

# Committee Agenda



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

## **Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee Monday, 13th June, 2011**

**Place:** Council Chamber  
Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

**Time:** 7.00 pm

**Democratic Services Officer:** Gary Woodhall (Office of the Chief Executive)  
Email: gwoodhall@eppingforestdc.gov.uk  
Tel: 01992 564470

### **Members:**

Councillors Mrs L Wagland (Chairman), Mrs R Gadsby, J Knapman, Mrs M McEwen and J Philip

---

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Assistant to the Chief Executive) To declare interests in any item on the agenda.

### **3. MINUTES**

To confirm the minutes of the following meetings of the Cabinet Committee:

- (i) 15 March 2011 (previously circulated); and
- (ii) 28 March 2011 (previously circulated).

### **4. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

To note the Terms of reference for the Cabinet Committee, as agreed by the Council on 17 February 2009; minute 113(a) refers.

(1) That a Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee be appointed with the following terms of reference:

(a) To oversee and submit recommendations to the Cabinet as appropriate on:

- (i) the preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF);
- (ii) the preparation of the Core Strategy including agreement of consultation stages and documentation, and the responses that should be

made to any representations received;

(iii) the preparation of other Development Plan Documents including agreement of consultation stages and documentation, and the responses that should be made to any representations received;

(iv) the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents including agreement of consultation stages and documentation, and the responses that should be made to any representations received; and

(v) the revision of the Local Development Scheme and monitoring the achievement of milestones;

(b) To consider and provide input to consultants' reports which contribute to the establishment of an up-to-date evidence base to influence preparation of the LDF;

(c) To consider options for joint or coordinated working with other councils, which best meet the needs of this District, as required by the East of England Plan and (where relevant) the London Plan and to make recommendations to the Cabinet thereon;

(d) To consider the comprehensive review of the East of England Plan, and make recommendations to the Cabinet on any responses to be made;

(e) To liaise with the Planning Services Scrutiny Standing Panel as appropriate; and

(f) To work within the budgetary provision for the LDF, as approved by the Cabinet and the Council.

**5. STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT - UPDATE (Pages 5 - 24)**

(Director of Planning & Economic Development) To consider the attached report (LDF-001-2011/12).

**6. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, together with paragraphs (6) and (24) of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution requires that the permission of the Chairman be obtained, after prior notice to the Chief Executive, before urgent business not specified in the agenda (including a supplementary agenda of which the statutory period of notice has been given) may be transacted.

In accordance with Operational Standing Order (6) (non-executive bodies), any item raised by a non-member shall require the support of a member of the Cabinet Committee and the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee. Two weeks' notice of non-urgent items is required.

**7. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

Exclusion

To consider whether, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the

public and press should be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on grounds that they will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the following paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended) or are confidential under Section 100(A)(2):

<b>Agenda Item No</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Exempt Information Paragraph Number</b>
Nil	Nil	Nil

The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, which came into effect on 1 March 2006, requires the Council to consider whether maintaining the exemption listed above outweighs the potential public interest in disclosing the information. Any member who considers that this test should be applied to any currently exempted matter on this agenda should contact the proper officer at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

#### Confidential Items Commencement

Paragraph (9) of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution require:

- (1) All business of the Council requiring to be transacted in the presence of the press and public to be completed by 10.00pm at the latest.
- (2) At the time appointed under (1) above, the Chairman shall permit the completion of debate on any item still under consideration, and at his or her discretion, any other remaining business whereupon the Council shall proceed to exclude the public and press.
- (3) Any public business remaining to be dealt with shall be deferred until after the completion of the private part of the meeting, including items submitted for report rather than decision.

#### Background Papers

Paragraph (8) of the Access to Information Procedure Rules of the Constitution define background papers as being documents relating to the subject matter of the report which in the Proper Officer's opinion:

- (a) disclose any facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the report is based; and
- (b) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing the report and does not include published works or those which disclose exempt or confidential information (as defined in Rule 10) and in respect of executive reports, the advice of any political advisor.

