

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0008
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5.96
Address: Tower Nursery, Netherhall Road, Roydon

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Four large Glasshouse Nurseries


SLAA yield: 182 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: 182



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0008** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Potential for recreational pressure effects in combination on Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (over 50 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(+)	Site within Flood Zone 2 and exception test not required.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to 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, 2,000m 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	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. Site shares characteristics with the adjacent zone of high sensitivity. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on adjacent landscape character area.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. Existing glasshouses, and development is of a scale that could effect the dispersed low density settlement character on Hamlet Hill. Impact could be mitigated through design and layout. Loss of glasshouse could affect market garden character of 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. The large protected tree on the west boundary could be incorporated through careful layout design.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists. Epping Road and Old House Lane both have suitable access points.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Horticultural Nurseries). 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-0009
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 14.86
Address: Land north side of Epping Road, known as 'Halls Green'

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Vacant land and wooded area


SLAA yield: 463 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Only circa 4ha (two parcels adjacent road) developable accounting for woodland/Scheduled Ancient Monument constraints. Under option to house builder - assumed residential led use.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 120



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No: **SR-0009** Issue: **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (over 100 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	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated. There are 12 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees at the edges and throughout 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 unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated. The site encompasses two Deciduous Woodland habitats, and is partially within the majority of a BAP priority habitat with no main feature. The site is likely to direct the habitats, and these effects may not be mitigable.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. Site encompasses a small portion of the Roydon Brickfields North LWS and may directly affect some of the LWS, but effects can be mitigated. Site is within the 250m buffer of Brickfields Wood LWS and Worlds End LPS however is unlikely to affect these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	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. 100% greenfield site, 1,500m from an existing settlement (Roydon).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(--)	Development is likely to substantially harm the existing settlement character. Site comprises Halls Green Farm. Farm provides a break between the 'long green' settlement at Halls Green to the west and from the substantial areas of glasshouses to the east. Major development could substantially harm the character of the settlement.
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 to nurseries.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (Brickworks and Anti-Aircraft Gun 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-0035
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.19
Address: Land at Epping Road, Roydon

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 6-7 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 33-38 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None


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

Dwellings: 7



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0035** 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, Incormans P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geomatics, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment	
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.	
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.	
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	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 more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, adjacent to a settlement (Roydon).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	Site comprises one of few remaining open sites facing Epping Road along the linear settlement of Roydon reflecting the 'long green' settlement pattern. The site is unlikely to negatively impact on this 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.	Main road adjacent.
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-0038
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.32
Address: Land at Tylers Cross Farm, Water lane, Tylers Cross, Harlow

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Farmhouse/Residential Buildings, Outbuildings and Farm Yard.


SLAA yield: 31 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Listed buildings on site reduces capacity for development by circa 1/2.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 15



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan


Drawing Status

Issue

Drawing No: **SR-0038** 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	(-)	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.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of 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	(-)	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-0039
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 2.15
Address: Land at Bourne Farm, Water Lane, Tylers Cross, Harlow
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Nursery (Glasshouses) with residential dwelling on front of site


SLAA yield: 65 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 HAR-B which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 65



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0039** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk



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 is 1 Ancient tree directly affected by the site. The tree is located in the south of the site and may be affected by development. Impacts may be mitigated by considered masterplanning or transposition.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	The site is partially within the buffer zone for a Traditional Orchard habitat. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	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.	Almost all of the site is within a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel which prevents the sprawl of Harlow. The Green Belt parcel is a gateway point to the town with added strategic importance and its release 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 is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 1,000m from an existing settlement (Harlow).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Loss of glasshouses could impact the market garden character of the area. Site is within a Conservation Area, and adjacent to Listed Buildings. The density of development is likely to have a detrimental impact on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Existing access off Water 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-0052A
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 61.45
Address: Land at East End Farm, Harlow

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Residential led urban extension to Harlow on existing agricultural fields

SLAA yield: Enhanced landscaping and access to the countryside. Not


SLAA source for baseline yield: Based on promoter material.



