0135B** 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	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	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
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-0136
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.05
Address: Burleigh Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens and Nursery


SLAA yield: 32 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 NAZ-1 which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 32



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0136** 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	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	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to nearest secondary school	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
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	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.

The site is almost wholly within Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.

Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b covering circa 2% is located along the eastern site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.

90% greenfield site, 900m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).

Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.

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

Existing access off Winston Farm Lane.

Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Transport Depot). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0150
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.43
Address: The Fencing Centre, Pecks Hill, Nazeing, EN9 2NY

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Fencing centre (open storage and glasshouse/warehouse storage)


SLAA yield: 43 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 NAZ-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 43



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No: **SR-0150** | 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.	70% brownfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development 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 relevant site character context is in part urban but in part countryside with a character moderately sensitive to the impacts of development. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is a fencing centre and is identified as a potential opportunity area. Redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Builders Yard). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

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

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Open storage yard near nurseries


SLAA yield: 7 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: 7



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0152** 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	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within a Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh buffer and partially within two other buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site not within or adjacent to an existing settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.	Site is an open storage yard behind existing housing. It is located within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. Therefore, redevelopment could enhance the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off North Street.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(--)	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to be mitigated.	Site unsuitable for development. West side of site contains a landfill site. East side of site could possibly be developed if it can be demonstrated that contamination (Horticultural Nursery) 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-0160
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 3.04
Address: Fernbank Nursery, Nazeing Road, Nazeing, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Nursery

SLAA yield: 73 - 122


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites

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: 73



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0160** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh habitat and is within four buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	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	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is located on the edge of the existing settlement. However, low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access by Nazeingbury Parade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, In filled Gravel Pit and within 250m of landfill site). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0166
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.42
Address: Spinney Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing dwelling house, garages and gardens


SLAA yield: 13 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 NAZ-1 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-0166** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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 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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	80% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development 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.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Winston Farm Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery / Car Breakers). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below 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-0172
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.27
Address: Vine Cottage, Betts Lane, Nazeing, EN9 2DA

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Small field and two cottages.

SLAA yield: 10 dwellings comprising 4 market homes and 6 affordable homes



SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites



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-0172** 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	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(--)	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.
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.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
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	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-0191
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.68
Address: Royd, St Leonards Road, Nazeing

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

SLAA yield: 6 to 8 dwellings


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites

SLAA site constraints: Flood risk would mean only 2/3 of site is developable. Also circa 90% of the site is covered by SR-0507, with only the access left this means the site has a zero yield when avoiding double counting.

Site selection adjustment: 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: 8




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

Drawing Status
Issue

Drawing No **SR-0191** Issue **P1**



© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Incormars 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	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.
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	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is 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	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
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	(-)	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-0212
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 6
Address: Lea Bank Nursery, Sedge Green, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5JS

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Glasshouses


SLAA yield: 180 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: 180



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0212** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 1,000m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouses area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, infilled pit / pond, electric sub station, within 250m of landfill site). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0213
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 4.85
Address: Bettina Nursery and Ashley Nursery, Sedge Green, Roydon, CM19 5JS
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing nurseries/glasshouses


SLAA yield: 146 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: 146



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0213** 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	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 high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	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	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.

The site is partially within Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.

100% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).

Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. It is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouses area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore, is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area.

Existing access off Sedge Green.

Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery, car repairs and respraying, within 250m of 2 x landfill sites). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.

Site Suitability Assessment

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

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 101 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: 101



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0232** 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	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 high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	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	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-0238
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 3.37
Address: Stoneshot Farm, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RN

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None

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


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites

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-0238** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is wholly within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	60% greenfield site, 1,500m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is far away from main settlement and within an existing glasshouses area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore is likely to have a negative effect on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	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.	Existing access off Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Farm / Industrial dwellings). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 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-0245
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 2.84
Address: Coronation Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 86 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: 86



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0245** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within a Deciduous Woodland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	The site lies mostly within a Green Belt parcel of very high sensitivity but is partially developed and existing planted buffers to the north would limit harm to the wider Green Belt to the north (which maintains the gap between Nazeing and Roydon).
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site, 1,200m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent Conservation Area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access lane off Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nursery). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

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

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 73 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: TPO's would reduce capacity by c.1/3