Inspection of background papers may be arranged by contacting the officer responsible for the item.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Report to the Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee**



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

**Report reference: LDF-001-2011/12**  
**Date of meeting: 13 June 2011**

**Portfolio: Planning & Technology**

**Subject: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment - Update**

**Responsible Officer: Amanda Wintle (01992 564543)**

**Democratic Services Officer: Gary Woodhall (01992 564470)**

---

### **Recommendations/Decisions Required:**

**(1) To approve the minor amendments to the draft methodology and site assessment form, as previously agreed by the Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee.**

### **Executive Summary:**

The draft methodology and site assessment form were agreed for public consultation, and as the basis for the appointment of consultants in May 2010. Due to staff losses in the Forward Planning team this work has not been advanced as quickly as was hoped, and neither the consultation nor the appointment of consultants has yet taken place. It is now necessary to amend the methodology and site assessment form to bring these up to date before work continues.

### **Reasons for Proposed Decision:**

To allow key local stakeholders to be consulted in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment draft methodology and appoint external consultants to undertake the assessments.

### **Other Options for Action:**

To not approve these minor amendments to the draft methodology and site assessment form.

### **Report:**

1. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is an essential piece of evidence that will help determine the amount of land that is potentially available for housing purposes. The LDF Cabinet Committee received reports in March and May 2010, which made recommendations about the approach that should be taken. The report considered in May 2010 included the draft methodology and site appraisal form that would be published for a period of consultation, and would also form the basis of an invitation to tender for suitable organisations to complete this study.

2. Due to the loss of key staff members from the Forward Planning team, this work has not been progressed as quickly as had been anticipated. In further reviewing the draft methodology and site appraisal form it became clear that some minor amendments were

needed. These changes will bring the methodology up to date in light of changing government policy, and to amend the appraisal form to make the assessment process clearer.

3. Firstly, the methodology (Appendix 1) has been updated to reflect the changing position in relation to government policy. The coalition government has made it clear that the requirement for a full and robust evidence base remains, however it is also clear that the Regional Spatial Strategies which have previously provided housing targets for all local authority areas are to be revoked. The Localism Bill contains the legislation required to revoke all Regional Spatial Strategies, and it is currently anticipated that this will be enacted by early 2012. In the meantime, this piece of evidence base work can be commenced, although clearly care will need to be taken to ensure that the changing policy background is monitored.

4. Secondly, in respect of the site appraisal form (Appendix 2), amendments have been made to make the ordering of the criteria more logical, and to make some of the criteria either clearer or more specific.

5. The changes that have been made are:

(a) Stage A – this has been re-ordered to show firstly the issues which could cause a site to be immediately discounted with no further investigation, followed by those which would be discounted for policy reasons.

(b) Stage B – almost throughout this section, the wording of the criteria have been amended to make clear the difference between the “amber” and “red” criteria. Further, the criterion relating to Conservation Areas has been moved from Stage C to Stage B as this relates to local policy.

(c) Stage C - clarification is provided for the travel times relating to the distances from amenities. These distances are determined using a combination of national policy and guidance, and previous good practice for appropriate travel times. Further, some of these distances have been amended to take into account the likely frequency of these amenities, and how reasonable it is to expect people to travel to reach them. For example, the same distance criteria had been used for both primary and secondary schools, even though student intake numbers and travel distances are greater for secondary schools than primary schools. It is more appropriate, that for facilities that do not occur so frequently, the distance to them is greater.

6. Subject to these amendments being agreed by the Local Development Framework Cabinet Committee, the Forward Planning team will now commence a tender exercise to appoint suitable consultants to complete this study, and make the draft methodology available for comment in accordance with the previously agreed consultation exercise.

**Resource Implications:**

From LDF Budget – estimated cost £30,000 as set out in report LDF-008-2009/10 (11/03/2010).

**Legal and Governance Implications:**

No relevant implications.

**Safer, Cleaner and Greener Implications:**

No relevant implications.

**Consultation Undertaken:**

None.

**Background Papers:**

Planning Policy Statement 3: *Housing* (as amended January 2010); and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Practice Guidance (July 2007).

**Impact Assessments:**

Risk Management

Risk of the Core Planning Strategy not being found “sound” by the Inspector following public examination due to procedures for carrying out the SHLAA not being correctly followed.

Equality and Diversity

*Did the initial assessment of the proposals contained in this report for relevance to the Council’s general equality duties, reveal any potentially adverse equality implications?* No

*Where equality implications were identified through the initial assessment process, has a formal Equality Impact Assessment been undertaken?* No

*What equality implications were identified through the Equality Impact Assessment process?*  
N/A.

