

Site Size:	2.06 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: M	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv -	S: Pub Priv Road/Houses		E: Pub Priv Road			W: Pub Priv Road & House	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: L Priv: L	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: H Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some effects from trees/hedges							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		OK		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area ‘Urban’ extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Tree line/verge/scrub + A12	E: Wood/Scrub + B1002	S: Tree line + A12		W: Tree line + A12
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Not directly adjacent to housing, nearest housing is separated by roads c. 80m to SE (bungalows) and woodland 70m to NE (detached 2-storey)				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established S L		Very young: S L					
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive			
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed			
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access			Permissive general access			PRoW route access		
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access				
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L			Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L		
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium				High			

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	F			G, L

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

Site south of A12 – but separated from main urban area by roads, woodland, etc.

NB: It is also assumed that in order to be developed, Sites 079a and 079b would be developed or agreed to be developed first

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Sites does not directly abut the existing large built up area of Ingatestone and is separate – the A12 is a strong boundary and limit to the N and W
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up areas	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	Small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Development will not cause coalescence. A12 is strong physical barrier to development. No apparent views from other towns. Use of the Site for employment unlikely to lead to any reduction in separation in gap due to surrounding treebelts and the strong A12 barrier, albeit larger buildings will be more noticeable when passing along the A12 (and from the local flyover) as well as filtered winter views from open countryside to the north where intervening tree cover is sparse.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHA)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	In absolute terms the Site is separated from the current limit of Ingatstone and does not abut any large built up areas. The Site is contained by the A12 which is a strong physical barrier. With regards to Employment use. the assessment levels are unchanged from the housing assessment		

Site Size:	20 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	<u>S</u> hort (<250m)	<u>M</u> ed (250m – 1km)	<u>L</u> ong (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: M Priv: L	0	<u>L</u> ow (1 - 10)	<u>M</u> ed (10-20)	<u>H</u> igh (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Medium			Locality visual amenity:		Medium		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Trees	E: Trees	S: Trees	W: Trees, hedgerow	
Buildings on Site:	Yes. Large sports halls			Approx. Footprint:	8%
Adjacent Buildings:					

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L	Young-established: S L		Very young: S L
Scale:	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined	Quite Enclosed	Partial Enclosure	Quite Open	Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation		Open general access	Permissive general access	PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths		Informal access		No access	
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L		Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L	Equal representative / non-rep: S L		Weakly representative/ degraded: S L
Tranquillity:	Low		Medium		High	

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary		Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	J			E	F

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Major urban/settlement

Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood nearby

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Beyond settlement edge formed by Doddinghurst Road
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Further development would reduce gap between Pilgrim’s Hatch and Shenfield – however A12 is intervening. Potential for visual perception of coalescence depending on scale of development – scope to mitigate with a number of intervening woodland tree belts. It is noted that larger mixed use development could result in additional visual reduction in the gap or perception of separation reduction depending on the location of larger buildings – however, towns would not coalesce.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Overall Site forms a leisure complex of fields, pitches and indoor centres. Level and scale of built development does limit overall countryside function. PROW outside/along northern edge
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PROW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PROW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Large scale recreational/leisure complex – located outside 'natural' settlement limits, with a number of existing large buildings and parking areas (western and southwestern areas of Site), limiting perception of countryside. Gap between Pilgrims Hatch and Shenfield would physically reduce with limited potential for visual coalescence – dependent on scale of development. Larger development situated in eastern half of Site (currently open) would have greater impact than being co-located with existing facilities in the east. A12 is significant intervening barrier. Overall, assessment unchanged from housing assessment.		

Site Size:	23.40 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: M	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Road	S: Pub Priv Footpaths		E: Pub Priv Road Houses			W: Pub Priv Road M-Way	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv: L	W: Pub: H Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little Variation							
Site visual amenity:		Poor		Locality visual amenity:		Variable –generally poor - OK			

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: tree line, bund + A127	E: Bund	S: Drain hedge + wood	W: tree line, embankment + M25	
Buildings on Site:	Portacabins; mobile homes			Approx. Footprint:	<2%
Adjacent Buildings:	none				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L			
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H	E, F	F	L

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K - Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M - Watercourse
F - Pasture	N – Waterbody
G - Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q - Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

Not near to large built up area. Site is degraded – virtually all previous landscape character lost. Used for motorway works. Southern extended boundary area contains agricultural land.