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 49



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0266** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and is in the relevant buffer zone. The site is likely to affect the whole of the BAP priority habitat, but these 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	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 1,500m from an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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 adjacent assessed landscape sensitivity zone extend to this site. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(--)	Development is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	Site is far away from main settlement and within Conservation Area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl and therefore it could significantly alter the character of the settlement.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(--)	The 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.	Existing access off Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	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-0270
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.37
Address: Halston Nursery, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 11 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: 11




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

Drawing Status
Issue

Drawing No
SR-0270 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	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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 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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
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	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-0298
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 16.84
Address: Lower Nazeing, West Area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad Area West of Nazeing


SLAA yield: 497 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Flood risk would reduce capacity by circa 1/4. Also circa 80% of the site has potential landfill contamination, further reducing site capacity.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 99



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0298** 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, 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	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 unlikely to be retained and effects cannot 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 2 and exception test not required.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
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 opportunity for on-site off-setting or mitigation.
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	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to 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-0299
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 12.07
Address: Lower Nazeing, South-west Area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad Area south-west of Nazeing


SLAA yield: 356 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph



SLAA site constraints: Flood risk would reduce capacity by circa 3/4. Also circa 15% of the site is covered by SR-0507 (55 dwellings) as such this is omitted from the yield.

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: 90



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0299** 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. Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (over 50 residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated. There are 9 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are concentrated at the east of the site. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. The site encompasses two Deciduous Woodland habitats, and a portion of BAP priority habitat with no main features habitat. It is within four buffer zones. The site is likely to directly the habitats, but mitigation may be able to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site. The site is within the 250m buffer for the Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required. Some 67% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 50% and 30% respectively is in Flood Zones 3a and 3b. Higher risk Flood Zones affect the north-western part of the site making the south-eastern portion of the site more suitable for development.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	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	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development 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 opportunity for on-site off-setting or mitigation. The public open space is largely located in the site area. Development would result in loss of public open space (public open spaces covers 81% of the site), with few opportunities for site re-orientation or re-provision.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	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. Considering the scale of the proposed development and its area coverage, it is likely to have a negative affect the semi-rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The 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. Existing access off Nazeing Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural nursery / industrial Boiler Stripping). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0300
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 19.04
Address: Lower Nazeing, South Area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad Area South of Nazeing

SLAA yield: 447 dwellings and 14,900 sqm commercial


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 447



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0300** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses the whole of a Traditional Orchard BAP priority habitat and is within two buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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.	The scale of the proposed development, the extent of the site and its location within a Conservation Area is likely to have a negative affect on the predominantly rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Existing access via a private road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over parts of the site (Farmyards / infilled ponds). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0301
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 21.84
Address: Lower Nazeing, North Area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad Area North of Nazeing


SLAA yield: 653 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Circa 25% of the site is covered by SR-0434 (150 dwellings) and is already accounted for, reducing yield.

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

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

Dwellings: 653



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No: **SR-0301** 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	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.
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	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.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
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	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.
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-0302A
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 32.4
Address: Lower Nazeing, south-east area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad area east of Nazeing including Hoe Lane and Nurseries and agricultural fields

SLAA yield: 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm commercial


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm proportionally split between sites based on site size.

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

Dwellings: 797



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0302A** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within the buffer zone for Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard habitats. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a, covering circa 1%, are located along a portion of the southern boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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.	The majority of the site overlaps a very high sensitivity Green Belt parcel which prevents the merging of Nazeing and Roydon and, to a lesser extent, Harlow. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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 identified as a potential regeneration area. Considering the scale of the proposed development and its area coverage, it is likely to have a negative affect the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Subject to care in layout.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries / Farm / Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0302B
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 4.49
Address: Lower Nazeing, south-east area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad area east of Nazeing including Hoe Lane and Nurseries and agricultural fields

SLAA yield: 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm commercial


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm proportionally split between sites based on site size.