*How have the equality implications identified through the Equality Impact Assessment been addressed in this report in order to avoid discrimination against any particular group?*  
N/A.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Epping Forest District Council**  
**Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment**  
**Draft Methodology for Consultation**  
**April 2011**

**Introduction**

1. This document proposes the method to be used for carrying out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The SHLAA is an important part of the evidence base to support the delivery of sufficient land for housing to meet the local need for more homes.
2. The methodology has been prepared in accordance with Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments, Practice Guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (July 2007).

**Local Planning Context**

3. Local planning authorities in England and Wales are required to produce a Local Development Framework (LDF) containing policies to guide development within their area. Epping Forest District Council is in the process of producing an LDF to replace the existing Local Plan and Alterations.
4. The key document in the LDF is the Core Strategy which will make decisions about the locations for new housing, employment, infrastructure and community facilities within Epping Forest District. The SHLAA will provide information on potential housing sites within the district to assist the decisions that will be made in the Core Strategy. It is important to note that the SHLAA will only provide background information on potential housing sites. The SHLAA is not a policy document.
5. The Government has publicised its intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies, including the review of the East of England Plan (EEP) which was intended to look forward to 2031, and all their associated housing and employment land targets. Abolition is now expected in early 2012 when the Localism and Decentralisation Bill is enacted. The Core Strategy will therefore need to set new, locally derived, housing targets for the district for the period up to 2031.
6. The Bill also contains a provision concerning a “duty to co-operate” with adjoining authorities, and it is anticipated that this will be strengthened which means that continued co-ordinated working, particularly with Harlow, will be expected. Urban extensions of the town, but within this district, will therefore remain an option while the new housing targets are being established. The main difference will be that those housing numbers would now count towards this Council’s figures rather than Harlow’s, as was the case under the EEP.

## ***National Planning Policy***

7. The national approach to planning for housing is contained in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) which seeks to provide a ready supply of land for housing to meet future demand and needs. To ensure there is sufficient land available at the local level PPS3 requires planning authorities to carry out an assessment of land supply for housing in their area known as the SHLAA.. The Assessment should identify:
  - specific deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development – this information is to be kept up to date and topped up as sites are developed;
  - specific developable sites for years 6-10, and ideally years 11-15, in plans to enable the five year supply to be topped up<sup>1</sup>.
8. For years 11-15 broad locations for growth can be indicated where it is not possible to identify specific sites. An allowance for windfall sites<sup>2</sup> should not be made for the first 10 years of the plan. However, where local circumstances make it difficult to identify specific sites, a windfall allowance may be justified.

## ***Purpose of the SHLAA***

9. The role of the SHLAA is to identify sites with potential for housing in appropriate locations; assess their potential; and assess when they are likely to be developed.

## ***Overall aim of the SHLAA***

10. According to the Practice Guidance the SHLAA should aim to achieve the following outcomes:
  - i. A list of sites, cross referenced to maps showing locations and boundaries of specific sites (or broad locations where applicable);
  - ii. An assessment of each site's deliverability/developability and a realistic timescale for when the site is expected to be developed i.e. during the period 0-5 years, 6-10 years or 11-15 years;
  - iii. An estimate of the potential number of houses that could be developed on the site;
  - iv. Provide details of any constraints on the site;
  - v. Recommendations on how these constraints could be overcome and when.

## ***Partnership Approach***

11. Where possible the SHLAA should be carried out at the level of the Housing Market Area which usually extends across the boundary of neighbouring local authorities. A number of Housing Market Areas have been identified in the sub-region, and Epping Forest District actually falls within 5 separate areas, so it is not possible to adopt this approach.

---

1 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments, Practice Guidance – Department for Communities and Local Government (July 2007)

2 Windfall – a housing site that was not allocated by local planning policy and becomes available for development at a later date

12. A joint Housing Market Assessment has been carried out for the local authorities in the sub-region known as the M11/London Commuter Belt East. This area comprises the districts of Uttlesford, Epping Forest, Harlow, Brentwood, East Hertfordshire and Broxbourne. Given the different stages of preparation of their individual Core Strategies, it was decided that it was not practical to prepare the SHLAA in partnership with these neighbouring authorities, so this SHLAA is to be prepared for the area of Epping Forest District only. This approach is acceptable under the Practice Guidance. The other authorities in the Housing Market Assessment Area will be consulted on the Epping Forest SHLAA, in particular East Hertfordshire and Harlow.