PRoW bounds northern and western Site boundary

ASSESSMENT OF GREENBELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	No relationship to existing large built up area.
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up areas	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	Small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	M25 is strong barrier to W of Site, yet scale of Site if developed would take up significant area of countryside between Upminster Greater London and Great Warley (hamlet) and towards West Horndon. Development would not cause towns to coalesce but may be perceived as encroachment from Greater London in to the Essex countryside east of the M25. It is noted that a large commercial development would be potentially more perceptible/visible from the M25 and from countryside east of the Site, compared to housing. Whilst not significantly reducing the gap between towns physically, commercial development is likely to have a slightly greater visual effect on the perceived openness of the green belt from further afield – particularly from the East and South. Overall, assessment level retained as SRF for employment use.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Existing works and storage area for M25 works – but also southern third of Site comprises agricultural land – with some hardstanding.
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic areas of settlement
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Towns (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Towns (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Towns (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Overall, the Site is not immediately related to any large built up area, falling within countryside east of the M25. Gaps between small hamlets & settlements in Brentwood and Greater London would be reduced by introduction of new development on the Site, but would not cause any towns to coalesce. Development for employment use is not considered to alter assessment compared to housing assessment, however it is noted a large commercial development would be more visually prominent in the area.		

Site Size:	1.4 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	<u>S</u> hort (<250m)	<u>Med</u> (250m – 1km)	<u>Long</u> (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv:	S: Pub: M Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Low. Some trees and hedgerows			Locality visual amenity:		Good – countryside, woodland patches, tree belts		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area ‘Urban’ extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: fence/none	E: Fence/hedgerow	S: Trees	W: Hedgerow (clipped)	
Buildings on Site:	Portacabins; large industrial sheds			Approx. Footprint:	40%
Adjacent Buildings:	Codham Hall to West				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L			
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			o access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractions: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary		Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H			E	H

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Large areas of hardstanding

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Existing developed Site, not related to any settlement
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)		Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)
Comments:	Site does lie directly between two towns but will not cause towns to merge. It is noted that development of the whole site would cause a massing of buildings in the area potentially affecting perception of overall openness and countryside cover marginally. Larger employment based buildings (compared to housing) are likely to be more visually prominent from a number of transport routes and views that could be perceived as separation reduction.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Existing commercially developed Site
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Existing developed Site, not related to an existing large built up area. Towns would not coalesce if Site was developed. Limited or no countryside function. Some further massing at the Site would marginally effect perceived openness with larger buildings employment based buildings being potentially more prominent compared to housing. Overall assessment rating unchanged – albeit Purpose 2 marginally increased.		

Site Size:	2.6 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv			E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Little variation								
Site visual amenity:	Poor but some traditional red brick buildings - historic			Locality visual amenity:	Good – views of countryside				

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: hedgerow	E: trees	S: hedgerow and trees	W: Tree belt	
Buildings on Site:	Industrial sheds			Approx. Footprint:	40%
Adjacent Buildings:	Codham Hall; and traditional cottages – two storey (2 No.)				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L					
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive			
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed			
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access			Permissive general access			PRoW route access		
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access				
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L			Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L		
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium				High			

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H		E	H

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Existing commercially developed Site. Single PRoW on northern boundary

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Existing developed Site, not related to any settlement
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Site does lie directly between two towns but will not cause towns to merge. Additional commercial or employment based buildings are unlikely to affect separation over and above existing situation with a number of large buildings already on Site.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Existing commercially developed Site
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Existing developed Site, not related to an existing large built up area. Towns would not coalesce if Site was developed. Limited or no countryside function. Employment assessment unchanged from Housing assessment.		

Site Size:	5.5 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	E: M	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E Pub Priv			W Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: H Priv:		W: Pub: H Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation. Least visibility in summer when trees in full leaf							
Site visual amenity:		OK – some degradation			Locality visual amenity:		Glimpses of green fields/open countryside		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area ‘Urban’ extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Fence, trees, metal grate	E: Hedgerow, trees, fence	S: Trees		W: Trees
Buildings on Site:	Y – small office and garage (Aerial view only)			Approx. Footprint:	2%
Adjacent Buildings:	Ingatstone Garden Centre				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L			
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H	-		G

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Former works Site – areas of hardstanding and pasture

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Bordered by railway and A12 on two sides. Partly associated with Ingatestone – separate from built up area but contained by infrastructure such that the land is clearly associated with the built up area
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Gap between Ingatestone and Mountnessing would virtually disappear, although settlements could not coalesce due to presence of A12. Larger commercial or employment buildings would be potentially of increased visibility across the A12 – particularly from south facing ribbon development east of Mountnessing, where existing tree belts are patchy/low or offer filtered views. Intervening treebelts are currently considered unsubstantial in terms of preventing visual coalescence. On balance, there would be an increased visual influence from employment use compared to housing development, however overall assessment rating retained at SSR.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment					
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:	
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Former works Site, hardstanding areas and 'depot', with large areas of pasture	
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping		
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of ProW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of ProW and important routes e.g. National Trail		
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:					
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)		

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Would reduce gap between Mountnessing and Ingatestone markedly, but A12 is a significant barrier. Employment use buildings are likely to be more visible from Mountnessing across the A12, however tree belts will mature to further screen views in future. Overall, assessment levels unchanged for Employment assessment; however, visibility of larger buildings is a more pertinent consideration to any development, potentially compared with housing.		

