

Site Size:	1.2 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M/L	E: S	W: S/M	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)	
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv Houses Road			W: Pub Priv Allotments	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: M Priv: M		W: Pub: Priv: M		0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Minor effect from some hedgerows								
Site visual amenity:		Low – brownfield site				Locality visual amenity:		OK – Good to west		

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: Unclear - House	E: Fence/Hedge/treeline + Ongar Rd	S: Hedge		W: Unclear – chainlink/fence, etc. - Allotments
Buildings on Site:	Y – Several workshops, stores, nursery (commercial), mast			Approx. Footprint:	c. 25% of Site
Adjacent Buildings:	Large house to north. Residential area east of Ongar Rd				

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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Majority of residences are post war.

Other Comments:

Ongar Rd very busy lying between Site and main residential areas. Active nursery/commercial interest. Allotments to W. Countryside (fields and woodlands) to south and west of site.

No apparent physical or visual linkage with other settlements.

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	Ongar Rd is a definite separation between main residential area (to East) and the Site. Other housing does lie north of the Site, lining the west of Ongar Rd.
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)	Also bounded to West by allotments	

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. Large woodland barriers in wider landscape to S & W				

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 commercial nursery – transitional area from urban to countryside
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:	Existing brownfield Site along Ongar Rd west of Pilgrim's Hatch. Housing at Pilgrim's Hatch has already gone beyond Ongar Road to the west with development forming an extension to this housing. Development would not result coalescence nor loss of valuable countryside		

Site Size:	3.30 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S/M	S: S	E: S/M	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Footpath		S: Pub Priv Houses		E: Pub Priv		W: Pub Priv Road Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: M	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes – filtered views through boundary vegetation							
Site visual amenity:		OK - Low in parts			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: hedge, treeline	E: fence	S: fence, hedge, gardens	W: A128, cottages	
Buildings on Site:	Y – Hulletts Farm			Approx. Footprint:	c. 1% of Site
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern bungalows to south. Scattered two storey cottages 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			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
	F	B, N		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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

Northern edge of Pilgrims Hatch – split Site with triangular wedge of land adjacent to A128 and most of the Site (L-shaped) north of housing of Orchard Lane.

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	Split Site that is on the northern edge of Pilgrims Hatch and partly contained by A128 to the W. Overall due to size of Site, development would be a large scale countryside encroachment in comparison to adjacent 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:	Development would not lead to the coalescing of towns, nor with any significant developed area to the north (e.g. Kelvedon Hatch, Doddingtonhurst etc). However, development would extend towards Crow Green (a hamlet) c. 500m north of Pilgrims Hatch. Good tree lined hedgerows currently visually separate Crow Green from Pilgrims Hatch, filtering/obscuring views. Some visual connectivity between the settlements may increase if the Site were developed (winter views). Development would also coalesce isolated cottages in to the overall urban area.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	There are adjacent footpaths to 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:	Split site forming a large area of the countryside edge to the north of Pilgrims Hatch. Weak relationship to the built up area, with little containment by other infrastructure overall. Development would not lead to town coalescence but some reduction to nearby hamlet Crow Green and coalescence with nearby isolated cottages		

Site Size:	10.93 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		S: Pub Priv Road Allotments Houses	E: Pub Priv Road Open Space			W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: L Priv: L	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Views affected by boundary vegetation to East							
Site visual amenity:		OK without being exceptional			Locality visual amenity:		Generally 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/shrub lines	E: Tree/shrub lines + fencing / allotments + road	S: Tree/shrub lines	W: Tree/shrub lines + A12	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Detached post-war housing to SW (bungalows) and SE (mixed) – Site abuts rear garden boundaries				

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	M		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.

Majority of residences are post war.

Other Comments:

Adjoins Local Wildlife Site and Allotments

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 is bounded to NW by A12 – a clear boundary to the large built up area. However, Site does extend in to area of countryside – to E & NE, bounded by the A12 and Brentwood – therefore is not considered ‘Infilling’
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement	
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, Site is contained by the A12 and will not lead to coalescence with other towns nor significantly reduce the gap between towns. Development would infill an area of Green Belt between areas of Brentwood. Existing woodland and treelines severely limit intervisibility with settlements outside of Brentwood.				

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 grassland used for grazing with hedgerow and tree lined boundaries and a stream splitting the Site in to 4 fields.
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:	Site is a green wedge of countryside (currently in agriculture) contained by the A12, separating areas of Brentwood. Development of the Site would not lead to coalescence, but would form an 'urban extension'.		

Site Size:	8.2 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 Houses on North side	S: Pub Priv Houses on South side	E: Pub Priv Road			W: Pub Priv Path & Houses		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: H	S: Pub: Priv: M	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv: M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Hedging and trees affecting visibility							
Site visual amenity:		Low generally (unkempt)			Locality visual amenity:		Generally 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: Treeline/hedge + fences	E: Treeline/hedge + fences	S: Treeline/hedge + fences	W: Treeline/hedge + fences	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Range of housing to N, S & W – primarily post war				

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	B	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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Majority of residences are post war.

Other Comments:

Sites sit within 'isthmus' between 2 larger areas of settlement to North and South, but through which A12 runs

Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood have already partly coalesced and form one 'urban' 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	Site is between two large built up areas (Pilgrims Hatch & Brentwood) bounded to N, S & W by housing and gardens. Bounded by Doddinghurst Rd and Leisure Centre to E. A12 runs through Site. Almost wholly contained.
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:	A12 is major barrier between Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood, which have already partly coalesced in to a single large built up area via development. Site consists of two green wedges between two settlement areas which will still be separated by the A12 and is otherwise contained on all sides by the existing settlement edge. No coalescence with other towns outside of Brentwood and Pilgrims Hatch				

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 Areas (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	The Site is largely contained on all sides by Brentwood and Pilgrims Hatch, which will still be physically separated by the A12. The Site forms two green wedges of countryside partly separating two residential areas where Brentwood and Pilgrims Hatch have already partly coalesced. Development would constitute infilling.		

Site Size:	0.67 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		S: Pub Priv Houses		E: Pub Priv General Land		W: Pub Priv Road	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Boundary vegetation (Deciduous) present							
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 + road (A12)	E: -	S: Garden boundary fence lines		W: Tree line + grass verge on to road
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Residential housing to south – mix of bungalows and semi-detached housing				

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
	F			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.

Majority of residences are post war.

Other Comments:

Bounded to N by A12, to S by residences. Within existing settlement limits

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	Within existing limit of the large built up area, bounded by A12 and housing
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:	N/A - Small scale infilling within existing physical boundaries of settlement. Will not cause coalescence with the A12 restricting development northwards. Development would not extend beyond existing edge of the town				

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:	Development of Site would not lead to coalescence and would be infilling within the existing limits of Brentwood		

Site Size:	19.58 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 Filtered/ OC		S: Pub Priv Playing field/ School			E: Pub Priv -		W: Pub Priv Houses
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: H	E: Pub: Priv:		W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Some changes in boundary vegetation							
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 + A12	E: Tree line + ditch	S: Tree line + ditch	W: Residential gardens/fence + lost boundary	
Buildings on Site:	Y – Farm building to SW (Hopfield Animal Sanctuary)			Approx. Footprint:	< 5%
Adjacent Buildings:	Residential housing to west – mix of bungalows and semi-detached housing				

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	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:

Large area of farmland bounded to north by A12 – limited association to existing large built up 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	Site is weakly associated to Brentwood via its western boundary. Bounded to north by A12 but development would encroach beyond existing limit of the town – assuming whole Site was developed.
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:	Site is part of a large green wedge separating northern areas of Brentwood/Pilgrims Hatch from Shenfield. Development would reduce this gap and provide potential visual connectivity and visual coalescence from the NW i.e. Pilgrims Hatch. There are some significant tree lines and woodland blocks that form visual barriers and 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	
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 Areas (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	The Site is part of a larger green wedge separating areas of Brentwood and Shenfield south of the A12. Development would be weakly associated with the existing settlement limits of Brentwood and would encroach in to the countryside, narrowing the gap between Brentwood and Shenfield – assuming the whole Site was developed.		

Site Size:	0.34 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 Houses		S: Pub Priv Road		E: Pub Priv Houses			W: Pub Priv Road & Houses
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Woodland cover – would most likely be lost							
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: Fence	E: Fence	S: Fence + Tree Line	W: Fence + Tree Line	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Housing to north and east (post war) – derelict hospital to NW (being developed to housing) – pub to S on opposite side of road				

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
	A			G	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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Majority of residences are post war.

Other Comments:

Site on edge of Warley bounded to north and east by housing, south by road and west by derelict hospital.

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	
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 with other towns and will not significantly reduce the gap to Great Warley. Large woodland barriers in wider landscape are significant barriers as well as the M25. No coalescence towards Romford.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Wooded area with no current public use
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 Areas (SRHT)
Comments:	No conservation area and adjacent housing is predominantly post-war		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site would form a natural small scale extension to the current Warley area, bounded on all sides by existing boundaries/edges of the large built up area. Site is currently woodland – so typical countryside function		

Site Size:	26.57 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	E: L	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Houses	S: Pub Priv Road & Houses		E: Pub Priv Houses, Paths & Roads		W: Pub Priv		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: M Priv: L	E: Pub: M Priv: L	W: Pub: M Priv: H	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Boundary hedges and interlying trees have a large seasonal effect from west – options available to mitigate							
Site visual amenity:		Quite good		Locality visual amenity:		Quite good			

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/tree line/road /wood		E: hedge/none	S: A128 + hedge	W: hedge
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern housing overlooking Site from 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			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/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:

Conservation Area to SW

Other Comments:

Land abuts existing residential area – some partial separation from Hanging Hill Lane – NW of 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	Site is adjacent to existing residential area to the west, forming a potential urban extension rather than a discreet housing area. Clearly an extension beyond the current settlement limit. Site not bounded to E. Bounded to SW by A128. Large scale site and effects on openness
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 of the Site would encroach towards Ingrave village to the South, reducing the gap from c. 0.9km to c. 0.7km. The main visual barrier is formed by the low lying flat nature of the interlying land and the distance between the two settlements.				