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: 0



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No: **SR-0052A** | Issue: **P1**
 
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, inclemens P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geomatics, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (over 10 rural residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(--)	Site contains a higher density of Ancient and/or Veteran trees, or are configured in such a way that direct loss or harm is likely. There are 41 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed and concentrated on the western boundary, and development of the site may affect a portion of the trees. The density of the trees is such that direct harm is likely.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. The site encompasses the majority of a Deciduous Woodland and Wet Woodland habitats, and is adjacent to a Semi Improved Grassland habitat. The site is likely to directly and indirectly affect the habitats, but these effects can be mitigated.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated. A small part of the site encompasses approximately half of the Worlds Ends LWS and may directly affect this LWS. The site is adjacent to Roydon Brickfields North and within the 250m buffer for Roydon Mead LWS, however is unlikely to affect these LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1. Some 95% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering 5%, are located on the northern site boundary. These areas can be avoided and the flood risk mitigated through site layout.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	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 is within very high/high sensitivity Green Belt parcels which contribute strongly to preventing the sprawl of Harlow and its coalescence with Roydon. If the site was released it may harm the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	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 adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Harlow).
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 high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Developer proposals include enhancement of landscape and publically accessible open space, with no built development. This is unlikely to impact on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination over small part of site (Farm). 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-0052B
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 94.56
Address: Land at East End Farm, Harlow

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Residential led urban extension to Harlow on existing agricultural fields

SLAA yield: 1,000 dwellings and 80,000 sqm commercial floorspace.


SLAA source for baseline yield: Based on promoter material.

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: 1000



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0052B** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	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	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	0	Site is more than 1600m and less than 2400m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	(-)	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 high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0068
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 53.57
Address: Land to the west of Sumners (bounded in part by Water Lane and Epping Road, Tylers Cross)

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Residential led urban extension to Harlow. Agricultural existing use.


SLAA yield: 1,100 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites (equivalent to 22 dph)

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 1100



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0068** 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 a higher density of Ancient and/or Veteran trees, or are configured in such a way that direct loss or harm is likely. There are 26 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed within the site, though development may directly affect all the trees. The density of the dispersed trees is such that direct harm is likely.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site encompasses a Deciduous Woodland habitat, and is partially within a portion of a BAP priority habitat with no main features and three buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, but mitigation can address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1. Some 99% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones, totalling less than 1%, are located in the northern corner of the site 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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high. The majority of the site is located in a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel which plays an important role in preventing the sprawl of 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 is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Harlow).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(-)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private. No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. An existing site masterplan identifies opportunities to provide new public open spaces in the development proposal.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change. The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape. Proposed extension to Harlow provides an opportunity to establish a new settlement character, and improve / reinforce the character of the outlying western parts of Harlow.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (sewage sludge/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-0081
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 16.05
Address: Hamlet Hill Land, Hamlet Hill, Roydon, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural field


SLAA yield: 478 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Gas pipeline will reduce capacity due to buffer along southern edge. Reduction by 1/4.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 478



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0081** 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 BAP priority habitat with no main features, and within three buffer zones. The site may indirectly affect the habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.	
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 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, 2,000m 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	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.	Site characteristics are such that a detailed assessment would be likely to find high vulnerability, at least in part. Development would need to be strongly constrained in extent and form so as not to be likely to affect adversely the wider landscape.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Significant development on land south of Hamlet Hill could have impact on the dispersed 'long green' settlement pattern at Roydon Hamlet; detached dwellings with large grounds. May require mitigation through design and layout, or a reduction in density.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	(--)	Gas or oil pipelines pose a major constraint to development. They will be difficult to overcome and affect a large part of the site.	More than 74% of the site is in HSE inner and middle consultation zones running through the middle of the site. Mitigation will be difficult due to the location and size of the affected area. Sensitivity level 3. HSE guidance advise against development.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Off Hamlet Hill.
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-0091
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 73.85
Address: Land to the west of Harlow between Old House Lane, Epping Road, Water Lane and Katherines
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural fields and glasshouses/nurseries


SLAA yield: 1,100 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Identified by agent

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 1100



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0091** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	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.	The site proposes a development type that is not considered a risk to SSSI features.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.	The site wholly encompasses Harold's Grove Ancient Woodland and half of the buffer zone. The site may affect all of the Ancient Woodland, but impacts may be mitigated against through considered masterplanning.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.	There are 13 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are largely at the southern end 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 four BAP priority habitats and is partially within the majority of two others. It is within three buffer zones. The site is likely to directly affect the habitats, and these effects may be able to be mitigated.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	A small part of the site encompasses Parndon Wood LWS. The site may directly affect some of the LWS, but effects can be mitigated. Site is adjacent to Brickfields Wood LWS and may indirectly affect some of the features and species of this LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.	Some 97% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a covering 3% is located in the south-eastern corner of the site 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 high or very high.	
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.6 Distance to 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 (Harlow).
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 high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb 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.	Proposed extension to Harlow provides an opportunity to establish a new settlement character, and improve / reinforce the character of the outlying western parts of Harlow.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(-)	The intensity of site development would be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	The protected trees on or adjacent to the site could be incorporated into the development proposed, subject to care in the layout, but would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the suitability of the site for development
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over west part of site (Horticultural Nurseries). 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-0094
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 5.05
Address: Land at North of Villa Nursery, Reeves Lane, Roydon, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Existing agricultural field.