Site Size:	0.8 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S+L	S: S+L	E: M	W: L	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv ----			E: Pub Priv	W: Pub Priv		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv: L	S: Pub: - Priv: -	E: Pub: M Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Little variation								
Site visual amenity:	Very good. Well-designed buildings + landscape				Locality visual amenity:	Good; Historic Pump House (Private); Open Countryside			

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Hedgerow/Trees	E: Timber fence	S: Poplar trees	W: Trees, ditch	
Buildings on Site:	Electricity substation; Attractive office buildings			Approx. Footprint:	25% - 30%
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey historic building; one and two storey				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L				
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive		
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed		
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access			Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access			
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L			Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low			Medium			High				

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H	-	E, F	G

Land Use/Cover

- | | |
|---|---|
| A – Woodland (>5m tall) | I – Parkland/Garden(s) |
| B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall) | J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation |
| C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh | K – Retail |
| D – Heathland / Bogs | L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail) |
| E – Arable Farmland | M – Watercourse |
| F – Pasture | N – Waterbody |
| G – Residential | O – Coastal Environment |
| H – Industrial/Commercial | P – Inland Rock |
| Q – Other: _____ | |

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Reservoir and pumping station

In Special Landscape Area:

Short views where hedgerow/buildings

Long views where gaps in hedgerow

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Existing developed area not associate with any settlement
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	No reduction in countryside gap over existing situation. On balance there a number of large brick buildings at the southern half of the Site that are not generally visible from wider countryside due to surrounding treebelts and hedgerows and do not cause visual coalescence of towns. A massing of the same size buildings and/or larger could cause some visual encroachment in to the countryside but it is unlikely to cause perceived separation reduction based on existing development and scale of Site.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Existing pumping station, reservoir, parking and buildings.
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)	Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)		Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Whilst not associate with any settlement, existing Site is developed and minimal countryside encroachment and no discernible reduction in separation, albeit a massing of employment buildings would be potentially more visible from the wider countryside compared to housing. Overall, assessment result unchanged for employment use.		

Site Size:	4.70 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S+M	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Road (A127)		S: Pub Priv Houses Byway		E: Pub Priv Road (A127)		W: Pub Priv House Road	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: L Priv: L	E: Pub: H Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some effects from boundary vegetation – developing tree cover on NE boundary (Junction of A127 & A128) –hedge on W boundary							
Site visual amenity:		Low/Poor - Brownfield			Locality visual amenity:		Low/OK		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Tree cover, embankment, fence, A127	E: Embankment, fence, trees	S: bund, fence, hedge	W: tree line / hedge/ ditch	
Buildings on Site:	Y – East Horndon Hall (E half Site) and Industrial Units/Sheds			Approx. Footprint:	c. 10% of Site
Adjacent Buildings:	Farmstead to W, Hall Cottages (2 dwellings) to south				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L			
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H, Q	G (East Horndon Hall)	L, F	

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K - Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M - Watercourse
F - Pasture	N – Waterbody
G - Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q - Other: Landfilling?	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Overlooked by Tyrell Chapel & All Saints – which is on a high point immediately N of the A127

Other Comments:

A127 very busy. Land appears to be being used for some sort of waste processing or landfilling – industrial/commercial operations. There are also other small commercial/business operations

Footpath shown going in to Site but goes nowhere – may have been diverted/extinguished

ASSESSMENT OF GREENBELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Site is not related to any existing built up area. Very few residential houses in the locality – development would not be associated to any existing urban area
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up areas	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	Small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	The Site already consists of a large private house and garden – with around two thirds of the Site being of a commercial/business nature. Most of the land appears subject to land spreading/filling works. Due to proximity to the A127 and A128, development is unlikely to be visible from towns to the E and N. Some slight/filtered views from West Horndon. Site does not fall directly between two towns. Compared to housing, commercial development has the potential to be more visually intrusive in the area – however, a large warehouse style building is existing at the Site that is only visible from relatively close proximity. Existing tree belts provide good screening from along the A127. Overall, Employment use at the locality is unlikely to lead to the separation between town being perceived as reduced, however, commercial buildings would be more perceptible in the local area compared to housing.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Some commercial/industrial units are significant on Site with large areas of hardstanding. Residence is private with private gardens. Access is unclear. Land is being restored where previous activities have been undertaken.
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:	NB: Tyrell Chapel & All Saints Church overlooks Site from immediately north of the A127		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Primarily a brownfield Site with limited countryside functions. Site is not currently related to any large built up area. Development would not lead to towns coalescing - overall, the employment assessment results are unchanged from the individual housing assessment.		

