

ONGAR PARK ESTATE, NORTH WEALD
BASSETT

PROPOSED SITE ALLOCATIONS REVIEW:
ENVIRONMENTAL, GREEN BELT, LANDSCAPE AND
ECOLOGY

LLA TABLE 1 EFDC SSA (2016) COMPARISON TABLE

January 2018

LLA Table 1: EFDC SSA (2016) comparison table (EFDC SSA 2016 site references and scores, with LLA December 2016 assessment of Land at Ongar Park Estate from LLA Environmental Issues Report, Updated January 2018)

EFDC SSA (2016) Criteria	EFDC SSA (2016) site reference and scores from EFDC SSA (2016) – EFDC residential allocation reference December 2017 in italics										LLA December 2016 assessment of land at Ongar Park Estate using Methodology from Stage 2 EFDC SSA (Refer LLA Environmental Issues Report December 2016, Updated January 2018)		
	SR-0036 <i>NWB.R1 forms part of this SSA site</i>	SR-0072 <i>NWB.R2</i>	SR-0158A <i>NWB.R3 forms part of this SSA site</i>	SR-0076 <i>NWB.R3 forms part of this SSA site</i>	SR-0455 <i>NWB.R4</i>	<i>NWB.R5 not assessed in EFDC SSA (2016)</i>							
	Score		Score	Score		Score		Score		Score	Not Assessed	Score	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland	0	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland		(0)	Site is not located within or adjacent to Ancient Woodland
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.	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.	0	No effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of BAP priority habitats from site.		(-)	Features and species in the Site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Site	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	0	Site has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.		(+)	Features and Species in the Site are retained and there are opportunities to enhance existing features
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	0	Site is within Green Belt, but the level of harm caused by release of the land for development would be none.	(-)	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.	(-)	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.	(-)	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.		(-)	Agree
4.1 Brownfield / Greenfield	(-)	Majority of site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	(-)	Majority of site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	(-)	Majority of site is greenfield land adjacent to a settlement.	(--)	Majority of the site is greenfield land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.	0	Majority of the site is previously developed land that is neither within nor adjacent to a settlement.		(-)	Agree
4.2 Impact on Agricultural Land	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	(--)	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).		(0)	Development of the Site would not result in the loss of agricultural land.
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public 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.	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.		(+)	Development could provide an opportunity to improve links to adjacent public open space or provide access to open space which is currently private
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 within significant character change.	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity – characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development within significant character change.	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity – characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development within significant character change.	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity – characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development within significant character change.	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity – characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development within significant character change.		(0)	Site falls within an area of low landscape sensitivity – characteristics of the landscape are able to accommodate development without significant character change
5.2 Settlement Character Sensitivity	0	Development is unlikely to have an effect on settlement character.	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.	(-)	Development could detract from the existing settlement character.		(+)	Development may improve settlement character through redevelopment of a run down site or improvement in townscape
6.1 Topographical Constraints	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.	(-)	Topography constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	(-)	Topography constraints exist in the site but potential for mitigation.	0	No topography constraints are identified in the site.		(0)	No Topography constraints are identified in the Site

Stansted:
Unit 1, The Exchange,
9 Station Road,
Stansted, CM24 8BE

t +44 (0)1279 647044
e office@lizlake.com
www.lizlake.com

Bristol:
1 Host Street,
Bristol, BS1 5BU

t +44 (0)117 927 1786
e office@lizlake.com
www.lizlake.com

Nottingham:
Suite 201,
20 Fletcher Gate,
Nottingham NG1 2FZ

t +44 (0)115 784 3566
e office@lizlake.com
www.lizlake.com

LIZ LAKE
ASSOCIATES
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

- Landscape Design
- Urban Design
- Residential
- Public Realm
- Masterplanning
- Landscape Planning
- Heritage Landscapes
- Gardens and Estates
- Restoration and Conversion
- Places of Worship
- Expert Witness
- Hospitality
- Education
- Retail / Office
- Community
- Ecology
- Arboriculture
- 3D / Graphic Design