SLAA yield: 154 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

Community feedback: None

Dwellings: 126



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0094** 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 high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land 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	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-0095
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 4.48
Address: Merry Weather Nursery, Reeves Lane, Roydon, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Nursery (Glasshouses) and existing agricultural field.


SLAA yield: 126 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

Community feedback: None

Dwellings: 126




Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No: **SR-0095** Issue: **P1**

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



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 high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land 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.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0096
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.68
Address: Villa Nursery, Reeves Lane, Roydon, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Nursery (Glasshouses) cover the site.


SLAA yield: 21 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

Community feedback: None

Dwellings: 21



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0096** 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 high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land 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	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-0107
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 3.37
Address: Land at Epping and Parsloe Road, Roydon, Essex (Blakes Farm)

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Agricultural fields

SLAA yield: 135 dwellings comprising 100 market homes and 35 affordable


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites



SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 135



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0107** 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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of 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	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-0109
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.3
Address: Richmonds Farm, Parsloe Road, Epping Green, CM16 6QB

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Farmyard and Former Nursery


SLAA yield: 37 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 HAR-B which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 37



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0109** 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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	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.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0117
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 1.31
Address: The paddock to the rear of Barn House, Farm Close, Roydon, Essex, CM19 5LW
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Open land.


SLAA yield: 39 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 ROY-C which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 39



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0117** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
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 Woodland Pasture and Parkland buffer zone. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(-)	Proposed site located within a Conservation Area or adjacent to a Listed Building or other heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Roydon).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Site is on edge of Roydon. The scale of development and location of the site is unlikely to negatively impact the character of the settlement.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade. Access to site would need to be through Farm Close or Temple Mead.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination (In filled Gravel Pit, Farm). 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-0140
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.37
Address: Hill Farm Nursery, Hamlet Hill, Roydon, Harlow, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Wooded/scrubland


SLAA yield: 12 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: 12



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0140** 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	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	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
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	(+)	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-0142
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 3.17
Address: Beale Oaken, Tylers Road, Roydon Hamlet, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Dwelling and agricultural field


SLAA yield: 91 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: 91



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0142** 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 buffer zone for BAP priority habitat with no main features. The site may indirectly affect the habitat, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	The site is within the 250m buffer for the Nazeing Church Fields 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	(-)	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	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.	
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 2,400m 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.	As a result of the site characteristics development is unlikely to adversely affect the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is on the edge of the existing settlement with scattered developments around it. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly 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.	Off Hamlet Hill.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination on east site (Horticultural Nursery / 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-0157
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 2.05
Address: Mount Pleasant House, Harlow Road, Roydon, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Dwelling house and gardens

SLAA yield: 150 dwellings comprising 100 market homes and 50 affordable


SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Call for Sites

SLAA site constraints: Lower density 30 dph

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 60



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0157** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is 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 that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0167
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.44
Address: Belmont, Hamlet Hill, Roydon

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Dwellings 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: The Council did not consult on a growth location which covers or is near to this site.

Dwellings: 13



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0167** 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	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	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
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		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-0169
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.53
Address: The Old Coal Yard, off 32 High Street, Roydon

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 16 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 ROY-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 16



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0169** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(--)	Site would result in loss of a heritage asset or significant impact that cannot be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is 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 less than 1000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	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-0197
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.5
Address: Land adjacent to Kingsmead, Epping Road, Roydon, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Lawn, part of large domestic garden


SLAA yield: 5 dwellings
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: 5



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0197** Issue **P1**
 
© Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right (2016). Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, Inclemens P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
 Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Geomatics, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(++)	Opportunity to enhance significance of the historical asset/ further reveal its significance / enhance the setting.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land 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	(-)	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	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-0214
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.85
Address: Land adjacent Brickfield Wood, off Old House Lane, Roydon

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Wooded area surrounded by agricultural fields.


SLAA yield: 26 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 HAR-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 26



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0214** Issue **P1**
ARUP Epping Forest District Council
 www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	0	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use do not undermine conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other sites).
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	(-)	Site is adjacent to or contains Ancient Woodland but possible effects can be mitigated.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	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	(--)	Features and species in the site unlikely to be retained and effects cannot be mitigated.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	0	There is a medium likelihood that further archaeological assets may be discovered on the site, but potential is unknown as a result of previous lack of investigation.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to 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 high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	(--)	The site has severely limited feasibility for development as a result of the extensive presence of protected trees, either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(--)	There is no means of access to the site and no likely prospect of achieving access.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0241
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.94
Address: Land on South side of Common Road (Rosewood Farm), Broadley Common, Essex [Title number: EX453918] and land at rear of Meadow Lodge, Epping Road, Nazeing, Essex
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 38 dwellings comprising 8 market homes and 30 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: 38



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0241** 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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	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	(+)	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-0303
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 39.97
Address: Roydon, West Area
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad Area West of Roydon comprising agricultural fields.