Site Size:	2.6 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv	E: Pub Priv	W: Pub Priv				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: - Priv: L	S: Pub: H Priv: -	E: Pub: M Priv: -	W: Pub: H Priv: -	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Least visible in summer when trees in full leaf – predicted to be quite visible in winter								
Site visual amenity:	None				Locality visual amenity:	Good – open, gently rolling countryside			

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Trees; fence	E: Trees/hedgerow	S: Trees	W: Hedgerow, trees	
Buildings on Site:	Warehouse style			Approx. Footprint:	50%
Adjacent Buildings:	None				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L			
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractions: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H	-	E	

Land Use/Cover

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| A – Woodland (>5m tall) | I – Parkland/Garden(s) |
| B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall) | J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation |
| C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh | K – Retail |
| D – Heathland / Bogs | L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail) |
| E – Arable Farmland | M – Watercourse |
| F – Pasture | N – Waterbody |
| G – Residential | O – Coastal Environment |
| H – Industrial/Commercial | P – Inland Rock |
| Q – Other: _____ | |

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

PRoW to East

Currently, buildings have greater visibility in winter views filtered through trees due to bright/pale green colour.

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Existing trading estate – but not associated with any settlement
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)		Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)
Comments:	No impact on separation beyond existing situation. Employment based development considered to comprise similar sized buildings to existing, so whilst there might be an increase in massing/density, there is unlikely to be much visual encroachment beyond existing situation.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Existing trading park – warehouse/buildings
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PROW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PROW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Existing developed area, with business type units, not associated with any settlement. Employment assessment levels unchanged from housing assessment.		

Site Size:	0.6 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv		W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Well screened, even in Winter, by trees.							
Site visual amenity:		Good – trees on boundary			Locality visual amenity:		Good- Poplar trees to N; Dense evergreen to East.		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Fence & trees	E: Fence & evergreen	S: Fence & trees	W: Fence & trees	
Buildings on Site:	Portacabin			Approx. Footprint:	8-10%
Adjacent Buildings:	Warehouse Industrial Type				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L	Very young: S L
Scale:	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined	Quite Enclosed	Partial Enclosure	Quite Open	Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation		Open general access	Permissive general access	PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths		Informal access		No access	
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L	Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L	Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low		Medium		High	

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary		Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H			E	H

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K - Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M - Watercourse
F - Pasture	N – Waterbody
G - Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q - Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Childerditch Industrial Park

PRoW lies to west of Site beyond tree line

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Existing industrial Site – not associated with any settlement
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Given existing surrounding treebelts, location, context of the immediately adjacent industrial estate and lack of views between towns in to the Site, no separation reduction is anticipated over the existing situation even accounting for potentially larger employment/commercial type buildings.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical ‘Countryside’ uses	Childerditch Industrial Park. Existing industrial development Large parking area.
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Existing industrially developed Site, not associated with any settlement. Assessment unchanged from housing assessment.		

Site Size:	1.1 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	<u>S</u> hort (<250m)	<u>M</u> ed (250m – 1km)	<u>L</u> ong (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub <u>Priv</u>	S: Pub <u>Priv</u>	E: Pub <u>Priv</u>	W: Pub <u>Priv</u>				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: H	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv: H	W: Pub: Priv: M	0	<u>L</u> ow (1 - 10)	<u>M</u> ed (10-20)	<u>H</u> igh (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Variable								
Site visual amenity:	Mature conifers and deciduous trees at edges			Locality visual amenity:	Farmland; trees young and mature				

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: None	E: Hedge/none	S: Trees	W: Buildings/none	
Buildings on Site:	Industrial sheds/large and small			Approx. Footprint:	50%
Adjacent Buildings:	Industrial on site to West; residential to east; more sheds small and large to North (industrial).				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L					
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive			
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed			
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access			Permissive general access			PRoW route access		
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access				
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractions: S L			Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L		
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium				High			

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H		E	H

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Childerditch Industrial Park

PRoW goes through a building/has been built on.

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Existing industrial Site – not associated with any settlement
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	No separation reduction over the existing situation – employment based development likely to replicate existing and unlikely to affect perceptions of separation.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Childerditch Industrial Park. Existing industrial development
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Existing industrially developed Site, not associated with any settlement. Assessment unchanged from housing assessment.		

Site Size:	2.3 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv		W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Boundary trees to W, S & N			Locality visual amenity:		Woodland patch, pond, arable countryside, hedgerows		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Hedgerow/trees	E: fence	S: fence/hedgerow trees	W: trees	
Buildings on Site:					Approx. Footprint:
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey warehouse style/industrial				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L					
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive			
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed			
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access			Permissive general access			PRoW route access		
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access				
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractions: S L			Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L		
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium				High			

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary		Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	Q	H (car park)		E	H

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K - Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M - Watercourse
F - Pasture	N – Waterbody
G - Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q - Other: Stockpiles invaded by ruderals – cleared land	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

NW of Childerditch Industrial Park – comprising previously cleared land

PRoW lies on western boundary of Site beyond embankment

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Cleared land part of existing industrial Site – not associated with any settlement
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)		Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)
Comments:	Overall, given that any town based views from the north (from Brentwood) are obscured by mature woodland and that any employment based buildings will be in the context industrial buildings, separation is perceived to be retained. The Site is also not broadly visible from any major transport routes, limiting locations where development may be visible.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Childerditch Industrial Park. Existing industrial development. PRoW on western boundary. Existing embankments are unnatural man-made features
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Cleared land as part of existing industrially developed Site, not associated with any settlement. Overall assessment is unchanged from housing assessment.		

