

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[#] 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*

[#] 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