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

Dwellings: 111



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0302B** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the majority of a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and within two buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in flood zone 1. Due to the configuration of the site the higher risk flood zones (2, 3a and 3b), covering 12%, affects the southern portion of the site and within the context of the whole site can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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 very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(-)	Site more than a 1000m from a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential opportunity area. Low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area, subject to sensitive design for part of the site located in the Conservation Area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries / Farm / Industrial). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0302C
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 19.85
Address: Lower Nazeing, south-east area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad area east of Nazeing including Hoe Lane and Nurseries and agricultural fields

SLAA yield: 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm commercial


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 80:20 housing to employment 30 dph and 0.4 plot ratio for commercial

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: Multi-parcel site, which has been split out. Assumed 1396 dwellings and 46,500 sqm proportionally split between sites based on site size.

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

Dwellings: 488



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0302C** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses two Deciduous Woodland habitats and a Traditional Orchard habitat. It is within three buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering circa 10%, are located along the north-western site boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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 very low, low or medium.	The majority of the site lies within medium or very low sensitivity Green Belt parcels. A small part of the site does not meet the Green Belt purposes. If the site was released it would have limited harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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 is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character.	The site is within a Conservation Area. The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site is likely to have a significant negative affect the rural character of the area. Development would contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Subject to care in layout.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.	No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

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

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 162 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: 162



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0426** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and Wet Woodland buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	90% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and within a existing glasshouses area. The number of houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	Subject to care in layout
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Sedge Green.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries and 2 x landfills within 250m). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0427
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5.63
Address: Nursery between Nursery Road and Pick's Hill and Lake Road Nursery
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 168 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: 168



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0427** 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	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	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	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	(-)	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-0434
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5.01
Address: Land North of Maplecroft Lane, Nazeing

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Greenfield site with the south of the site adjoining Maplecroft Lane which is part of a built up housing area.


SLAA yield: 150 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 30 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 150



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0434** 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	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	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
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	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	0	Access to the site can be created within landholding adjacent to the highway.
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.

The site is adjacent to a Deciduous Woodland habitat and is within the relevant buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.

100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).

Site is on the edge of the existing settlement and the proposals are for higher density development than the neighbouring developments. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.

Off Maplecroft Lane, gated farm access set back from road however and would require improvements.

Potential contamination on very small part of site. Minimal adverse impact with opportunity to enhance.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0471
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.56
Address: Presdale Farm House, Hoe Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2RJ

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Residential


SLAA yield: 17 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Circa 10% site omitted as site in flood zone 3b.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 15



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0471** 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	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. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Only 5% of the site is in Flood Zone 2, located along parts of the southern boundary and can be avoided through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	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 with a very low sensitivity Green Belt parcel. The release of the site would have limited impact on the gaps between Lower Nazeing and surrounding towns, and on the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement. 80% greenfield site, 700m from an existing settlement (Little Nazeing).
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	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Off Hoe Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date. No potential contamination identified.
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below 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-0473
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 7.66
Address: St. Leonards Farm, St. Leonards Road, Waltham Abbey, Nazeing, EN9 2HG
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agriculture.


SLAA yield: 229 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: 229



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0473** 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. Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (over 50 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering less than 1%, are located along a part of the eastern 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	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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 exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Off St. Leonards Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination on very small part of site. Minimal adverse impact with opportunity to enhance.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0486
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.21
Address: Leaside Nursery and Sedgigate Nursery, Sedge Green, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2PA
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Nursery.


SLAA yield: 45-55 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 39-48 dph)

SLAA site constraints: Circa 60% of the site has potential contamination which may not be suitable for housing development (landfill). As such developable site area reduced to 40%.

Site selection adjustment: None

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



Dwellings: 18



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

Drawing Status
Issue

Drawing No
SR-0486 Issue
P1



Criteria	Score	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to an area of Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh and wholly within two buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Lee Valley Central LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	
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	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 200m from an existing settlement (Little Nazeing).
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. The proposals could be configured to avoid loss of public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space and could provide opportunities to improve access to open land.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site is identified as a potential regeneration area. Proposed density reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Off Sedge Green Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(--)	Potential contamination on site, which is not likely to be able to be mitigated.	Circa 60% of the site has potential contamination (Landfill site and Horticultural Nursery). Potentially significant adverse impact that may not be possible to mitigate for Housing use. Remaining 40% has potential contamination on site (nursery).
6.6 Traffic impact		Site below 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-0507
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 2.86
Address: Land at Little Cutlands, Incorporating Wilbea and Royd, St Leonards Road, Lower Nazeing, Waltham Abbey, EN9 2HJ
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Residential curtilage.