Site Size:	1.27 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: L	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation.							
Site visual amenity:		Good/Moderate: Mature boundary trees/hedgerow			Locality visual amenity:		Good – mature tree belts; woodland pockets; woods; pastures		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Roadside barrier hedgerow	E: Dense trees	S: Buildings; trees; open	W: hedgerow; trees	
Buildings on Site:	None			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey semi-detached residences and detached property. Modern one storey large restaurant (Mizu) and petrol filling station				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L		
Scale:	Intimate	Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined	Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation		Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths			Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L		Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low			Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	F	-	F	K, A

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K - Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M - Watercourse
F - Pasture	N – Waterbody
G - Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q - Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Land at M25 Junction 28 – A12 to north, Brook Street to south

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Separated from western extent of Brentwood
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Overall, whilst the M25 is a substantial barrier – further massing of employment would reduce gaps from Brentwood to eastern London boroughs. Scale of Site means reduction in gap unlikely to be significant, however, it is noted employment use would lead to larger buildings and the perception of encroachment or separation reduction is likely to marginally increased over housing development when passing along the M25 and A12/A1023. However, this is not considered to increase the overall assessment rating .				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)	Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)		Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site not bounded to existing settlement edge, and would constitute a reduction in gap between towns but would not cause coalescence with M25 being strong barrier. It is noted larger buildings would increase perception of encroachment/separation reduction when passing along local roadways but overall Employment assessment results unchanged from housing assessment.		

Site Size:	4.5 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: S	E: S	W: S	<u>Short</u> (<250m)	<u>Med</u> (250m – 1km)	<u>Long</u> (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv		W: Pub Priv		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv: M	E: Pub: H Priv: M	W: Pub: H Priv:	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation.							
Site visual amenity:		Good – green fields/trees, hedgerows		Locality visual amenity:		Good – trees			

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Trees, fence	E: Trees, hedgerow, fence	S: Trees, hedgerow	W: trees	
Buildings on Site:	None			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Semi-detached two storey along A1023 Chelmsford Road to South				

Maturity:	Full maturity S L		Middle-aged S L		Young-established: S L	Very young: S L
Scale:	Intimate	Small		Medium	Large	Expansive
Enclosure:	Very Confined	Quite Enclosed		Partial Enlosure	Quite Open	Exposed
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation		Open general access		Permissive general access	
	Permissive paths			Informal access		No access
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L		Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L	Weakly representative/ degraded: S L
Tranquillity:	Low			Medium		High

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary		Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	E			E	G

Land Use/Cover

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| A – Woodland (>5m tall) | I – Parkland/Garden(s) |
| B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall) | J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation |
| C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh | K – Retail |
| D – Heathland / Bogs | L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail) |
| E – Arable Farmland | M – Watercourse |
| F – Pasture | N – Waterbody |
| G – Residential | O – Coastal Environment |
| H – Industrial/Commercial | P – Inland Rock |
| Q – Other: _____ | |

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Land sandwiched between A1023 and A12 – ribbon development to south (opposite side of A1023)

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Site well contained by roads but not bordered by any settlement – ribbon development to south – disconnected from Shenfield
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Development would mass employment buildings to the NE of Shenfield in conjunction with adjacent ribbon development. However, locality and road network and surrounding tree belts generally preserve separation between adjacent built up areas. However, based on a precautionary approach and when compared to the housing assessment, there is a potential for larger buildings to be visible over interlying tree belts which could enhance perception of separation reduction – particularly with the level of ribbon development existing between Shenfield and Mountnessing.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)	Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)		Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Farmland not contained by any built up area – development would not cause settlements to merge., however Employment use is considered (by virtue of potential intervisibility from the edge of Mountnessing and Shenfield) to marginally increase the assessment level for Purpose 2 compared to the housing assessment. However the overall assessment level of Moderate is unchanged.		

Site Size:	0.8 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation.							
Site visual amenity:		Poor/OK built elements and dense mixed boundary trees			Locality visual amenity:		Good – woodland/wooded hills to NE		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Hedgerow; road barrier crash	E: hedgerow, trees	S: Fence	W: hedgerow; trees	
Buildings on Site:	Sheds; show conservatories; chalet style			Approx. Footprint:	<5%
Adjacent Buildings:	Holiday Inn to East				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L	Middle-aged: S L	Young-established: S L	Very young: S L	
Scale:	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Expansive
Enclosure:	Very Confined	Quite Enclosed	Partial Enclosure	Quite Open	Exposed
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation		Open general access	Permissive general access	PRoW route access
	Permissive paths			Informal access	No access
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L	Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L	Equal representative / non-rep: S L	Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low		Medium		High

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	K		H	F, A

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Brentwood Garden Centre

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Not well related to western extent of Brentwood, separated by hotel and other land
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)		Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)
Comments:	No notable reduction in separation over and above existing situation – M25 very strong barrier west of Brentwood. Small scale site. Employment based development is unlikely to reduce the countryside gap and the large Holiday Inn lies immediately to the east.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Brentwood Garden Centre – but large hardstanding and building supplies area and garden shed sales
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Overall, existing partly developed Site. Massing of employment based development would be marginally more perceived over existing situation but would not lose functional countryside or cause settlements to merge. Overall, assessment results unchanged from previous housing assessment.		