### ***Key Local Stakeholders***

13. The work of producing the SHLAA will include the input of key local stakeholders such as house builders, social landlords, planning agents, town/parish councils and any other agencies that have a recognised interest in the district. These key local stakeholders ('the SHLAA Partnership') will be consulted on this methodology and their views will help to shape the way in which the SHLAA is carried out. In addition, the views of key local stakeholders will be sought in assessing the deliverability and developability of potential sites.

### ***Stages in the Methodology***

14. These stages are set out below and follow the approach given in the Practice Guidance.
  - 1) Planning the Assessment
  - 2) Determining which sources of sites will be included in the Assessment
  - 3) Desktop review of existing information
  - 4) Assessing which sites and areas will be surveyed
  - 5) Carrying out the survey
  - 6) Estimating the housing potential of each site
  - 7) Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed
    - i. Assessing suitability for housing
    - ii. Assessing availability for housing
    - iii. Assessing achievability for housing
    - iv. Overcoming constraints
  - 8) Review of the Assessment
  - 9) Identifying and assessing the housing potential of broad locations (where necessary)
  - 10) Determining the housing potential of windfall (where justified)
15. The Forward Planning team at Epping Forest District Council will manage the production of the SHLAA via the appointed consultants. The team has extensive knowledge of local policies and the development of housing sites within the District which will be relayed to the appointed consultants. At different stages other officers of the Council will be needed to provide specific assistance (see Stages 6 and 7). Consultation with key local stakeholders will ensure that the assessment is properly conducted to the expected level of detail and in accordance with the Practice Guidance.

**Stage 2: Determining which sources of sites will be included in the Assessment**

16. Table 1 below lists the sources of potential sites that will be considered in the assessment. If any other sources of potential sites become apparent during the Assessment these will also be investigated.

Table 1

<b>Sites in the planning process</b>	
<b>Source of potential sites</b>	<b>Source of information</b>
Unimplemented planning permissions for housing	In-house database
Planning permissions for housing under construction	In-house database
Housing allocations	Local Plan and Alterations
All other land allocations	Local Plan and Alterations
<b>Sites not currently in the planning process</b>	
Vacant and derelict land and buildings	National Land Use Database Urban Housing Capacity Study 2002 Empty Property register Valuation office database LPA vacant property registers (industrial and commercial) Commercial property databases English House Condition Survey
Surplus public sector land	Essex County Council Land Terrier Primary Care Trust(s) Environment Agency British Waterways Contact Utility companies for Land holdings EFDC Land Terrier via Asset Management Group Register of Surplus Public Sector Land
Land in non-residential use which may be suitable for redevelopment for housing	Urban Housing Capacity study 2002 National Land Use Database Call for Sites Site visits Desktop survey
Additional housing opportunities in established residential areas	Urban Housing Capacity Study 2002 Desktop survey using Aerial Photographs Site visits
Large scale redevelopment and redesign of existing residential areas	Call for Sites Development and Design Brief St John's, Epping Broadway Options Development Brief, Debden Broadway Site visits
Sites in rural settlements and rural exception sites	Local Plan representations that were not allocated. Call for Sites

	Parish Council information Site visits
Urban extensions	Call for Sites
New free standing settlements	Call for Sites

17. Wherever possible the initial assessment will not exclude consideration of any type of land. The exceptions will be those sites that have particular designations and are protected from harmful development, for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest.

**Stage 3: Desktop review of existing information**

18. The sources of information for potential sites have been listed in Table 1 above. A Call for Sites exercise was commenced in 2008 to enable landowners, developers and members of the public to put forward potential development sites. Due to the delay in producing the Core Strategy, sites being put forward under the Call for Sites process are still currently being accepted.
19. Apart from setting out the sources of information, another key aspect is deciding the size of sites that will be included in the assessment. It is possible to look at all sites that have potential for at least one dwelling. However the total housing yield from that exercise would be unlikely to justify the amount of extra work involved. Analysis of the information for the 5 year housing land supply for the District shows that while there are a considerable number of small sites they contribute a relatively small number of dwellings to the overall housing supply. A 5 year housing land supply can still be achieved even when those sites with five or less dwellings are removed from the figures.
20. It is proposed that thresholds of 6 dwellings minimum per site, or a minimum site area of 0.2 hectares are set. This area allows for 6 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare.
21. As part of the desktop review each site will be assessed against a Site Appraisal Sheet (see Appendix to this report). This asks a series of standard questions that draw out further information about each site and its potential suitability for housing development.
22. All the sites identified by the desktop review will be listed and mapped at the scale of 1:1250.