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 of town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of 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:	Limited relationship of Site to historic town but is adjacent, to the east of Conservation Area (and Historic Park & Garden) the opposite side of the A128.		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site forms part of a green wedge of countryside separating Brentwood and Ingrave. The gap would be reduced but would not cause coalescence. Development would potentially form an 'urban' extension southwards from housing areas on the southern edge of Brentwood.		

Site Size:		58.31 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 Houses & footpath				S: Pub Priv Road & Houses				E: Pub Priv Houses, Paths & Roads				W: Pub Priv Houses, Paths & Roads				
	Numbers:		N: Pub: L Priv: L		S: Pub: M Priv: M		E: Pub: L Priv: L		W: Pub: L Priv: H		0		Low (1 - 10)		Med (10-20)		High (21+)		
Seasonal visibility:			Some - hedgerows																
Site visual amenity:			Quite good							Locality visual amenity:			Quite good						

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/tree line/road wood		E: hedge	S: -	W: hedge + A128
Buildings on Site:	Y – Ingrave Hall			Approx. Footprint:	
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
	E/F	A/M		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:

Conservation Area to SW

Other Comments:

It is assumed that 28A would be implemented before 28B is considered – which (together) would result in the coalescence of the southeastern area of Brentwood with Ingrave – i.e. there would be continuous settlement where there is currently countryside.

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	Assumes Site 028a is developed first thus forming an ‘urban’ extension. Not a well contained Site and due to scale of Site would be large scale encroachment in to the countryside. Eastern parts of the Site are very weakly related to the existing town
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 of the whole Site would cause Brentwood and Ingrave to coalesce and remove the interlying countryside				

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 of town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of 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:	Limited relationship of Site to historic town but is adjacent, to the east of Conservation Area (and Historic Park & Garden) the opposite side of the A128.		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	The Site is a large area of countryside, that if wholly developed would mean the coalescing of Brentwood and Ingrave. Would be a large area of 'urban' sprawl. Not well contained and weakly associated with existing Brentwood area.		

Site Size:	349 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: L	E: L	W: S/M/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:	Hedges, deciduous woodland – increased visibility in winter								
Site visual amenity:	Good – few distracting features			Locality visual amenity:	Good – expansive 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: Hedgerows/woodland, footpaths, tracks, ditches	E: Hedgerows/woodland, footpaths, tracks, ditches	S: Hedgerows/woodland, footpaths, tracks, ditches	W: Hedgerows/woodland, footpaths, tracks, ditches	
Buildings on Site:	Y – Farmstead/buildings and farmhouses			Approx. Footprint:	< 1%
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
	E	A/M	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:

Ingrave Church is visible from within Site a certain localities

Other Comments:

Large scale countryside – arable farmland. Forms majority of countryside East and South-east of Brentwood and North-east of Ingrave. See 028b for notes. Assumes 028a and 028b are 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	Assumes Site 028a and 028b is developed first thus forming an 'urban' extension. Not well contained where development of the whole Site would be large scale encroachment in to the countryside. Weakly related to the existing large built up area and sporadic development across site could lead to separate housing 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:	Due to scale of Site, development would take up majority of countryside SE of Hutton (Brentwood) and NE of Ingrave and would coalesce the areas together, as well as other smaller settlements and hamlets in wider countryside (e.g. Havering’s Grove). Development would halve the countryside gap between the Hutton area of Brentwood and Billericay such that views between the two settlements would be available and may cause some visual coalescence between the two from some locations. Significant reduction in the countryside gap between Brentwood and Basildon				

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 of town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of 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:	Limited relationship of Site to historic town but is adjacent on the Sites northern boundary to the Hutton Village Conservation area. There is also some intervisibility with Ingrave Church		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Large scale countryside, which if developed would dramatically increase the size of the existing town as well as significantly reduce the current gap to Billericay and merge the Hutton area of Brentwood with Ingrave and other smaller Hamlets in the area.		

Site Size:	0.4 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 House	S: Pub Priv Footpath			E: Pub Priv Footpath		W: Pub Priv Road and Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Partial – Hedge on boundary will change slightly in winter							
Site visual amenity:		OK-Low			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: hedge/tree line	E: fence	S: hedge/tree line	W: hedge/fence + road	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Semi-detached housing to west overlooking site				

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	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 lies west of Hanging Hill Lane on edge of settlement area.

Road to west is natural physical boundary to settlement – properties to north are v.low density with large gardens – different character than opposite side of road (to west)

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 is opposite side of road from main residential area but covers a similar area as to the two properties to the north. Not significantly separated from Brentwood – close enough to be considered an extension rather than discreet housing development
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:	Small scale site with the existing gap between Brentwood/Hutton area and Ingrave village to the South unchanged. Woodland barriers restrict any views east from the 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	
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 of town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of 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:	Small scale Site, would not cause coalescence if developed or large scale urban sprawl.		

Site Size:	1.75 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 -	S: Pub Priv Houses			E: Pub Priv -			W: Pub Priv Houses
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some effects on screening provided by trees at boundaries							
Site visual amenity:		Low			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: Wooded	E: tree line	S: fence, farm access track		W: housing/fence/gardens
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Large modern detached housing to W, farmhouse to SE				

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
	B	F		F	G, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

Land contains scrub in north with rough grassland (ungrazed) in the south

Restricted access

NB: Land to North is another potential housing allocation (Site 026)

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	Development would be extension to E of existing housing area – beyond existing settlement limit
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 would not lead to coalescence eastwards and SE. Distance to other towns e.g. Billericay and other interlying housing is significant with interlying farmland and tree line barriers. Small scale site in context of surroundings. Development would encroach towards nearby farmstead				

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 is on the edge of the existing Brentwood area. Development would extend beyond existing settlement limits marginally, but would not lead to Coalescence.		

Site Size:	1.82 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 Houses	S: Pub Priv			E: Pub Priv Houses/Businesses			W: Pub Priv Houses
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Screening from woodland, trees and hedges – some seasonal effect							
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: Fences/gardens/hedge	E: Hedge	S: Woodland/fences	W: fence/hedge	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Large modern detached housing to NW, farmhouse to E				

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	N		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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

No access to Site

Site more accessible from north – adjacent to existing residential areas – limited connectivity in south of Site

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 abuts existing residential area to the NW. Otherwise, development would extend beyond existing settlement limit and encroach on countryside – but not on a large scale. Contained to east by existing farmstead
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 would not lead to Coalescence eastwards or southwards. Distance to other towns e.g. Billericay (and Ingrave village to the South) and other interlying housing is significant with interlying farmland, tree lines and woodland barriers. Small scale site in context of surroundings. Development would encroach towards nearby farmstead				

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 Areas (SRHT)
Comments:			

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site is on the SE edge of the existing Brentwood area and weakly connected. Development would extend beyond existing settlement limits, but would not lead to coalescence or large scale countryside encroachment.		

Site Size:		5.88 ha		Views Out (distance):		N: S		S: S		E: S		W: S+L		Short (<250m)		Med (250m – 1km)		Long (>1km)	
Views in:	Viewer Types:		N: Pub Priv Houses/commercial				S: Pub Priv Road/Rail				E: Pub Priv Houses				W: Pub Priv Roads & Golf course				
	Numbers:		N: Pub: Priv: L		S: Pub: L Priv:		E: Pub: Priv: M		W: Pub: L Priv: L		0	Low (1 - 10)		Med (10-20)		High (21+)			
Seasonal visibility:			Yes- South has deciduous woodland, West has deciduous hedges, some interval hedges, less value N + E																
Site visual amenity:			Variable – Poor → 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: Wall, hedge	E: Hedge, fence, gardens	S: Tree line + railway	W: Hedge and road	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Bungalows to west, commercial building (Wickes) to north				

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, 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: _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

Land appears as countryside, linking to adjacent rural areas to the west, and forms physical/visual 'barrier' from west to built up area of Brentwood to the East (partly screening Brentwood).

Site slopes downwards to west – some distant views of Site from Romford – beyond the 25 to the west

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 contained by housing and commercial buildings to west and north respectively and rail line to south. Nags Head Lane to west is a barrier but is beyond the existing edge of Brentwood.
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:	Due to topography, Site is a physical barrier separating views across the M25 from Romford to Brentwood. Some minor encroachment towards the M25 and Greater London beyond but not significant. M25 and rail line are permanent barriers that would not be physically breached				

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 areas of settlement
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:	Site is general well contained to the N, S & W but does encroach on the countryside to the E. Some minor visual connectivity may arise upon development between Romford and Brentwood, with the slope being a westerly facing slope.		

Site Size:	20.80 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S/M	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Road and Houses	S: Pub Priv Road, playing field, houses		E: Pub Priv Rail		W: Pub Priv Road, houses		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv: H	S: Pub: L Priv: L	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: M Priv: M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Strong – high amount of hedge/woodland vegetation							
Site visual amenity:		OK/Poor		Locality visual amenity:		OK/Poor			

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, gardens	E: Woodland, trees, rail line	S: hedge, gardens	W: hedge, gardens, A1023	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	School to SW, ribbon dev (bungalows) to north along 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	A		G, A, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

Infilling between ribbon development to north and Shenfield.