Site Size:	13.6ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Roads	S: Pub Priv Roads/Rail	E: Pub Priv Houses Roads			W: Pub Priv Houses Roads		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv:	E: Pub: M/H Priv: L/M	W: Pub: H Priv: L - M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Effects from hedgerow vegetation on site boundaries and within site							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		OK/Low		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Hedge/treeline/road	E: hedge/road (M25 for Site 100b)	S: tree line + rail line	W: hedge/treeline + ditch (M25 for Site 100a)	
Buildings on Site:	Y –old manor house			Approx. Footprint:	c. 1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Holiday Hotel and garden centre to north of 100a on opposite side of A1023				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L			
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	F	L (powerlines)		

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K - Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M - Watercourse
F - Pasture	N – Waterbody
G - Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q - Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

Lies to the E of the M25 bounded to N by A1023 and S by rail line

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Very large Site adjacent to M25 contained by surrounding infrastructure and not the Brentwood area/limits – the Site is not adjacent to any existing residential / large built up areas.
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up areas	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	Small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	The M25 is a significant barrier between Brentwood and Romford (Greater London area). Development would significantly reduce the countryside gap between Brentwood and Romford. Although the two ‘towns’ could not physically merge due to presence of M25, the perception to users of the M25, A12, A1203 and rail line would be of countryside encroachment with minimal separation between towns if Site were developed. Mixed Use development is likely to comprise a number of larger buildings. This will be perceived as a greater massing of built form in the green belt compared to housing and would be more visually intrusive – however town coalescence would not occur.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Sites forms part of a countryside wedge between Brentwood and Romford either side of the M25. Large scale encroachment of the countryside if wholly developed significantly reducing the gap between towns. Mixed Use Development is noted as being more visually intrusive than housing development due to likely increased scale of building however, the assessment levels are unchanged overall from the housing assessment.		

Site Size:	15.5ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Roads	S: Pub Priv Roads/Rail	E: Pub Priv Houses Roads			W: Pub Priv Houses Roads		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv:	E: Pub: M/H Priv: L/M	W: Pub: H Priv: L - M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Effects from hedgerow vegetation on site boundaries and within site							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		OK/Low		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Hedge/treeline/road	E: hedge/road (M25 for Site 100b)	S: tree line + rail line	W: hedge/treeline + ditch (M25 for Site 100a)	
Buildings on Site:	Y – pylons and farm buildings			Approx. Footprint:	c. 1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Oak Farm to W				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L			
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	F	L (powerlines)		

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

Lies to the W of the M25 bounded to N by A12 and S by rail line

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Very large Site adjacent to M25 contained by surrounding infrastructure and not the Brentwood area/limits – the Site is not adjacent to any existing residential / large built up areas.
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up areas	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	Small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	The M25 is a significant barrier between Brentwood and Romford (Greater London area). Development would significantly reduce the countryside gap between Brentwood and Romford. Although the two ‘towns’ could not physically merge due to presence of M25, the perception to users of the M25, A12, A1203 and rail line would be of countryside encroachment with minimal separation between towns if Site were developed. Mixed Use development is likely to comprise a number of larger buildings. This will be perceived as a greater massing of built form in the green belt compared to housing and would be more visually intrusive – however town coalescence would not occur.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Overhead pylons are detracting features at the Site
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Sites forms part of a countryside wedge between Brentwood and Romford either side of the M25. Large scale encroachment of the countryside if wholly developed significantly reducing the gap between towns. Mixed Use Development is noted as being more visually intrusive than housing development due to likely increased scale of building however, the assessment levels are unchanged overall from the housing assessment.		

