## Site Suitability Assessment

Site Reference: SR-0478A Parish: Chigwell

Settlement

Size (ha):

Chigwell Nurseries, 245 High Road, Chigwell, Essex, 1G7 5BL Address:

Primary use: Housing SLAA notes: Nursery.

SLAA yield: 225 dwellings

SLAA source for baseline yield: Assumption based on 30 dph

SLAA site contraints:

Circa 1/4 of the site is covered by SR-0478 (NLP ref 2, 50 dwellings). As such the yield for this site is reduced to ensure no double counting.

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Site selection} & \text{Full capacity reinstated for site selection assessment (overlapping adjustment} & \text{site}). \end{array}$ 

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

Community feedback: <u>Dwellings:</u>



Epping Forest District Council

Epping Forest District Local Plan

Drawing Status

Issue

Drawing No SR-O478A

**ARUP** 

Epping Forest District Council

Issue P1



Divernings. 223			
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 incombination 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 SSSIs.	
1.3a Impact on Ancient Woodland	0	Ste 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 sile.	
1.4 Impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land	0	Site is unlikely to impact on Epping Forest Buffer Land.	
1.5 Impact on BAP Priority Species or Habitats	(-)	Features and species in the site may not be retained in their entirety but effects can be mitigated.	The site encompasses a Deciduous Woodland habitat and is within four buffer zones. The site may directly affect the BAP priority habitats, but mitigation can be implemented to address this.
1.6 Impact on Local Wildlife Sites	0	Ste has no effect as features and species could be retained or due to distance of local wildlife sites from site.	
1.7 Flood risk	(++)	Ste 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 tack of previous disturbance indicates a high likelihood for the discovery of high quality archaeological assets on the site.	
1.9 Impact of air quality	(-)	Ste lies within an area which has been identified as being at risk of poor air quality, but it is likely that the risk could be mitigated or reduced.	Parts of the sile are close to the A11 and therefore miligation measures are likely to be required.
2.1 Level of harm to Green Belt	()	Ste 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	(+)	Ste is within 400m of a bus stop.	
3.3 Distance to employment locations	(+)	Ste is within 1600m of an employment ste/location.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Ste is less than 1000m from nearest town, large village or small village.	
3.5 Distance to nearest infant/primary school	0	Ste is between 1000m and 4000m from the nearest infant/primary school.	
3.4 Distance to local amenities	(+)	Ste is less than 1000m from the nearest secondary school.	
3.7 Distance to nearest GP surgery	0	Ste 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 (Chigwell).
4.2 Impact on agricultural land	()	Development would involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3).	
4.3 Capacity to improve access to open space	0	Development unlikely to involve the loss of public open space.	No public open space is located in the site area. Development will not involve the loss of public open space.
5.1 Landscape sensitivity	(-)	The site falls within an area of medium landscape sensitivity - characteristics of the landscape are resilient to change and able to absorb development without sgnificant 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 character of the area. Therefore, development is not likely thave an impact on the character of the area.
6.1 Topography constraints	(-)	Topographical constraints exist in the sile 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 High Road.
6.5 Contamination constraints	(-)	Potential contamination on site, which could be mitigated.	Potential contamination (nursery). Minimal adverse impact with opportunity to enhance.
6.6 Traffic impact	0	Area around the site expected to be uncongested at peak time, or site below the site size threshold where it would be expected to affect congestion.	
			© Aru