Not immediately adjacent to urban area but area of land between Shenfield, A1023, A12 & rail line

NB: northern part of Site is subject to Article 4 Direction – removing permitted development rights

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	Unusual Site – separate from large built up areas of Shenfield but also contained by A1023, A12 and rail line. Primarily ‘Not Contained’ as the Site is not immediately adjacent to the existing large built up area and scale of Site would be large scale countryside encroachment
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:	Will not cause towns to merge, with the Site contained by the A1023, A12 and rail line. Will infill area of land between Shenfield and ribbon dev to the north, merging it with the overall large built up area. This will reduce the countryside gap to Mountnessing to the N of the A12, but there will be no significant views				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Wood to west is also a local wildlife 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:	NB: northern part of Site is subject to Article 4 Direction – removing permitted development rights		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site is not contained within or adjacent to the existing large built up area of Shenfield – but is contained by nearby infrastructure (main roads and rail). Would not cause towns to merge with only a minor reduction in the gap to Mountnessing. Ribbon dev to north of Shenfield would coalesce with Shenfield if Site was developed.		

Site Size:	15.44 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: S/M	E: M	W: M	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Road, houses & footpath	S: Pub Priv Road			E: Pub Priv Footpath and houses			W: Pub Priv Houses and road
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv: L	S: Pub: H Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv: L	W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes – around parts of site							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		Good		

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 + trees	E: hedges, open	S: hedge, A127	W: Hedge, open, Childerditch Lane	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	-
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
	E/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:

Separated from West Horndon by the A127. Not related to any town or settlement – in countryside

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 West Horndon by A127 – large encroachment in to countryside – even if land west of West Horndon is developed.
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:	Due to scale of Site and development being north of the A127, the gap to other towns would be somewhat reduced (decreasing the gap to Brentwood to around 3km – with interlying woodland) but would not cause towns to coalesce. Gaps to sporadic housing and hamlets would decrease as well. NB: Scale of development may offer views from distance.				

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:	Not a well contained Site, not connected to West Horndon, separated by A127. Development would lead to significant encroachment in to the countryside. Development would be north of the A127 but would not cause towns to coalesce.		

Site Size:	7.9 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 Houses	S: Pub Priv Roads			E: Pub Priv Road			W: Pub Priv Houses & Park
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Slight – Hedgerows							
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: -	E: -	S: hedge + minor road		W: fence, gardens, housing
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Post war semi and detached 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			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/F			E/F	G/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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

Residences abuts Site on western boundary – but extends east some way away from settlement

Golf course to east

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 is bounded to west by housing – development would form extension along Station Road – the further any development falls E within the Site the more remote it becomes. A128 is a physical barrier to the E.
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:	Gap to Basildon physically reduced from around 3.7km to 3.1km if whole Site developed. Minimal visual connectivity – with woodland and industry west of Basildon restricting views west. A128 are physical barriers to further eastward development.				

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:	Some decrease in the gap to Basildon but still functional, with very limited or no visual linkages. Some loss of countryside if developed.		

Site Size:	68.56 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S/M	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Road + access lane to N	S: Pub Priv Houses			E: Pub Priv Houses & road		W: Pub Priv Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv: H	E: Pub: L Priv: L		W: Pub: Priv: H	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Variable – large site with woodland parts and hedgerows, and a variety of viewpoints							
Site visual amenity:		Good			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: Hedge + trees	E: hedges, local minor road and A128		S: gardens + none	W: gardens	
Buildings on Site:	Y – 2 farmsteads, school and private residences (few) in NE			Approx. Footprint:	<1%	
Adjacent Buildings:	Housing to W and SW – primarily semi detached					

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/F	A/G / I / J/M		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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:Large Site – would connect few residences to NE to West
Horndon – A127 is a barrier to north

SW of site is also a park with open access.

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	Bounded to W & SW by housing and N by A127 – large scale countryside encroachment and would only become totally bounded to S if 038a was developed first. A128 is physical barrier to E. Not Contained primarily due to scale of Site in relation to West Horndon.
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:	A127 is strong physical barrier to N, yet wider views are available from sporadic housing, hamlets and settlements to NE of Site at distance – e.g. Herongate. Gap to Basildon physically reduced from around 3.7km to 3.1km if whole Site developed. Minimal visual connectivity – with woodland and industry west of Basildon restricting views west. A128 is a strong physical barrier to E. Development would cause the few houses to the NE of the Site to coalesce in to West Horndon				

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:	Development would not affect an historic town, however Woodside Farm in the northern part of the Site is part of a Conservation Area and Historic Park/Garden. The designation only affects a small proportion of the Site. NB: The Site is also overlooked by Tyrell Chapel and All Saints church N of the A127 adjacent to the junction with the A128		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Development would lead to large countryside encroachment, not leading to coalescence with other towns – but some reduction in the interlying countryside gap. Abuts West Horndon to the W and SW. Site also contains (covering small northern area of the Site) a Conservation Area and Historic Park/Garden but is not related to an historic town.		

Site Size:	3.22 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: S	E: S	W: S/M	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: H	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Seasonal due to woodland/tree cover, which restricts existing residential views northwards								
Site visual amenity:	Medium			Locality visual amenity:	Medium/High – Pond and tree to North/NW				

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/hedge /ditch	E: Hedge/treeline	S: Hedge, fencing, housing/gardens	W: Fence (post & rail) some occasional	
Buildings on Site:	Shop/garages (non-Green Belt area)			Approx. Footprint:	<5%
Adjacent Buildings:	2-storey housing along southern boundary with views north.				

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
	A/B		F, G	E

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)

B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)

C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh

D – Heathland / Bogs

E – Arable Farmland

F – Pasture

G – Residential

H – Industrial/Commercial

I – Parkland/Garden(s)

J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation

K – Retail

L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)

M – Watercourse

N – Waterbody

O – Coastal Environment

P – Inland Rock

Q – Other: _____

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Majority of residences are post war.

Other Comments:

Pasture used for grazing north of Pilgrims Hatch

Woodland/scrub. Some views from footpath to north. Tree cover restricts views north from residential dwellings – which overlook the 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	Only southern boundary abuts residential built up area. With the eastern, northern & western boundary being countryside, overall development relative to Pilgrims Hatch considered 'Not Contained'	
Development type:	'Infilling'	'Urban Extension'	New settlement		
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 would not lead to the coalescing of towns nor with any significant developed area to the north (e.g. Kelvedon Hatch, Doddington etc). However, development would extend 100m towards Crow Green (a hamlet) c. 500m north of Pilgrims Hatch. Good tree lined hedgerows currently visually separate Crow Green from Pilgrims Hatch, filtering/obscuring views. Some visual connectivity between housing may increase if the Site were developed (winter views). Noted that existing tree cover restricts views northwards from Pilgrims Hatch				

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 is a large area of tree and scrub cover forming the countryside to the northern edge of Pilgrims Hatch. Weak relationship to the large built up area, with no containment by other infrastructure (e.g. roads, rail). Development would not lead to town coalescence but some reduction to nearby hamlet Crow Green		

Site Size:	2.81 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: L	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv House Footpath		S: Pub Priv Footpath		E: Pub Priv Footpaths		W: Pub Priv Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: H Priv: M	W: Pub: Priv: L - M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some minor effects from hedgerows and treelines bounding the Site and in the area (particularly on E boundary)							
Site visual amenity:		OK		Locality visual amenity:		OK/Good			

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, footpath, hedge	E: Fence, footpath, hedge	S: Fence, footpath, wood, garden	W: Fence, gardens	
Buildings on Site:	Y – bungalow in SW corner			Approx. Footprint:	c. 1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Detached and semi-detached 2-storey properties of Ingrave (Modern/Traditional). Also Salmonds Hall Farm appears pre-WWII				

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
	F	G		L, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Some visually linkages with tower of Ingrave (St Nicholas' Church. Adjacent to Salmonds Hall Farm

Other Comments:

Bounded to W, NW and SW by post WWII housing area within Ingrave village – open countryside to E.

Long range views towards Billericay

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 is contained to the W, NW and SW by existing housing at Ingrave village. Open countryside to E.
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:	Would not coalesce Ingrave with any other town. Some long range views towards Billericay are available looking E from the 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	Site does also contain a small bungalow and some access tracks associated with Salmonds Hall Farm.
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: Some visual links to St Nicholas' Church tower and adjacent to Salmonds Hall Farm (pre WWII?)		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Pasture (horse grazing) Site on the edge of Ingrave Village, partially contained by existing housing. Development would not significantly reduce the gap to other towns and would not represent large scale countryside encroachment.		

Site Size:	1.87 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: L	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv House Footpath		S: Pub Priv Footpath		E: Pub Priv Footpaths		W: Pub Priv Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: H Priv: M	W: Pub: Priv: L - M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some minor effects from hedgerows and treelines bounding the Site and in the area (particularly on E boundary)							
Site visual amenity:		OK		Locality visual amenity:		OK/Good			

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, footpath, hedge	E: Fence, footpath, hedge	S: Fence, footpath, wood, garden	W: Fence, gardens	
Buildings on Site:	Y – bungalow in SW corner			Approx. Footprint:	c. 1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Detached and semi-detached 2-storey properties of Ingrave (Modern/Traditional). Also Salmonds Hall Farm appears pre-WWII				

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		
			E/F, G	L, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Some visually linkages with tower of Ingrave (St Nicholas' Church. Adjacent to Salmonds Hall Farm

Other Comments:

Bounded to W, NW and SW by post WWII housing area within Ingrave village – open countryside to E.