SLAA yield: 83 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Circa a third reduction in capacity because of the location of the site within Flood Zone 3a.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 55



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0507** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 6 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are concentrated at the north edge of the site. Impacts to the Ancient trees may be mitigated due to the low density and by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is adjacent to a BAP priority habitat with no main features habitat, and is wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.	Some 14% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 of which 8% is in Flood Zones 3a and 3b. Flood Zones 3a and 3b are located along the northern and eastern site boundary and the impact can be mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(+)	Majority of the site is greenfield land within a settlement.	75% greenfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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	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 on the edge of the existing settlement. However, low density development is proposed which reflects the character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	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.	Existing track off St. Leonards Road, which would require upgrading and access through third party land.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (pond). Potential adverse impact, but 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-0508

Parish: Nazeing

Settlement:

Size (ha): 3.55

Address: Nazeing Glassworth Site,
Nazeing New Road,
EN10 6SU

Primary use: Housing

SLAA notes: A functioning industrial estate with a number of businesses operating on site. There is an element of undeveloped land to the west but it is mostly densely covered by trees.

SLAA yield: 107


SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph (quantity not indicated on pre app form)

SLAA site constraints: A reduction is made to the yield as circa a third of the site is landfill, as identified in the EFDC Senior Contaminated Land Officers comments on the extent to which there is potential landfill 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: 71



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
Drawing No **SR-0508** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	The site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	No Ancient or Veteran Trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Lands
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses the majority of a BAP priority habitat, and is adjacent to two other habitats. The site may directly affect the habitats, but it may be possible to mitigate.
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 a Local Wildlife Site. The site may indirectly affect the Local Wildlife Site, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.7 Flood risk	(-)	Site within Flood Zone 3a where exception test required.	The whole site is in flood zone 2, with a substantial amount also falling in flood zone 3a across the whole area. Development would be significantly constrained.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	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.	The site lies partially in the Green Belt. In the Stage 1 assessment, the Green Belt parcel was assessed as making no contribution to preventing merging between towns and performed relatively weakly in terms of preventing sprawl.
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 that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	Split site (50% greenfield and brownfield). Site is not within or adjacent to an existing 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.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. Site adjacent to existing public open space which could provide opportunities for improved access to woodland semi natural public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	0	The site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change.	As a result of the site characteristics 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.	Redevelopment of existing employment site not likely to impact on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
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.	Subject to care in layout and design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Access from Nazeing New Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	There is the potential for a landfill to be present on the soft covered area in the southern / south western part of the site, meaning it would be necessary for a developer to demonstrate the feasibility of developing it for unmanaged domestic use (Red) b
6.6 Traffic impact	(-)	Low level congestion expected at peak times within the vicinity of the site.	

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0599
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5
Address: Old House Farm, Old House Lane, Nazeing, Essex, EN9 2LJ

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: A number of open fields separated by dense tree boundaries.


SLAA yield: 200
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 40 dph based on edge of settlement location and the fact that the scheme will also include a primary school (this is an 'other use' not assessed in the SLAA).

SLAA site constraints: Site is 100% covered by SR-0300. As such the yield is omitted for this site to avoid double counting.

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

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

Dwellings: 200



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0599** 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	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is within Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).
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 an area of historic field patterns to the south of Nazeing, and an area which is highly sensitive to change. Proposed development could negatively impact this historic character, but could be mitigated through layout and design.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.	Existing access via a private road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	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-0840
Parish: Nazeing
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.17
Address: Retail strip at Nazeing Road, Lower Nazeing, Essex.

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: A parade of local shops with residential flats above and associated parking and access.


SLAA yield: 8
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Settlement Capacity Analysis (equivalent to 48 dph)

SLAA site constraints: The site is located in the Lea Valley Regional Park but as the site is already built up it unlikely to have any negative impact.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 8



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Drawing No **SR-0840** 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	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.
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 more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
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	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).

The site is wholly within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.

100% brownfield site, within an existing settlement (Lower Nazeing).

The relevant site character context is urban and development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.

Site is located within the settlement area and provides an opportunity for intensification. However, number of proposed houses is at a higher density than the neighbouring areas. Therefore, development is likely to affect the character of the area.

Potential contamination (Laundry / Farm). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.