SLAA yield: 1200 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 ROY-C which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 1200



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0303** 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (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	(-)	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 4 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed in the centre 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 is partially within a portion of a Wood Pasture and Parkland habitat, and is adjacent to three habitats. The site is likely to directly and indirectly affect the habitats, 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. Some 94% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher risk flood areas 2, 3a and 3b, covering 6%, are located in the northern corner of the site 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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium. Most of the site falls within low/very low sensitivity Green Belt parcels; a small area extends into a medium sensitivity parcel. Integration of sensitive planting at the western edge would limit the 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	(+)	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Roydon).
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 high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	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. Numerous access points.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination over parts of the site (Farmyards / infilled Gravel Pits). 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-0304
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 9.12
Address: Roydon, North-east Area
Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad Area North-east of Roydon


SLAA yield: 273 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 ROY-A which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 273



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0304** 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	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (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 adjacent to an area of Wood Pasture and Parkland. It is in 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.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1. Some 94% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, covering 6%, is located on the eastern edge of the site 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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium. The majority of the site is within moderate/very low sensitivity Green Belt parcels and touches a very high sensitivity Green Belt parcel. If released, the existing heavily planted eastern edge would limit harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	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	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Roydon).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape. Proposed development provides an opportunity to establish a new settlement character, and improve / reinforce the character of the outlying eastern parts of Roydon, subject to sensitive design reflecting the adjacent listed buildings.
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 Harlow Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination over small parts of the site (Brickworks / Gravel Pit / infilled pond). Potential adverse impact that could be mitigated.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0306
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 14.05
Address: Roydon, south-east Area

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Broad Area south-east of Roydon


SLAA yield: 200 dwellings.
SLAA source for baseline yield: Based on promoter material. Developer proposals recognise potential to provide a 'green buffer'.

SLAA site constraints: None

Site selection adjustment: Capacity re-assessed based on promoter material. Site boundary re-drawing removing the recreation ground and allotments.

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

Dwellings: 422



Client
Epping Forest District Council

Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0306** Issue **P1**

ARUP

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development partially located between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (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 3 Ancient trees directly affected by the site. The trees are dispersed at the edges 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 two BAP priority habitats and lies 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 adjacent to the Worlds End LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium. The majority of the site is located within a low sensitivity Green Belt parcel. The site area is well aligned with identified buffer features which would limit potential harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt if the site was released.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.6 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 100% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Roydon).
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 and the recreation ground has been omitted for the development site boundary. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character. The scale of the proposed development and the extent of the site, is likely to have a negative affect on the semi-rural character of the area. Development may contribute to urban sprawl.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	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	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade. Access would need to be substantially upgraded with new access points (existing access is not sufficient).
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated. Potential contamination over small part of the site (Sewage Works). 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-0423
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.88
Address: Land East of Little Brook Road, Roydon

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None


SLAA yield: 27 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: 27



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0423** 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	(-)	Site contains Ancient and/or Veteran trees but at a sufficiently low density across the site that removal could be largely avoided or possible impacts could be mitigated.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.
6.1 Topography constraints	(--)	Topographical constraints in the site may preclude development.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.

Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0424
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 4.36
Address: Water Lane Cottage and Adjacent Field

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: None



SLAA yield: 131 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 HAR-B which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 131



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0424** 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	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 small area of a BAP priority habitat with no main features, and in the related 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.	Some 98% of the site is in Flood Zone 1. Higher Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a, covering 2%, are located in the northern corner of the site 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	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.	
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(--)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be high or very high.	Almost all of the site is within a high sensitivity Green Belt parcel which prevents the sprawl of Harlow. The Green Belt parcel is a gateway point to the town with added strategic importance and its release 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 is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(-)	Site is more than 2400m from an employment site/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.	
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.	
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	100% greenfield site, 800m from an existing settlement (Harlow).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without significant character change.	The form and extent of any development would have to be sensitive to the location to avoid potential adverse impact on the wider landscape character.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	Site is within a very low density area with scattered developments around it. Therefore, development is likely to affect the predominantly rural character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.	
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.	
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.	
6.4 Access to site	(+)	Suitable access to site already exists.	Off Water Lane.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination over part of site (Smithy). 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-0675
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 0.24
Address: Parkfields Garages, Nos. 4-19, Roydon

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: Council owned garages with associated parking and turning area.