**Stage 4: Assessing which sites and areas will be surveyed**

23. All the sites identified by the desktop review will be visited. In addition to considering all identified sites attention will be paid to the following:
- Current development hotspots that are the focus of recent planning permissions which give an indication of current market demand;
  - Town and district centres and an area within 10 minutes walking time of these centres (up to 800 metres is approximately a 10 minute walk time);
  - Principal public transport corridors and their walking catchment areas.

24. The survey of potential sites will follow a sequence with the most sustainable sites considered first. In this context the sequence will be:
- urban brownfield sites in the main towns located close to existing public transport routes;
  - brownfield sites in the main towns;
  - brownfield sites surrounding the main towns;
  - greenfield sites around the main towns;
  - brownfield sites in smaller settlements;
  - sites on the edge of smaller settlements;
  - brownfield sites located away from existing settlements; and finally
  - greenfield sites located away from settlements.
25. The above sequence is based on the guidance in PPS3 to give preference to brownfield sites in urban areas particularly where located close to existing public transport links and infrastructure, eg a town or district centre. Any site in the above sequence that is located close to existing public transport links will be considered more sustainable and preferred over a similarly located site that is not as close to such links.

***Stage 5: Carrying out the survey***

26. A standard site visit sheet will be used by all those carrying out the survey, to ensure a consistent approach.

***Stage 6: Estimating the housing potential of each site***

27. The housing potential for each surveyed site will be guided by the dwelling densities that are appropriate to that particular area of the District. It may be worthwhile in some cases to consider a number of different densities, which will give a range of different housing figures, but all details and assumptions should be appropriately recorded.
28. Where an estimation of potential has already been made this will be used e.g. unimplemented planning permissions, pre-application discussions, development briefs.
29. For other sites the estimate will take into account the context of the location and existing dwelling densities. This will be combined with using examples of recent schemes in other similar areas to determine an appropriate density.

***Stage 7: Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed***

30. In deciding when and whether development is likely to occur consideration must be given to the suitability, availability and achievability of the site. Any constraints and whether they can be overcome should also be considered.
- Suitability – a site would be considered suitable for housing development if it offers an appropriate location for development and would contribute to the creation of sustainable mixed communities. Factors to be considered include (a) planning policy restrictions; (b) physical problems or limitations such as access, flood risk or contamination; (c) potential impacts such as effect on

landscape features or natural habitats; and (f) environmental conditions that would be experienced by prospective residents;

- Availability – this depends on (1) there being no restrictions in terms of legal ownership, (2) an owner prepared to sell for development or (3) a developer expressing interest to develop the site. Planning permission does not necessarily indicate availability if, for example, a landowner is not willing to sell the site. Assessment will be made on the best available information on the ownership and legal status of a site;
- Achievability – where the economic conditions allow for development at a particular time the site can be considered achievable. Essentially the cost of development needs to be balanced against the eventual value of the dwellings when sold. To gauge whether a site is economically viable for development, views will be sought from Council officers, housebuilders and developers/agents to gain an understanding of viability. Their comments on the selected sites can then be used to check whether conclusions drawn on the economic viability of the remaining sites are correct;
- Overcoming constraints – Any constraints and the actions needed to overcome them will be considered. For example a new road access may be needed to make development possible.

31. A conclusion can then be reached about whether, according to the Practice Guidance, the site is deliverable or developable.

- Deliverable – this is where (1) a site is available immediately, (2) it offers an appropriate location for housing development and (3) there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years from the date of adoption of the plan.
- Developable – this means that a site should be in an appropriate location for housing development, and there should be a reasonable prospect that it will be available for, and could be developed at, a specific point in time.

32. It is important to note, however, that the identification of a site in the SHLAA does not mean it will ultimately be found to be a suitable development site. Allocation of sites for housing purposes will be via the Local Development Framework.

### ***Stage 8: Review of the Assessment***

33. Once stages 6 and 7 are completed a list of sites will have been generated where the housing potential of each site has been assessed and a judgement made on when the site could come forward for development. A map showing the boundary of each site will also be produced.

34. The information collected will be used in updating the five year land supply of deliverable housing sites and will also be used to produce a housing trajectory showing when potential housing sites are likely to come forward up to 2031.