Long range views towards Billericay

If assumed Site 067A developed first would form one housing 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	Paddock/field area separated from Ingrave by small paddock (Site 067A) – small Site but limited relationship to existing settled area without 067A (if combined with 067A most likely Partly Contained)
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	
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:	Would not coalesce Ingrave with any other town. Some long range views towards Billericay are available looking E from the 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	
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 Size:	1.49ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Road Church		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv Houses		W: Pub Priv House	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L/M Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: M	E: Pub: M Priv:		W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Some minor effect from hedges and trees							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		OK/Good		

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, fence - track	S: -	W: hedge/fence	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Farmstead to W, Church + house to N, modern two storey houses to E				

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/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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Site is south of St Nicholas Church, Kelvedon Hatch

Other Comments:

Some informal access off Church Road through breaks in the tree line – does not extend on to Site.

Site appeared to be being grazed by deer

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 on W edge of Kelvedon Hatch residential area, adjacent to local shops. Site is bounded to N by Church Road and local church and to W by a farmstead.
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:	Small scale site not significantly encroaching in to the countryside such that there will be no significant reduction in the countryside gap between Kelvedon Hatch and nearest major settlements (over 3km away). Development would join the farmstead to the W in to the overall Kelvedon Hatch area.				

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:	Partly contained Site on edge of Kelvedon Hatch built up area. Development would form an urban extension and would not lead to coalescence with other towns or villages.		

Site Size:	0.54ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M/L	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Houses Road	S: Pub Priv Footpath	E: Pub Priv Houses Road	W: Pub Priv Houses				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv: L/M	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: M Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Minor effect from hedgerows and trees along W boundary								
Site visual amenity:	Low			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: Fence, hedge, road	E: Hedge, road	S: -	W: Fence, hedge, gardens	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey modern properties to N & 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 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
	F			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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Modern housing area

Other Comments:

Appears to be informal access leading around edge of Site leading off public footpath.

Some trees along W boundary filter some first floor views from existing properties.

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	Small Site on S edge of Kelvedon Hatch. Housing lies to the W and to the N & NE, opposite Stocks Lane. To S is open countryside offering some medium-long range views
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 would infill a triangular wedge of land between existing housing and would not significantly extend the edge of Kelvedon Hatch southwards. No reduction in countryside gap to other towns or villages.				

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:	Existing countryside on edge of exiting town (Kelvedon Hatch). Development would be small scale and would not cause Coalescence.		

Site Size:	3.93 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S/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: <u>Pub</u> <u>Priv</u> Road Farmhouses		S: Pub <u>Priv</u> Houses		E: <u>Pub</u> Priv Road		W: <u>Pub</u> <u>Priv</u> Road House	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv: M/H	E: Pub: L/M Priv:	W: Pub: L/M Priv: L	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes – filtered views through boundary vegetation							
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: hedge, minor road	E: hedge	S: post/wire fence, fence/gardens	W: fence/gardens in parts	
Buildings on Site:	-			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey modern detached houses to S. Two large farmsteads to north of Redrose Lane				

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	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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

Two sites – G070 (2.24ha) and G070a (1.69ha). Sites are sandwiched between northern edge of Blackmore and Redrose Lane either side of Fingrith Hall Lane

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	Split Site on northern edge of Blackmore. Sites are somewhat contained by Redrose Lane (which would be the absolute northern limit of Blackmore) and farmsteads to north. Some countryside encroachment
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:	No significant encroachment northwards from Blackmore if the Sites were developed with no significant large built up area within 5km, to the N of Blackmore.				

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 lie to the north of the residential areas (post WWII) of Blackmore. Some containment offered by Redrose Lane which would be the absolute northern limit of Blackmore. Development would not lead to any coalescence with other towns/villages. Some countryside encroachment but separation to other urban areas retained.		

Site Size:	1.83 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S+L	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Houses & roads	S: Pub Priv Houses		E: Pub Priv (Distant)			W: Pub Priv roads & playing fields	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv: L	S: Pub: L Priv: L		E: Pub: L Priv: L		W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10) Med (10-20) High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some effect – hedge and trees to west							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		Good		

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, fence, gardens	E: Fence, hedge + B1002	S: tree line + access track		W: Fence, tree line, garden
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern detached / semi detached housing to south – large houses to north. Farmstead to E.				

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	F, J, 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.

Churches and Margaretting Hall c. 9km to NE

Other Comments:

Infilling between ribbon development and Ingatestone.

Sports pitches to W – opposite side to B1002. A12 and rail line close by

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	Land to north of Ingatestone – infills between ribbon development to north of existing residential properties. Bounded to W by B1002. Countryside to NE
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:	Will not cause towns to merge. Would infill between Ingatestone and ribbon dev (several houses) to north. Minor physical narrowing of gap to Margaretting to NE, where visual barriers are primarily related to the distance of views, interlying hedgerows/tree lines etc. No strong settlement limit to north 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	
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:	Development would form an urban extension, with some countryside encroachment. Some minor reduction in gap to Margaretting to NE but not significant due to scale of Site if developed.		

Site Size:	1.39 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 Road	S: Pub Priv Houses (screened)		E: Pub Priv road/houses			W: Pub Priv -	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: L Priv: M	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some effect to south – boundary vegetation							
Site visual amenity:			OK - Low		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: Wood and B1002	E: Fence/hedge + B1002	S: Tree line	W: Tree line + A12	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey detached housing to S – bungalows opposite side of road to E				

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
	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:

Site south of A12 – part of Ingatstone large built up area rather than open countryside to north of A12

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 is well contained by A12 to W, B1002 to N, with residential areas to the S and E
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 of Ingatestone and to development. No apparent views from other settlements.				

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:	Site is well-contained by the A12, where development would primarily constitute infilling on the edge of Ingatestone. Limited countryside encroachment and development would not lead to coalescence. Existing agricultural use so Functional Countryside		

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			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.				

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.		

Site Size:	2.2 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: H Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: H Priv: H	W: Pub: Priv:	0	<u>L</u> ow (1 - 10)	<u>M</u> ed (10-20)	<u>H</u> igh (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Little variation. Least in summer.								
Site visual amenity:	Very good – Attractive mature trees and Victorian water tower			Locality visual amenity:	Very good. Woodland patches, mature 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	E: Hedgerow, trees	S: Trees, fence, shrubs	W: Trees, woods	
Buildings on Site:	Large detached two storey houses; Victorian Water tower			Approx. Footprint:	7%
Adjacent Buildings:	Old Warley gatehouse lodge; Walter Boyce 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
	A	G	G	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:

Although viewer numbers are high, site was well screened by boundary trees so views heavily filtered/restricted.

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	Contained to West by woodland, some of which is Ancient woodland. Local roads do separate Site from immediately surrounding housing i.e. beyond settlement edge. Other redevelopment of local areas also ongoing/ have planning approval
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:	Significant countryside gaps; no risk of merging						

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Scattered large houses and grounds, with amenity grassland and large amounts of mature tree coverage.
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:	Within Brentwood Historic Town extents but no conservation designation NB: <i>The Water Tower (Grade II Listed) lies within the Site and is a significant local feature</i>		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:			

Site Size:	0.5 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: H Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	<u>L</u> ow (1 - 10)	<u>M</u> ed (10-20)	<u>H</u> igh (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Good and little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Moderate			Locality visual amenity:		Good		

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: fence	S: fence	W: fence	
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern 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 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
	F	J/Q		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: Community hall	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

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	Surrounded to W & E by build development, and bounded to N by Blackmore 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:	Although perception at site is close to countryside, southern pastures and trees/woodland, the site is essentially contained by built development				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Permissive access to Community Hall, with land comprising open field/pasture (potentially available for recreation), and formal 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:	Site is well contained within built development despite area of pasture and trees to immediate south.		

Site Size:	1.73 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 Road	S: Pub Priv Houses		E: Pub Priv Road & Houses		W: Pub Priv Playing Field		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: M	E: Pub: L Priv: L	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Minor – hedge on north boundary							
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: hedge, minor road	E: hedge, minor road, gardens	S: tree line, gardens	W: tree line – sports pitches	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	School to W, bungalows to south, 2-storey semi detached houses to SE+E				

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

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:

Adjacent, north of, existing residential area – bounded to W by school and playing fields and N by minor road.

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	Amenity space on edge of existing large built up area – contained by school playing fields and local road
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:	On edge of existing limit of Shenfield with strong physical barriers in wider landscape (road and rail) separating the Site from other distant towns and settlements – to NE.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical ‘Countryside’ uses	Amenity space – currently used by public
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:	Site would form a minor urban extension beyond the current limit of Shenfield, on to land currently used as amenity open space. Development would not lead to coalescence with any other neighbouring town or village.		

Site Reference: 090

Date/Time: 10/3/15 12:20

Site Size:	3.8 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: M Priv:		S: Pub: H Priv: M		E: Pub: Priv: L		W: Pub: M Priv: L		0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Large amounts of boundary vegetation limiting views in summer. Part of Country Park										
Site visual amenity:		Good				Locality visual amenity:		Good				

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, hedgerow	E: trees, hedgerow, fence	S: Hedgerow, trees, fence	W: trees, hedgerow, fence	
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	School 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		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, I, J	N		K, Q

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: Education - Schools	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Merrymeade County Park

PRoW along Southern edge.

Small pond/marshy area fenced off in Southern corner.