Site Size:	10.5 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	<u>Short</u> (<250m)	<u>Med</u> (250m – 1km)	<u>Long</u> (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv	E: Pub Priv	W: Pub Priv -				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv: L	S: Pub: H Priv: M	E: Pub: H Priv:	W: Pub: Priv:	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Little variation								
Site visual amenity:	Good – meandering stream; scattered lone trees			Locality visual amenity:	Good – woods; trees; arable farmland				

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area ‘Urban’ extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: None/ruderals	E: none/trees	S: railway embankment; ruderals; trees	W: Trees/shrubs, brambles, ruderals	
Buildings on Site:	None			Approx. Footprint:	-
Adjacent Buildings:	Industrial estate to south beyond railway line				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged S L		Young-established: S L	Very young: S L
Scale:	Intimate	Small	Medium		Large	Expansive
Enclosure:	Very Confined	Quite Enclosed	Partial Enclosure		Quite Open	Exposed
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation		Open general access		Permissive general access	
	Permissive paths			Informal access		No access
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L		Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low		Medium			High

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	E	N, Q	E	G, H, L

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: ____Trees____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Site lies to north of rail line, separating Site from industrial estate

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Opposite side of rail line from urban area
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)		Negligible or No Separation (NNS)
Comments:	Encroachment in to countryside, reducing gap from Shenstone to Mountnessing/Ingatesstone – albeit countryside gap largely retained. With Employment development there is a potential that larger buildings would be perceived as greater encroachment/separation reduction compared to housing. Also the tops of larger buildings could conceivably be more visible over or through interlying treebelts. Overall assessment remains SRF on balance.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Large scale countryside encroachment, beyond the existing settlement limit of Shenstone as defined by railway line. Employment buildings could conceivably be more visible from surrounding area, but in assessment terms, unlikely to present any further separation reduction over and above housing development.		

Site Size:	5.2 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: L	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv			E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv: L	S: Pub: M Priv:		E: Pub: H Priv:		W: Pub: M Priv: L	0 Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20) High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some variation – least visible in summer – boundary trees along A127 and A128							
Site visual amenity:		Medium			Locality visual amenity:		Good. Landmark traditional Red roofed church; hedgerows, trees, countryside		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: hedgerow/fence	E: hedgerow/fence	S: Hedgerow/fence	W: Hedgerow/fence/trees	
Buildings on Site:	None			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey terrace				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L		Young-established: S L		Very young: S L					
Scale:	Intimate		Small		Medium		Large		Expansive			
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed			
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access			Permissive general access			PROW route access		
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access - PROW adjacent				
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L			Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L		
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium				High			

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	F	B		F

Land Use/Cover

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| A – Woodland (>5m tall) | I – Parkland/Garden(s) |
| B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall) | J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation |
| C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh | K – Retail |
| D – Heathland / Bogs | L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail) |
| E – Arable Farmland | M – Watercourse |
| F – Pasture | N – Waterbody |
| G – Residential | O – Coastal Environment |
| H – Industrial/Commercial | P – Inland Rock |
| Q – Other: _____ | |

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Within Special Landscape Area

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Not bordered by any built up area
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Whilst business uses are immediately adjacent and Site is well related to A127/A128 junction that form significant boundaries (the A128 is slightly above the Site with adjacent tree planting preventing significant visual coalescence of West Horndon and Basildon), a massing of larger employment based buildings in conjunction with wider development has the potential to be perceived or have greater visibility from West Horndon compared to housing development. This potentially increases the perception of separation reduction- compared with the housing assessment.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)	Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)	
Comments:	NB: Tyrell Chapel & All Saints Church overlooks Site from immediately north of the A127		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Uncontained field – development would not lead to settlement coalescence, however employment assessment rating for Purpose 2 has increase from SR to SRF in light of potential increased intervisibility of larger buildings compared to housing. Overall assessment rating remains Moderate.		

Site Size:	235.9 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: L	E: L	W: L	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv		W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Medium tree belts; hedgerows, open farmland			Locality visual amenity:		Wooded, pastures/farmland		

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) or none
Boundary Type:	N: Hedge, fence, trees	E: Fence	S: Hedgerow	W: Hedgerows, fence, trees	
Buildings on Site:	None			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Dunton Hills Farm, Dunton Hall				

Maturity:	Full maturity S L		Middle-aged S L		Young-established: S L	Very young: S L
Scale:	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Expansive	
Enclosure:	Very Confined	Quite Enclosed	Partial Enclosure	Quite Open	Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation		Open general access		Permissive general access	PRoW route access
	Permissive paths			Informal access		No access
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L		Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L	Weakly representative / degraded: S L
Tranquillity:	Low		Medium		High	

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	E, J	A, B	E	J

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)	I – Parkland/Garden(s)
B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)	J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation
C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh	K – Retail
D – Heathland / Bogs	L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)
E – Arable Farmland	M – Watercourse
F – Pasture	N – Waterbody
G – Residential	O – Coastal Environment
H – Industrial/Commercial	P – Inland Rock
Q – Other: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Golf Course covers southern half of Site.

Western half of Site is c. 20m above levels of eastern and southern parts of Site – large topographic variation

Landscape Improvement Area

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	Very large scale Site not bordered by any built up area
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Development of entire Site would significantly reduce countryside gap between West Horndon and Basildon. Site does not extend to Basildon and A128 is significant barrier to West Horndon – physical coalescence would not occur. Perception of significant loss of countryside openness and towns merging. Mixed Use development is likely to contain many larger buildings (potentially employment or commercial based) which will be potentially more visually prominent compared to housing.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	L
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of PRoW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of PRoW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)		Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)	Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)	Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)		Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Expansive agricultural Site if wholly developed significantly reducing the countryside gap between West Horndon and Basildon, as well as presenting large scale development along the A127 leading east from the M25. Overall assessment for Mixed Use development unchanged from housing assessment, however, larger buildings are likely to be more visually prominent.		