35. The collated information will be set out in a spreadsheet showing the likely delivery of the identified sites with housing potential over the periods 0 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years and 11-15 years as required. The 15 year period covered by the SHLAA would start in 2014 when it is intended the Core Strategy will be adopted.

***Stage 9: Identifying and assessing the housing potential of broad locations (where necessary)***

36. If insufficient sites have been found the next step would be to identify broad locations for housing development. These would give some indication to the local community about where future development will be directed and provide some certainty to developers about where development will be encouraged. If it is necessary to find broad locations for housing development regard will be had to the nature and scale of opportunities in the area identified and market conditions.

***Stage 10: Determining the housing potential of windfall (where justified)***

37. PPS3 makes it clear that, where possible, the supply of land for housing should be based on specific sites or, where necessary, broad locations as these provide a more positive approach with greater certainty over the future direction of housing growth. The intention is therefore not to make an allowance for windfall sites as part of the housing supply. This position will be kept under review as the SHLAA progresses.



## **Appendix 1**

### **Key Stakeholders for Consultation**

#### **Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Neighbouring Councils**

Borough of Broxbourne  
Brentwood Borough Council  
East Hertfordshire District Council  
Harlow Council  
Uttlesford District Council

#### **Other Neighbouring Authorities**

Chelmsford Borough Council  
Enfield Council  
Havering London Borough  
Redbridge Council  
Waltham Forest Council

#### **Housing Associations**

East Thames Housing Group (Dan Read, 0208 522 2000 email: dan.read@eastthames.co.uk)  
Hastoe Housing Association (Ulrike Maccariello, 01799 522901 email: umaccariello@hastoe.com)  
London and Quadrant Housing Trust (Andrew Clarke, 0208 535 2931 email: aclarke.lqgroup.org.uk)  
Moat Housing Group (Paul Martin, 01621 841180 email: paul.martin@moat.co.uk)  
Warden Housing Association (Home Group) (Jay Rutnam, 01279 621621 email: jay.rutnam@homegroup.org.uk)

#### **Town/Parish Councils**

Abess, Beauchamp and Berners Roding Parish Council  
Buckhurst Hill Parish Council  
Chigwell Parish Council  
Epping Town Council  
Epping Upland Parish Council  
Fyfield Parish Council  
High Ongar Parish Council  
Lambourne Parish Council  
Loughton Town Council  
Matching Parish Council  
Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers Parish Council  
Nazeing Parish Council  
North Weald Bassett Parish Council  
Ongar Town Council  
Roydon Parish Council  
Sheering Parish Council  
Stanford Rivers Parish Council  
Stapleford Abbots Parish Council  
Stapleford Tawney Parish Council  
Theydon Bois Parish Council  
Theydon Garnon Parish Council

Theydon Mount Parish Council  
Waltham Abbey Town Council  
Willingale Parish Council

***Housebuilders or Planning Agents***

Andrew Newman  
BB Partnership  
Bellway Homes Essex  
Bidwells  
BRD Tech  
Clear Designs  
Colin Southgate  
Crest Nicholson (Eastern) Ltd  
Darren Hunt  
David Sadler  
Hill Partnerships  
Higgins Homes Plc  
JB Planning  
JCN Design Ltd  
JSP Partnerships  
JTS Partnership  
Ken Fox  
Ken Judge  
Martyn Pattie  
Redrow Homes Eastern Ltd  
Sworders Agricultural  
White & Mileson

***Other Agencies/Bodies***

Corporation of London  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Essex County Council  
Lee Valley Regional Park Authority  
Natural England

SHLAA Site Appraisal

Site Name/Address	Ownership

Method

The Appraisal sheet uses a traffic light scoring system to calculate the potential suitability of a site for housing development. A green light is where there is no impact or issue and scores 1. Amber is where there is an impact or issue although this can be mitigated or it is not significant – this scores 2. A red light is where there is a significant issue and scores 3. After all questions have been answered the score for the site is totalled to allow comparison with other sites in terms of potential suitability for housing – the lower the total the more suitable the site should be. The figures should not be interpreted or otherwise used as a definite identification of development sites – any such decisions will have to be subject to full community engagement and consultation. The totals will, however, be used as evidence to inform future stages in the preparation of the Local Development Framework.