S = site, L = locality

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	
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:	On balance, Site forms important countryside wedge between Brentwood and Shenstone – physical reduction in gap, halving gap between nearest dwellings at settlements. Scale of Site and intervening woodland would retain some separation – some scope to mitigate.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Part of Merrymeade Country Park. Informal pathways/routes. PRoW along/outside perimeter of southern edge. Small pond/marshy area fenced off in southern corner.
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:	Part of Merrymeade Country Park – Site not contained and functional countryside in reasonable condition however. Development would not lead to settlements merging, but the intervening gap would substantially reduce		

Site Size:	2.1 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: L		E: Pub: Priv:		W: Pub: Priv: L	0 Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20) High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation. Least visible in summer.							
Site visual amenity:		Good – pastures; trees			Locality visual amenity:		Good – Arable countryside; mature trees; attractive housing		

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, shrubs, fence	E: Trees belt	S: trees	W: Trees	
Buildings on Site:	L Shaped			Approx. Footprint:	2%
Adjacent Buildings:	Bungalows; two storey semi-detached and terraced housing				

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	A		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:

Within Special Landscape Area

Adjacent to A12

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	On balance, strongly contained by built development at Mountnessing and A12
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:	On balance, development would not lead to settlements merging – A12 is significant barrier between Ingatestone and Mountnessing. However loss of countryside would bring the large settled area of Mountnessing towards Ingatestone – notwithstanding the existing ribbon development between the two settlements.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Fields between settlement edge and A12
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:	Predominantly, Site would comprise infilling between A12 and Mountnessing		

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: 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 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, 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 – would be new housing development
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. Developing woodland barriers separate Greater London from the M25 in this locality.				

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 housing on the Site, but would not cause any towns to coalesce. From previous assessment the inclusion of agricultural land south of the Site within the Site boundary has elevated the overall Site contribution from Low-Moderate to Moderate – this is due to some of the overall Site having a countryside function.		

Site Size:	9.2 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:	30%
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	F/B	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. Housing development primarily replaces the existing commercial development would not affect perceived or actual separation – some increase in quantum of built development likely in southern part which is predominantly hardstanding.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Predominantly an 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 predominantly 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 increase in quantum of built development likely in southern part which is predominantly hardstanding.		

Site Size:	5.5 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	E: M	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: H Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: H Priv:	W: Pub: H Priv:	0	<u>L</u> ow (1 - 10)	<u>M</u> ed (10-20)	<u>H</u> igh (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Reduced visibility when boundary trees in full leaf in summer							
Site visual amenity:		Boundary trees of variable condition		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:				Approx. Footprint:	2%
Adjacent Buildings:	Bungalow				

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	C		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:

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				

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		

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				

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 large business/commercial type units, not associated with any settlement		

Site Size:	2.3 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: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Boundary trees to W, S & N			Locality visual amenity:		Industrial estate – adjacent 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	
	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 and Q			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:	No separation reduction over the existing situation. Any development in context of adjacent industrial 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. 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		

Site Size:	7.05 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: M	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv: L	W: Pub: L Priv: M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Variable								
Site visual amenity:	Variable – brownfield - Mature conifers and in places – arable land in southern half			Locality visual amenity:		Industrial estate and 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: Industry	E: Road	S: None	W: Tree Belt	
Buildings on Site:	Industrial sheds/large and small			Approx. Footprint:	30%
Adjacent Buildings:	Industrial on site to north; 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 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/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 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:	On balance – whilst development would encroach in to arable land this is totally in context of existing industrial estate				

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 and area of arable land to south	
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		

Site Size:	1.56ha	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 Road	S: Pub Priv			E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Potentially – deciduous woodland cover surrounding site							
Site visual amenity:		Poor - OK			Locality visual amenity:		OK-Good – adjacent 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: -Trees/Road	E: Woodland	S: Woodland	W: Commerical	
Buildings on Site:	Y - part			Approx. Footprint:	<5%
Adjacent Buildings:	Ford Offices 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			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
	I	A		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:

Site forms part of Ford HQ (rest of Site 117A) which extends beyond Green Belt boundary – surrounding amenity grassland area and woodland edge

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	Part of overall 117A Site (Ford HQ). Small area of amenity grass and woodland – contained by woodland to east.
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:	Site primarily in context of existing developed area – no reduction in overall separation to nearby towns				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Whilst part of Ford HQ – the land cover generally suggest Functional Countryside
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:	Area of grassland and woodland at eastern extent of Ford HQ		

Site Size:	19.5 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 Road	S: Pub Priv Railway		E: Pub Priv Road		W: Pub Priv Housing		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv:	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: H	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Minimal effect							
Site visual amenity:		OK-Poor		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: Hedge, minor road	E: hedge + A128	S: Tree line + railway	W: gardens, fence	
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Semi-detached housing to west overlooking site				

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/F			G/L/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:

Land lies between West Horndon and the A128 north of a rail line

Golf course to East

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	Bounded to W by housing, to S by rail line and to E by A128. Housing overlooks the Site from the West – minor road to the north. Further east any development is, the more remote it will be from West Horndon
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:	Gap to Basildon physically reduced from around 3.7km to 3.1km if whole Site developed. Minimal visual connectivity – with woodland and industry west of Basildon restricting views west. A128 and rail line are strong physical barriers.				

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 of town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of 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:	Some decrease in the gap to Basildon but still functional, with very limited or no visual linkages. Some loss of countryside if developed.		

Site Size:	3.5 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	E: M	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: Priv: L	S: Pub: M Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: M Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some variation.							
Site visual amenity:		Leyland Conifer screen; Beech hedging; deciduous trees			Locality visual amenity:		Trees, 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:	E:	S:	W:	
Buildings on Site:	Garden centre sheds; two storey house/office			Approx. Footprint:	10%
Adjacent Buildings:	Semi-detached 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 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
	K			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:

Ingatstone 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	Site sandwiched between Rail Line and Roman Road/A12 on western edge of Ingatstone
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 would not substantially change the existing situation other than increasing the number/amount of built development. A12 is substantial barrier to Mountnessing and no significant additional encroachment.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Garden Centre
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 would be redevelopment of existing garden centre		

Site Size:	0.7 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:		Little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Good - trees			Locality visual amenity:		Good – woodland; pasture		

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: Fence; trees	S: Low brick wall; hedge; trees	W: Trees, hedge	
Buildings on Site:	Large two storey dwelling			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	St. Mark's church; two storey dwelling				

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
	G	A, Q	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: ___ Car Park _____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

No public/private res views in due to dense trees.

Views of chimney tops from informal path through adjacent field used by walkers.

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	Overall, considered to be Not Contained. Site lies north of Hall Lane and clearly beyond existing extent of housing
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:	Located within important gap between Shenstone and Pilgrims Hatch/Brentwood. Significant interlying woodland and A12 boundaries. Scale of Site would not cause coalescence or perceived coalescence. Site already developed with a single house but development of multiple houses would represent a new massing of development in the countryside				

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 private residence, with no specific countryside functions. Majority of Site consists of private residential gardens, some tree lined boundaries, surrounding house and private driveways/tennis court
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:	St Marks Church lies to east		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Existing private residential site falling within an important gap between settlements – further development would not cause settlement coalescence		

Site Size:	0.7 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: -	S: S	E: S	W: -	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: M	W: Pub: Priv: H	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Little variation – higher visibility in winter								
Site visual amenity:	Good – Mature trees			Locality visual amenity:	Good – woodland; golf courses; countryside near				

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: Hedging, Trees, Fence	S: Trees/Open/None	W: Trees, railings	
Buildings on Site:	None			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	School to North; Houses to North; Houses across Brentwood Road 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
	A	B	G	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:

Wooded area

Heavily filtered views:

- From access road to school on north boundary; and
- From school playing field to West

Southern boundary not defined

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	Area of land immediately south of Ingrave adjacent to Brentwood Road through village
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:	In conjunction with Hillcrest Nursery to the south of the Site, development would likely cause coalescence between Ingrave and Herongate, which is already occurring through various ribbon development.				

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:	Development would reinforce and lead to coalescence of Ingrave and Herongate		

Site Size:	1.99ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: M + L	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv House		S: Pub Priv Road		E: Pub Priv Houses Road School			W: Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv: L	S: Pub: M/H Priv: M	E: Pub: M/H Priv: L		W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20) High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Slightly less visibility in summer due to foliage							
Site visual amenity:		Good. Attractive grass and mature trees. Long views			Locality visual amenity:		Good. Countryside grassland and trees/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: Hedge + road + houses	E: Hedge + road	S: Treeline – (A12)		W: -
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern housing – 2 storey. Infant school to NE				

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/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.

Other Comments:

Tranquillity lowered by A12 and heavy road traffic

Site is separated from Ingatstone by A12

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 separated from Ingatestone by A12 – Site is outside of village limit and is only associated to housing where it abuts the ribbon development along Fryering Lane N of A12
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 towns to coalesce nor significantly encroach towards another large built up area – significant distance to any other town or village. Development would infill land between the adjacent ribbon development and the A12.				

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:	Development of the Site would not lead to coalescence – but it would fall outside of the Ingatstone large built up area beyond the A12 forming the northern limit of Ingatstone – representing countryside encroachment.		

Site Size:	7.03 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S/M	S: S	E: S	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv	S: Pub Priv Houses (rear gardens)			E: Pub Priv		W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: M Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation – Deciduous trees so lower in summer							
Site visual amenity:		Med/good			Locality visual amenity:		Med		

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, woodland, treeline, footpath	E: Hedge, treeline	S: fence, treeline	W: treeline, fence, woodland	
Buildings on Site:	Y – Greenacres Riding Stables			Approx. Footprint:	c. 5% of Site
Adjacent Buildings:	Some residential two storey properties to South – some separated from Site by large gardens				

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, Q	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: Equine Stables	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

Site is split in to two parts straddling Beads Hall Lane (PRoW). Western part of Site is smaller with riding stables. Eastern part of Site (5.4ha) is split in to series of paddocks by tape/rope for horses. Caravans or mobile units also present. Northern part of this Site is woodland with open informal access.