Site Size:	5.4 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv			E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: H Priv: -	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation – most visible in winter							
Site visual amenity:		Poor except for boundary trees			Locality visual amenity: Good – farmed countryside + woodland				

Site-settlement relationship (Containment):	Wholly / Largely contained by large built up area	Abuts large built up area 'Urban' extension	Near but clear separation	Limited association to large built up area	Distant association (visual) only or none
Boundary Type:	N: Bund; hedgerow, trees	E: Hedgerow; trees, bund	S: Woodland; bund	W: Fence; trees; bund	
Buildings on Site:	Large warehouse style/office building			Approx. Footprint:	8%
Adjacent Buildings:	Large agricultural barn, small shed; large two storey house				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L		Middle-aged: S L	Young-established: S L		Very young: S L				
Scale:	Intimate		Small	Medium		Large		Expansive		
Enclosure:	Very Confined		Quite Enclosed		Partial Enclosure		Quite Open		Exposed	
Access in site area:	Promoted open recreation			Open general access		Permissive general access			PRoW route access	
	Permissive paths				Informal access			No access		
Landscape Quality:	Highly representative: S L			Mainly representative / minor detractors: S L		Equal representative / non-rep: S L			Weakly representative/ degraded: S L	
Tranquillity:	Low				Medium			High		

Land-Use:	Site - Primary	Site - Secondary	Locality - Primary	Locality - Secondary
	H	B (Trees)	F,E	G

Land Use/Cover

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| A – Woodland (>5m tall) | I – Parkland/Garden(s) |
| B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall) | J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation |
| C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh | K – Retail |
| D – Heathland / Bogs | L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail) |
| E – Arable Farmland | M – Watercourse |
| F – Pasture | N – Waterbody |
| G – Residential | O – Coastal Environment |
| H – Industrial/Commercial | P – Inland Rock |
| Q – Other: _____ | |

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Commercial depot Site

ASSESSMENT OF GREEN BELT PURPOSES

Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas				
Criteria	WC	PC	NC	Comments:
Containment:	Within large built up area	Abuts large built up area	Separate from large built up area	No significant countryside encroachment (industrial site) yet close to an existing town/large built up area
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement Housing separated from large built up area	
Boundary:	Strong/Definite	Weak/Degraded/Unclear	None	
Effects on openness:	Limited/no countryside encroachment	Some countryside encroachment	Large scale countryside encroachment	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Well-Contained (WC)		Partly Contained (PC)	Not Contained (NC)	

Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another					
Criteria	SR	SRF	SSR	NNS	N/A
Interlying physical barriers:	Substantial / strong	Moderate	Unsubstantial, but functional	Absent	small scale, contained Site within town (e.g. infilling)
Views between Towns	None / Very Distant	Some / Distant	Filtered / Obscured / Reasonably Close	Direct / Close	
Coalescence:	None	None / Minor physical narrowing of gap	Physical narrowing of gap & potential visual coalescence	Coalescence	
Residual contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose (should the Site be developed to housing):					
Separation Retained (SR)		Separation Reduced, but Functional (SRF)	Significant Separation Reduction (SSR)	Negligible or No Separation (NNS)	
Comments:	Whilst comprising an existing developed Site, a large massing of new employment based development in this location would potentially cause minor separation reduction between West Horndon and outer London boroughs/Brentwood. Whilst there is an existing large warehouse visible from number of locations, particularly along the A12, this only covers a small proportion of the Site. A massing of large buildings is likely to be of increase visual prominence locally and along major transport routes compared to housing, with the tops of buildings likely to be visible over treebelts. This will increase perception of separation reduction and assessment level has been increased to SRF compared to the housing assessment.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Currently an industrial site
Land-cover:	e.g. Built / Hardscaping	Mixed	Natural / Landscaping	
Access:	No Public Access	Some access (informal, permissive) or low number of ProW	Access Land, public area (park), high number of ProW and important routes e.g. National Trail	
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:				
Limited Countryside Functions (LCF)	Mixed Functions within Countryside (MFC)		Functional Countryside (FC)	

Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns			
Criteria	LRHT	MRHT	SRHT
Historic Town relationship:	No / Limited physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town
Relative contribution of Site to Green Belt Purpose:			
Limited Relationship with Historic Town (LRHT)		Moderate Relationship with Historic Town (MRHT)	Strong Relationship with Historic Town (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Existing commercial Site not bordered by any settlement. Overall, employment based buildings will be of greater visual prominence in the area compared to the housing assessment. As such, Purpose 2 increased rating to SRF –overall assessment rating unchanged at Low-Moderate.		