Stage A (Strategic Constraints) is a filter for the minimum requirements for a site to be suitable. Sites will be discounted if there is a red light for questions 1) or 2) or 3). They will also be separately discounted if there is a red light for both 4) and 5).

All remaining sites will be tested against Stages B and C (Local and Other Constraints). For Stage B one or more red lights means the site is unlikely to be suitable although it will not be discounted at this stage and further investigation will be required.

For questions where it is a subjective judgement as to whether it is a green, amber or red light the decision will be made on the best available information.

**Stage A – Strategic Constraints**

1) Is the site within Flood Risk Zone 3b (Functional Floodplain)?

(Green - G) No – Zone 1, little or no risk

(Amber – A) No – Zone 2, low to medium risk

(Amber – A) No – Zone 3a, high risk - exception test required (Table D3 of PPS25)

(Red – R) Yes – site is discounted

2) Is the site within or does it impact a European Site of Nature Conservation (Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar site), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), National Nature Reserve (NNR), or Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA)?

(G) No

(A) Yes – adverse impact/impacts that can be mitigated against

(R) Yes – within or significantly impacts - site will be discounted

3) Would development of the site affect Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments or Historic Parks & Gardens?

(G) Opportunity to enhance/no significant adverse impact

(A) Significant adverse impact that can be mitigated

(R) Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated – site will be discounted

4) Is the site in the Green Belt?

(G) No

(R) Yes

5) Is it a Greenfield or Brownfield<sup>#</sup> site and is it within or adjoining an existing settlement?

(G) Brownfield site within an existing settlement boundary\*

(A) Brownfield site adjoining an existing settlement boundary\*

(A) Brownfield site not within or adjoining an existing settlement boundary\*

(A) Greenfield site within or adjoining an existing settlement boundary\*

(R) Greenfield site not within or adjoining an existing settlement boundary\*

<sup>#</sup> Brownfield or previously developed land as defined in Annex B of PPS3 Housing

\* This refers to those settlements shown on the Local Plan Proposals Map as being outside the area of Green Belt policy and which therefore have a settlement boundary.

### Stage B – Local Constraints

6) How would development of the site impact on the character of the landscape?

(G) Opportunity to enhance/no adverse impact

(A) Adverse impact/impact that can be mitigated

(R) Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated against

7) Is the site a Local Nature Reserve or Local Wildlife Site, or does it contain any Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Species or Habitats?

(G) Opportunity to enhance/no adverse impact

(A) Adverse impact/impact that can be mitigated

(R) Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated against

8) Are there any trees on the site protected by tree preservation orders (TPOs)?

(G) No

(A) Yes – adverse impact/impact that can be mitigated

(R) Yes – significant impact on the protected trees that cannot be mitigated against

9) Is there any relevant planning history (planning applications/decisions/appeals and/or consideration at Local Plan Inquiries)?

(G) No

(G) Yes – relevant but does not preclude development

(A) Yes – relevant issues raised that can be mitigated against

(R) Yes – relevant issues raised that cannot be mitigated against

10) Is the site allocated/being considered for development in the Minerals and Waste Plan/LDF?

(G) No

(A) Yes – proposed

(R) Yes – allocated

11) Is the site (or part of it) within the boundary of the Lee Valley Regional Park (LVRP)?

(G) No

(A) Yes – impact on the LVRP is minimal

(R) Yes – impact on the LVRP is significant

12) Is the site within (a) 30m of an underground electricity transmission cable; (b) 100m of an electricity transmission overhead line; or (c) 150m of a high pressure gas pipeline?

(G) No

- (A) Yes – distance scores 'Moderate' on relevant National Grid risk table
- (R) Yes – distance scores 'High' on relevant National Grid risk table

13) Is the site within or adjacent to a Conservation Area?

(G) No

(A) Yes it is adjacent to, or not prominent within, a Conservation Area

(R) Yes it is prominent within a Conservation Area

### Stage C – Other Constraints

The distances below are assumed to equate approximately to the following times for walking:

400m – 5 minutes; 800m – 10 minutes; 1200m – 15 minutes; 1600m – 20 minutes; 2400m – 30 minutes; 3200m – 40 minutes

14) Accessibility – distance from the following:

(a)(i) bus stop (with at least hourly service)

(G) Within 400m

(A) More than 400m and less than 800m

(R) More than 800m

(a)(ii) Central Line station (recognising that this serves only 5 settlements in the district)