Majority of Site is separated from main urban area (Pilgrims Hatch) to rear of very large gardens

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 weakly abuts the northern edge of Pilgrims Hatch but is generally poorly associated to the existing urban area – large scale countryside encroachment
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:	Scale of Site is such that there would be an encroachment northwards from Pilgrims Hatch towards Doddinghurst village – but this would not be significant and the countryside gap would only marginally decrease. Substantive barrier exist in the surrounding countryside such as treelines and woodland with no readily appreciable views between towns/villages. Some longer range views to the NE of open countryside				

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 stables – livery and pasture – with woodland scrub
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 Site poorly related to the existing Pilgrims Hatch area. Existing livery and pasture land. Development would not cause towns to coalesce but would cause countryside encroachment		

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 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
	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 housing to the NE of Shenfield in conjunction with adjacent ribbon development. However, locality and road network and surrounding tree belts preserve separation between adjacent built up areas				

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.		

Site Size:	2.78 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: S	E: S	W: S/M	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: H	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Similar but less visible in summer due to foliage							
Site visual amenity:		Medium			Locality visual amenity:		High – Pond and tree to North		

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 (post & rail)	E: Fence/Hedge/treeline	S: Poor hedge, footpath, fencing, housing		W: Fence (post & rail) some occasional
Buildings on Site:	No			Approx. Footprint:	N/A
Adjacent Buildings:	2-storey housing along southern boundary with views north. Rescue Centre (large estate type house) 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		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, G
				E, N

Land Use/Cover

A – Woodland (>5m tall)

B – Scrubland (include young woodland <5m tall)

C – Semi-natural grassland / marsh

D – Heathland / Bogs

E – Arable Farmland

F – Pasture

G – Residential

H – Industrial/Commercial

I – Parkland/Garden(s)

J – Sports, Amenity & Recreation

K – Retail

L – Infrastructure (Road/Rail)

M – Watercourse

N – Waterbody

O – Coastal Environment

P – Inland Rock

Q – Other: _____

Heritage Assets/Notes:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Majority of residences are post war.

Other Comments:

Pasture used for grazing north of Pilgrims Hatch

Tranquil Site. Footpath route runs along southern boundary between housing and wider Site.

Good views north from 2nd floor windows of housing. Some degradation of rear boundaries of housing

Some occasional views from footpath c. 60m NW of Site and footpath E of Site where breaks in vegetation allow

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	Only southern boundary abuts residential built up area. With the eastern, northern & western boundary being countryside, overall development would be large scale encroachment beyond existing boundaries of Pilgrims Hatch – hence ‘Not Contained’
Development type:	‘Infilling’	‘Urban Extension’	New settlement	
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 would not lead to the coalescing of towns nor with any significant developed area to the north (e.g. Kelvedon Hatch, Doddington etc). However, development would extend 100m towards Crow Green (a hamlet) c. 500m north of Pilgrims Hatch. Good tree lined hedgerows currently visually separate Crow Green from Pilgrims Hatch, filtering/obscuring views. Some visual connectivity between housing may increase if the Site were developed (winter views).				

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 is a large field forming the countryside to the northern edge of Pilgrims Hatch. Weak relationship to the large built up area, with no containment by other infrastructure (e.g. roads, rail). Development would not lead to town coalescence but some reduction to nearby hamlet Crow Green		

Site Size:	0.7 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: H Priv: M	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Little variation								
Site visual amenity:	OK – Mature boundary trees			Locality visual amenity:	Good – open countryside to north (flat), trees visible				

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: clipped hedge	E: timber rail fence	S: clipped hedge; timber fence	W: fence	
Buildings on Site:	Stables			Approx. Footprint:	~ 5%
Adjacent Buildings:	Residences – two storey detached; bungalow				

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	Q	G, E	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: ___Stable_buildings_____	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

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	Overall, whilst Site is sandwiched between housing and settlement edge to W and SE, northern boundaries open up in to countryside (paddocks/sports grounds). On balance, partially contained.
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 would not lead to coalescence				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Paddock/stables
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 is on balance partially contained, yet development would not lead to settlement coalescence.		

Site Size:	0.8 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: 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	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:	Not notable reduction in separation over and above existing situation – M25 very strong barrier west of Brentwood. Small scale 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	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 housing would be marginally more perceived over existing situation but would not lose functional countryside or cause settlements to merge		

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. Visual linkages do exist between existing 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	
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.		

Site Size:	1.1 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: H Priv:	E: Pub: H Priv: L		W: Pub: H Priv:		0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation.									
Site visual amenity:		Moderate mature trees/shrubs to North				Locality visual amenity:		Good – views to wooded hills; local mature 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: Tree belt	E: Fence, treebelt	S: Very low rail		W: Fence/neighbouring hedgerow trees
Buildings on Site:	Car dealership; (2 storey) warehouse			Approx. Footprint:	20-25%
Adjacent Buildings:	Holiday Inn to West; (public house opposite 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 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	A		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: Shacks (Disused)	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Car dealership – sandwiched between Wigley Bush Lane and Holiday Inn hotel

Woodland scrub lies in northern half of 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	Site is west of Wigley Bush Lane which delineates extent of housing in Brentwood – however, Site is also bounded to west by hotel complex
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 / Disant	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 is sandwiched between western extent of housing at Brentwood and also the Holiday Inn.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Southern half of Site forms car dealership, northern half comprises woodland scrub
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 partly developed Site between western extent of Brentwood and the Holiday Inn.		

Site Size:	0.7 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 Footpath	S: Pub Priv House	E: Pub Priv Footpath	W: Pub Priv Houses				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L/M Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: L/M Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some dense scrubland – some decreased screening during winter- minor effect							
Site visual amenity:		OK		Locality visual amenity:		OK – Good to E			

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, hedge	E: treeline, scrub, fence	S: fence, scrub	W: fence, hedge	
Buildings on Site:	Y – bunaglow – private residence			Approx. Footprint:	< 5% of Site
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey detached modern houses to W. Bungalow to S.				

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
	A, B	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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

No Access. Site forms southern extent of grounds of private residence – primarily comprises of woodland trees and scrub – not a usual formal garden

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 is overall, weakly associate with existing large built up area of Doddinghurst – only abutting housing areas to the W. Despite being private residence Site appears more like scrubland and part of the countryside
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 forms part of a larger countryside area separating Doddinghurst from Wyatts Green. The current gap between the two built up areas is c. 450m. If wholly developed, housing would extend over 150m in to the countryside gap, substantially reducing the physical distance between the two villages. Substantial treelines and woodland do visually separate the two ‘towns’.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Despite being part of grounds of private residential property, the Site comprises well developed woodland and scrub
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 is poorly related to the existing settlement limits of Doddinghurst and forms part of an important area of countryside separating Doddinghurst and Wyatts Green. Development would cause significant separation reduction and countryside encroachment. Overall whilst the Site forms the grounds of the wider residence, the land use and cover within the Site boundary comprises woodland and scrub and is considered functional countryside.		

Site Size:	1.5 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: L	S: Pub: - Priv: -	E: Pub: - Priv: L	W: Pub: M Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Little variation							
Site visual amenity:		Poor – car parking			Locality visual amenity:		Good – woodland, leafy suburbs		

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, wall	E: Trees, hedgerow		S: Woodland		W: Trees, hedgerow
Buildings on Site:	Two storey hospital/blood donor centre				Approx. Footprint:	50%
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey hospital; Detached houses 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
	Q	A		Q

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: __Health Centre/Hospital__	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Overall Site forms part of a Health Centre. Only the car parks (surrounded by woodland) to the western extent of the Site fall within the Green Belt – as such the assessment only relates to around 25% of the 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	The car parks are strongly associated with surrounding buildings, albeit protruding in to the Green Belt from the settlement edge
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:	The Site is well bounded by mature dense woodland to the west. Whilst development would mass housing on the Site there would be no appreciable reduction in the gap between Shenstone and Brentwood.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Car Parks and Woodland Areas
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:	Partly developed Site (as car parks) surrounded by woodland to west and associated with settlement boundary to east.		

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:	Fair				Locality visual amenity:	Fair – local detracting features.			

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 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
	F		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:

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:	Overall, whilst Site is undeveloped business uses are immediately adjacent and Site is well related to A127/A128 junction that form significant boundaries – A128 slightly above Site with adjacent tree planting preventing visual coalescence of West Horndon and Basildon. Some minor physical narrowing of intervening gap. Other intervening land to West Horndon is relatively flat limiting depth of view				

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.		

Site Size:	1.96ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	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:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: L-M Priv:	W: Pub: M-H Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Some boundary deciduous trees + hedgerows. Minor seasonal effect								
Site visual amenity:	Good			Locality visual amenity:	Good to south				

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, trees, hedge	S: fence, trees, hedge	W: fence, trees	
Buildings on Site:	Ashwells lodge dormer style and shed			Approx. Footprint:	< 5% of site
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey terraced; two storey detached and bungalows				

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	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:

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	At least two boundaries abut built up area without containment. Weak boundaries otherwise.
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 would encroach on countryside, but not significantly reduce Greenbelt purpose. Large countryside gap to Kelvedon Hatch; scope to mitigate perceived closure of countryside gap.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Small part of the site has dwelling present, however vast majority of Site contain fields (paddock/agricultural use).
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 abuts existing settlement and is partly contained but functional countryside.		

Site Size:	0.87ha	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 House Road	S: Pub Priv			E: Pub Priv Houses			W: Pub Priv PRoW
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Minor effects							
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: Hedge, fence, road	E: fence, hedge	S: treeline	W: new hedge planting	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey houses to E + N of Blackmore Rd				

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, E	A, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

Existing field – some informal access around field edge. New hedge planting along W boundary.

Woodland to SW

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 weakly adjoins the existing SW edge of Kelvedon Hatch, with housing to the E and N of Blackmore Rd. Development would not lead to large scale countryside encroachment, significantly beyond the existing edges of the built up area. Overall, considered to be Partly Contained.
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:	Strong wooded features to the SW and W screen the Site from wider views. No significant encroachment in to the countryside and no physical narrowing of the countryside gap to the nearest 'town' (Pilgrims Hatch to the S).				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Informal access around field 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:	Existing agricultural field, with the Site related to the existing southwestern limits of Kelvedon Hatch. Some countryside encroachment but would not diminish the countryside gap to other 'towns'.		