SLAA yield: 7 dwellings
SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site constraints: Site is an awkward shape.

Site selection adjustment: None

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

Dwellings: 4



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0675** Issue **P1**

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



Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	0	Based on the Impact Risk Zones there is no requirement to consult Natural England because the proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSI's.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	(+)	No effect likely on historic assets due to distance from site.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(+)	Site is not located in the Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	(+)	Site is within 400m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(++)	Majority of the site is previously developed land within or adjacent to a settlement.
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	0	Development would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	Potential for access to the site to be created through third party land and agreement in place, or existing access would require upgrade.
6.5 Contamination constraints	0	No contamination issues identified on site to date.
6.6 Traffic impact		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-0890
Parish: Roydon
Settlement:
Size (ha): 6.33
Address: Land at Epping Road, Roydon, Harlow, Essex

Primary use: Housing
SLAA notes: One residential dwelling with outbuildings and garden and agricultural field to the rear


SLAA yield: 60
SLAA source for baseline yield: Indicated in Request for Pre-Application Planning Advice form (dwellings equivalent to 9 dph)

SLAA site constraints: Site is 90% covered by a SR-0306. As such the yield is reduced 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 ROY-B which is within or near to this site. Refer to Appendix B1.4 for further details.

Dwellings: 60



Client
Epping Forest District Council
 Job Title
Epping Forest District Local Plan
 Drawing Status
 Issue
 Drawing No **SR-0890** Issue **P1**
ARUP **Epping Forest District Council**
www.eppingforestcouncil.gov.uk

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

Criteria	Score	Qualitative Assessment
1.1 Impact on Internationally Protected Sites	(-)	Effects of allocating the site for the proposed use are not likely to be significant alone but should be checked for in-combination effects. Residential development between 400m and 2km from Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. In-combination effects from recreational pressure likely.
1.2 Impact on Nationally Protected sites	(-)	Site falls within an Impact Risk Zone and due to the nature and scale of the development proposed it is likely to be possible to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Due to the development type (over 50 residential dwellings), development of the site is likely to pose a risk and consultation with Natural England is required. However, it is likely that mitigation to reduce the risk would be possible.
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland.
1.3b Impact on Ancient/Veteran Trees outside of Ancient Woodland	0	No Ancient or Veteran trees are located within the site.
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site. The site is partially within 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 Worlds End LWS. The site is unlikely to affect the features and species of the LWS.
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Site within Flood Zone 1.
1.8a Impact on heritage assets	0	Proposed site located within the setting of a heritage asset and effects can be mitigated.
1.8b Impact on archaeology	(-)	Existing evidence and/or a lack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.
1.9 Impact of air quality	0	Site lies outside of areas identified as being at risk of poor air quality.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	(-)	Site is within Green Belt, where the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be very low, low or medium. Almost all the site is within a low sensitivity Green Belt parcel which is separated from the wider Green Belt by dense planted buffers to the east. If the site was released it would have limited harm to the purposes of the wider Green Belt.
3.1 Distance to the nearest rail/tube station	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest rail or tube station.
3.2 Distance to nearest bus stop	0	Site between 400m and 1000m of a bus stop.
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Site is within 1600m of an employment site/location.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	0	Site is between 1000m and 4000m from nearest town, large village or small village.
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	(+)	Site is less than 1000m from the nearest infant/primary school.
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest secondary school.
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	(-)	Site is more than 4000m from the nearest GP surgery.
3.8 Access to Strategic Road Network		Not applicable.
4.1 Brownfield and Greenfield Land	(-)	Majority of the site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement. 95% greenfield site, adjacent to an existing settlement (Roydon).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent existing public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private. No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space. An existing site masterplan identifies opportunities to provide new public open spaces in the development proposal.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(--)	The site falls within an area of high landscape sensitivity - vulnerable to change and unable to absorb development without significant character change.
5.2 Settlement character sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character. Low density development is proposed which reflects the rural character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely to have an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.
6.2a Distance to gas and oil pipelines	0	Gas or oil pipelines do not pose any constraint to the site.
6.2b Distance to power lines	0	Power lines do not pose a constraint to the site.
6.3 Impact on Tree Preservation Order (TPO)	0	The intensity of site development would not be constrained by the presence of protected trees either on or adjacent to the site.
6.4 Access to site	(-)	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 Epping Road, which would require upgrading to support development.
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.