(G) Within 800m

(A) More than 800m and less than 1600m

(R) More than 1600m

(a)(iii) Railway station (recognising there is only one (Roydon) in the district, so take into account those close to the district boundary ie Waltham Cross, Cheshunt, Broxbourne, Harlow, Harlow Mills and Sawbridgeworth)

(G) Within 1600m

(A) More than 1600m and less than 3200m

(R) More than 3200m

(b) local employment provision (ie employment sites and principal, smaller or district centres as defined on the Local Plan and Alterations Proposals Maps)

(G) Within 1600m

(A) More than 1600m and less than 2400m

(R) More than 2400m

(c) nearest primary school

(G) Within 800m

(A) More than 800m and less than 1200m

(R) More than 1200m

(d) existing (village) shop/post office

(G) Within 800m

(A) More than 800m and less than 1200m

(R) More than 1200m

(e) GP surgery/health centre

(G) Within 800m

(A) More than 800m and less than 1200m

(R) More than 1200m

(f) nearest secondary school (recognising that only Buckhurst Hill, Chigwell, Epping, Loughton and Waltham Abbey have secondary schools)

- (G) Within 1600m
- (A) More than 1600m and less than 2400m
- (R) More than 2400m

(g) nearest principal/smaller/district centre as defined in the Local Plan Alterations

- (G) Within 800m
- (A) More than 800m and less than 1600m
- (R) More than 1600m

(h) nearest local centre as defined in the Local Plan Alterations

- (G) Within 400m
- (A) More than 400m and less than 800m
- (R) More than 800m

15) Is there potential contamination on site?

- (G) Opportunity to enhance/no adverse impact
- (A) Adverse impact/impact that can be mitigated
- (R) Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated against

16) Are there potential noise problems with the site?

- (G) No
- (A) Adverse impact/impact that can be mitigated
- (R) Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated against

17) Could the topography constrain development of the site?

- (G) No
- (A) Adverse impact/impact that can be mitigated
- (R) Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated against

18) Would development of the site be likely to affect, or be affected by, an Air Quality Management Area?

- (G) No
- (A) Adverse impact/impact that can be mitigated
- (R) Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated against

19) Are there issues with car parking in the area?

- (G) No significant issues
- (A) Significant issues that can be mitigated against
- (R) Significant issues

20) Is there sufficient access to the site?

- (G) Yes - access is suitable
- (A) No - however access issues can be overcome
- (R) No - significant issues with access

21) Is the site used to access nearby properties/businesses/roads or pathways?

- (G) No - not used for access
- (A) Yes - however there are alternative means of access
- (A) Yes - however alternative access can be provided
- (R) Yes - providing alternative access may preclude against development

22) Do any nearby buildings overlook or front onto the site?

- (G) No
- (A) Yes although site could be designed to overcome this problem without reducing housing capacity

(R) Yes to overcome this problem housing capacity on the site would need to be reduced

23) Is the site part of a larger site or could it prejudice the development of any strategic sites?

(G) No

(A) Yes it is part of a larger site although this would not prejudice the development of strategic sites

(R) Yes it is part of a larger site and would prejudice the development of strategic sites

24) Would development of the site affect any locally listed buildings (e.g. Buildings of Local Interest)?

(G) No

(A) Yes - not adversely

(A) Yes - impact could be mitigated against

(R) Yes – significant impact

25) Would development of the site affect a Protected Lane (as defined by the Local Plan Proposals Map)?

(G) No

(A) Yes – impact could be mitigated

(R) Yes – significant impact

26) Would development of the site affect any archaeological remains and their settings?

(G) No

(A) Yes – not adversely

(A) Yes – impact can be mitigated against

(R) Yes – significant impact

27) Does the shape of the site impact upon its potential for development?

(G) No

(A) Yes – not adversely

(A) Yes – impact can be mitigated against

(R) Yes – significant impact

28) Does the site relate well with existing communities?

(G) Yes

(A) No – although the problems can be overcome

(R) No

29) Is the site (or part of it) Common Land?

(G) No

(R) Yes

30) Will development take place on Previously Developed Land?

(G) Yes

(R) No

31) Is the site identified in the Employment Land Review

(G) No

(R) Yes

32) Is the site Urban Open Space as shown on the Local Plan Proposals Map?

(G) No

(A) Yes, but impact or loss can be mitigated

(R) Yes – significant impact on, or loss of, open space