Site Size:	5.95 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	E: M/L	W: S	Short (<250m)		Med (250m – 1km)		Long (>1km)	
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv House		S: Pub Priv Long Distance Path			E: Pub Priv Long Distance Path			W: Pub Priv Houses Road		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: M		S: Pub: M/H Priv:		E: Pub: M/H Priv:		W: Pub: M Priv: L-M		0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Some minor effect from boundary vegetation where present										
Site visual amenity:		OK/Good				Locality visual amenity:		OK/Good				

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, garden, hedge/treeline	E: hedge, ditch	S: Long distance path (open)		W: Ditch, hedge?, road
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Large houses to north. 2 storey houses on opposite side of Chelmsford Rd				

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	M		G, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Other Comments:

St Peters Way bounds the Site to the S.

Chelmsford Road separates Site from Blackmore

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	Chelmsford Rd currently forms the Eastern edge of Blackmore. Development would be large scale encroachment outside of the existing built up area. Housing to north is low density ribbon development along Chelmsford Rd
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 Blackmore to coalesce with another town. Large woodlands in landscape to E act as visual barriers. NB: the ribbon development along Chelmsford Rd would merge with the overall Blackmore area if the Site were developed				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Long Distance Path on S. boundary
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 is not immediately adjacent to nor contained by the existing built up area – large scale countryside encroachment. Development would not cause towns to coalesce. Well used long distance path provides views across Site and surrounding landscape.		

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 cannot occur. Perception of significant loss of countryside openness and towns merging				

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.		

Site Size:	4.46 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M/L	E: S	W: M/L	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Houses	S: Pub Priv	E: Pub Priv Houses Footpath Church	W: Pub Priv Road				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: M/H Priv: L	W: Pub: M Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Some effects – mature treeline splits site in half								
Site visual amenity:	OK/Good				Locality visual amenity:	OK/Good			

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, gardens, hedge, road	E: Fence (garden), path, cemetery, ditch	S: -	W: hedge/tree line, road	
Buildings on Site:	-				Approx. Footprint:
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey properties to NE of site. Site overlooked by Priory Church of St Laurence church spire. Appears quite historic.				

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/F, I	B	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: Equine Stables	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

NE part of Site does lie within the Blackmore Conservation Area – with the Priory Church of St Laurence (and cemetery) to E

Other Comments:

NB: G044 covers land adjacent to St Laurence Church and a large field to W of Blackmore. See Sheet G044 (W) for the large field west of Blackmore.

Open promoted access (DEFRA) used like park. Public footpaths – with St Peters Way crossing the northern part of the Site.

Mature treeline splits site in half – with pasture grassland to north and arable land 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	Large scale Site in comparison to Blackmore, weakly abutting the existing built up area to the NE. Due to scale of Site, development would extend beyond the containment of Blackmore – encroaching S in to open countryside.
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 would not lead to Blackmore coalescing with other towns– however some minor reduction in the countryside gap to Doddinghurst/Stondon Massey, over 1.8km to the SW				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment					
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:	
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical ‘Countryside’ uses	Parkland with promoted access – important PRoW	
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:	Significant part of Site falls within Blackmore Conservation Area, with St Laurence Church to the E		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Due to scale of Site, it is not contained by the existing Blackmore built up area. The Site partly falls within a Conservation Area and would lead to countryside encroachment. Site currently has high amenity value.		

Site Size:	24.57 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M/L	S: M/L	E: S	W: M/L	Short (<250m)		Med (250m – 1km)		Long (>1km)		
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Road		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv Houses PRoW Recreation Ground				W: Pub Priv PRoW Houses (Distant)			
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L/M Priv:		S: Pub: Priv:		E: Pub: M/H Priv: M		W: Pub: M/H Priv: M/H		0	Low (1 - 10)		Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Some effects from treeline along eastern boundary – between Blackmore and Site											
Site visual amenity:		OK/Good				Locality visual amenity:		OK/Good					

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, road	E: treeline, fencing, bridleway	S: hedge, ditch	W: ditch, scattered hedge	
Buildings on Site:	-			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey modern properties on western edge of Blackmore. Blackmore Village Hall and Millennium Park to NE.				

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			E	G, I, 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: Equine Stables	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

NE part of Site does lie within the Blackmore Conservation Area – with the Priory Church of St Laurence (and cemetery) to E

Other Comments:

NB: G044 covers land adjacent to St Laurence Church and a large field to W of Blackmore. See Sheet G044 (S) for land field east of Blackmore Rd.

St Peters Way crosses southern part of the Site.

Treeline along bridleway along western edge of Blackmore

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	Large scale Site, weakly abutting the existing western edge of Blackmore. Due to scale of Site, development would extend beyond the containment of Blackmore – encroaching W in to open countryside. Development would roughly double the size of Blackmore
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 would not lead to Blackmore coalescing with other towns – however due to scale of Site there would be a substantial loss of the countryside which would decrease the gap from Blackmore to Stondon Massey (c. 1.8km to SW) and to Chipping Ongar (c. 5m to W). NB: Gap to Nine Ashes (ribbon development along Nine Ashes Rd c. 1km NW of Blackmore) would be halved – potentially causing visual coalescence.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment					
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:	
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical ‘Countryside’ uses	St Peters Way crosses 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:	This part of G044 does lie in or adjacent to the Blackmore Conservation Area		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Development would result in a large scale countryside encroachment, poorly related (especially in terms of scale) to the existing Blackmore built up area. Some countryside gap reduction to other towns – but development would not cause towns to coalesce.		

Site Size:	4.23 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S/M	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv House	S: Pub Priv Road	E: Pub Priv Road Footpaths			W: Pub Priv Houses Road		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: L/M Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes – effects from existing woodland							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		Good		

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: Woodland	E: Woodland + road	S: Woodland + road	W: Treeline/footpath	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	A few cottages to N & W. Hutton Hall to W. All Saints Church to S. Pre-WWII				

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
	I, A	J	F/E	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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Lies within Hutton Village Conservation Area, adjacent to Hutton Hall and All Saints Church

Other Comments:

Recreational open space with young and establishing woodland and footpaths – vegetation makes Site feel enclosed and smaller than what it is. Well used by locals.

Separated from main 'urban' area

Tranquillity lowered by public use and activity in neighbouring gardens

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	Little or no relationship to existing large built up areas – separated by local minor roads (country lanes) forming recreational open space. Overlooked by a few cottages
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 would form a new housing area marginally reducing the countryside gap between Brentwood and Billericay and the interlying hamlet of Havering's Grove, visually separated by interlying landform and woodland. Development would not cause coalescence. If wholly developed local isolated cottages would be amalgamated in to larger built development.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Publicly used open space with footpaths etc.
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:	Wholly within Hutton Village Conservation Area, adjacent to Hutton Hall and All Saints Church		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site is detached from the main Brentwood area and would form a discreet development outside of the existing settlement limits. The Site is used as recreational open space and is situated within a Conservation Area, with nearby historic or prominent buildings.		

Site Size:		12.42ha	Views Out (distance):		N: M/L	S: S/M	E: S	W: S (L)	Short (<250m)		Med (250m – 1km)		Long (>1km)		
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N Pub Priv				S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv Houses			W: Pub Priv Road Houses				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:		S: Pub: Priv:		E: Pub: Priv: H		W: Pub: M Priv: L		0	Low (1 - 10)		Med (10-20)		High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:			Minor effect from boundary hedgerows and trees/woodland												
Site visual amenity:			OK/Good				Locality visual amenity:			OK/Good					

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/footpath	E: hedge, garden/fencelines	S: Hedge/trees	W: hedge/wood, road	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Large detached two storey traditional housing to E. Few houses to E off Hall Lane				

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	M, A	E/F	G, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Adjacent housing appears traditional and some properties appeared to be pre-war?

St Marys Church lies to SW

Other Comments:

Tranquillity lowered by audible noise from A12 (to N)

Site lies to read (W) of properties along Roman Road - overlooked

Hall Lane lies to W. Land to south is open amenity (playing fields) and Shenfield cricket club.

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	Large Site lying between Hall Lane and houses on the western edge of Shenfield. Weakly associated with limits of Shenfield, with Site bounded to S by amenity/recreational areas and SW by housing off Hall Lane. Considered Not Contained due scale of Site & lack of clear limits to 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:	Site is part of a large green wedge separating Shenfield from northern areas of Brentwood/Pilgrims Hatch. Some reduction in this important gap if developed – A12 lies midway between the Site and Pilgrims Hatch. Houses along Hall lane would be amalgamated in to the overall Shenfield large built up area if the Site were developed.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment					
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:	
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Footpath bounds Site on N boundary	
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: St Marys Church does lie to the SW of the Site and some of the housing adjacent to the Site is pre-WWII (1930's)		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site is large area of countryside on the western edge of Shenfield. Development would be weakly associated with the existing large built up area of Shenfield and would encroach in to the countryside, narrowing the gap between Brentwood and Shenfield – assuming the whole Site was developed. Some housing along Hall Lane would be merged with the Shenfield urban area.		

Site Size:		Views Out (distance):	N: M/L	S: S/M	E: S	W: S (L)	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)	
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv Houses		W: Pub Priv Road Houses		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: H		W: Pub: M Priv: L		0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Minor effect from boundary hedgerows and trees/woodland								
Site visual amenity:		OK/Good			Locality visual amenity:		OK/Good			

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/footpath	E: hedge, garden/fencelines	S: Hedge/trees	W: hedge/wood, road	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Large detached two storey traditional housing to E. Few houses to E off Hall Lane				

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	M, A	E/F	G, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Adjacent housing appears traditional and some properties appeared to be pre-war?

St Marys Church lies to SW

Other Comments:

Tranquillity lowered by audible noise from A12 (to N)

Site lies to read (W) of properties along Roman Road - overlooked

Hall Lane lies to W. Land to south is open amenity (playing fields) and Shenfield cricket club.

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	Large Site lying between Hall Lane and houses on the western edge of Shenfield. Weakly associated with limits of Shenfield, with Site bounded to S by amenity/recreational areas and SW by housing off Hall Lane. Considered Not Contained due scale of Site & lack of clear limits to 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:	Site is part of a large green wedge separating Shenfield from northern areas of Brentwood/Pilgrims Hatch. Some reduction in this important gap if developed – A12 lies midway between the Site and Pilgrims Hatch. Houses along Hall lane would be amalgamated in to the overall Shenfield large built up area if the Site were developed.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Footpath bounds Site on N boundary
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: St Marys Church does lie to the SW of the Site and some of the housing adjacent to the Site is pre-WWII (1930's)		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site is large area of countryside on the western edge of Shenfield. Development would be weakly associated with the existing large built up area of Shenfield and would encroach in to the countryside, narrowing the gap between Brentwood and Shenfield – assuming the whole Site was developed. Some housing along Hall Lane would be merged with the Shenfield urban area.		

Site Size:	2.82 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S/M	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub, Priv, House A129		S: Pub Priv, Care Home			E: Pub Priv		W: Pub, Priv, Houses Road
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M/H Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv:		W: Pub: L Priv: H	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes – effects from hedgerows and boundary treelines							
Site visual amenity:		OK			Locality visual amenity:		Good		

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: Treeline/hedge, Garden, A129	E: Gardens, fence/hedge	S: Nursing home	W: hedge/trees, garden, minor road	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	2 cottages to north, row of cottages near W boundary with housing on opposite side of road. Hutton Court flats and houses to E. Nursing home to S.				

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	B		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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Lies within Hutton Village Conservation Area

Other Comments:

Paddock with horses. Site wraps around existing housing, separated from main 'urban' area by minor road – but still overlooked by local housing.

Triangular wedge of land.

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 wraps around C19 th housing currently lining Hutton Village (local minor road) which separates the Site from the overall large built up area. Still overlooked by the urban area. Bounded to S by nursing home, N & NE by the A129 and 2 cottages. Considered Partly Contained due to the Site scale and it being a wedge between the A129 and the 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:	Development would lead to some encroachment east away from Brentwood toward Billericay and the interlying hamlet of Havering’s Grove. Site visually separated from Billericay by interlying landform and woodland. Development would lead to properties at Hutton Court merging with the Brentwood (Hutton) built up area.				

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:	Lies within Hutton Village Conservation Area, adjacent to Hutton Hall and All Saints Church		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site is a wedge of land between the A129 and the main Brentwood area wrapping around existing properties off Hutton Village (local minor road). Site lies within a Conservation Area. Development would not lead to a significant reduction in the gap to Billericay nor cause towns to coalesce.		

Site Size:	10.24 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: S	E: M	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv Country Park	S: Pub Priv	E: Pub Priv Houses Country Park	W: Pub Priv				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: H Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: H Priv: M/H	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Yes – from boundary hedgerows								
Site visual amenity:	OK				Locality visual amenity:	OK-Good			

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: Hedgerow/wood	S: Hedgerow	W: Hedgerow	
Buildings on Site:	Y – derelict farm building (Collins Farm?)			Approx. Footprint:	c. 1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern/traditional – mix of two storey houses and bungalows				

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	A, N	F	G, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

Four fields delineated by hedgerows. Centre of Site forms a local high point offering filtered views north and east towards an industrial estate – filtered by hedgerows.

Rail line c. 245m to north. A129 Rayleigh Rd c. 350m to south.

Only abuts housing on SW boundary of Site

Site is bounded by Hutton Country Park on W, N and NE boundaries

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	Weakly associated to large built up area via boundary with housing off Goodwood Avenue, Hutton. Large scale countryside encroachment, bounded to W, N & NE by a country park. As majority of land is immediately adjacent to countryside, Site is considered to be Not Contained
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 would lead to the encroachment of Hutton towards Billericay and the interlying hamlet of Havering’s Grove, but would not cause Coalescence. Local high point if developed may offer some visibility from wider areas and other towns – filtered by interlying woodland/hedgerows.				

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 informal access from country park
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 is weakly associated to Brentwood but does abut the existing housing and large built up area on SE edge of Brentwood. Some minor narrowing of gap from Brentwood to Billericay. Large scale countryside encroachment.		

Site Size:	0.46ha	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 House		S: Pub Priv Road		E: Pub Priv Houses		W: Pub Priv Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv: I	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some – deciduous hedge/treeline – particularly along rail line and Stock Lane (S of site)							
Site visual amenity:			Low /Poor		Locality visual amenity:		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: Hedge	E: fence, gardens	S: Hedge + road	W: Treeline + rail line	
Buildings on Site:	Y – house (the nutshell)			Approx. Footprint:	< 5% of Site
Adjacent Buildings:	Some small houses (mobile homes?) to E.				

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	F	E/F, L	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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

No substantial historic buildings appear near to Site.

Other Comments:

No Access. Primarily appears to be associated to Garage (motor vehicle) works.

Site on opposite side of railway line from Ingatstone – outside of main village limits. Site is overlooked by two storey housing on opposite side of rail line – filtered by treeline. No/very limited views from rail line – in a deep cutting

Allotments to S of Stock Lane.

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	Small Site. The rail line forms the physical boundary of Ingatestone – the Site is outside of this limit – separate from the main housing 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:	Development will not cause coalescence. Primarily a brownfield Site. No significant reduction in the gap to other towns.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical ‘Countryside’ uses	Brownfield Site – appears primarily related to local garage – some grassland potentially on 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:	Any housing development would clearly be outside of the existing limit of Ingatestone, delineated by the rail line and would not be contained. Development would not cause towns to merge. Site is primarily brownfield with limited countryside functions		

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 housing in this location would potentially cause minor separation reduction between West Horndon and outer London boroughs/Brentwood. Overall scale of Site and intervening woodland indicates housing development not likely to influence perception of separation over the existing situation, with existing large warehouse visible from number of locations.				

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		

Site Size:	1.35 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: S	W: S-M	<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: Priv:	S: Pub: M-H Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Variable in winter due to boundary tree cover								
Site visual amenity:	Mod to good				Locality visual amenity:	Moderate - Good			

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: Post and wire, trees	E: Post and wire, brambles, trees	S: timber fence, hedgerow trees	W: post and wire, brambles, trees	
Buildings on Site:	Lean-to brick shed and corrugated iron shelter, deciduous and evergreens			Approx. Footprint:	~2%
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey house (Alexander 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 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
	F	Q	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: Small sheds and hardstand	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Telegraph wires/poles cross site

Footpath immediately south of 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	East of Alexander Lane which delineates edge of Shenfield. Site not directly bounded by any settlement limit
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:	Ribbon development and A12 alongside countryside, are interlying between Mountnessing and Shenfield – no coalescence				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Minor detracting feature – overall open pasture field
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:	Uncontained field – relatively small scale – no coalescence of built up areas.		

Site Size:	0.5 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: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Slight variation in winter							
Site visual amenity:		Ok - good			Locality visual amenity:		Ok - good		

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: Concrete, post and wire fence, evergreen cypress	E: Deciduous trees, timber panelled fence	S: Post n wire fence		W: Trees
Buildings on Site:	Small timber sheds			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern 2 storey dwellings detached				

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
	F	A Q	E G	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: Sheds	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

Noise from A12

Abuts smaller built up area – Mountnessing

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	On balance, strongly contained by built development at Mountnessing and A12
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:	On balance, development would not lead to settlements merging – A12 is significant barrier between Ingatestone and Mountnessing. However loss of countryside would bring the large settled area of Mountnessing towards Ingatestone – notwithstanding the existing ribbon development between the two settlements.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Fields between settlement edge and A12
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:	Predominantly, Site would comprise infilling between A12 and Mountnessing		

Site Size:	0.65 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: L	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: H Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv:	0	<u>L</u> ow (1 - 10)	<u>M</u> ed (10-20)	<u>H</u> igh (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Variable							
Site visual amenity:			Ok - good		Locality visual amenity:		Good – countryside to W		

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 (garden) trees, leylandii	E: Timber fence, Trees	S: scattered trees	W: trees	
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern 2 storey build 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
	B	A	E G	J 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:

Woodland Scrub area between housing and pub at Kelvedon Hatch

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	Infills area of land between housing and pub at western extent on Kelvedon Hatch along Ongar 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:	No separation reduction to other villages/towns over 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	Woodland scrub
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:	Development would primarily infill gap between ribbon development on western edge of Kelvedon Hatch. Overall, moderate due to the naturalistic countryside function of the Site (woodland scrub) which is reasonably attractive.		

Site Size:	1.17 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	Priv			W: Pub Priv		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: M	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some variation							
Site visual amenity:		Excellent - good			Locality visual amenity:		Good		

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	S: Timber fence, houses (2 storey)	W: Golf course	
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Private residences				

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
	A		G I	J 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:

Bird song

Part of Thorndon Park (Registered Park and Garden/ Conservation 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	Partly contained by Herongate to South and Ingrave to north
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 would lead to Herongate and Ingrave directly merging through housing development				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Thorndon Country Park - woodland
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:	Site wholly within Conservation Area western side of Herongate/Ingrave		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Small Site where development would cause Herongate and Ingrave to further coalesce as well as being located in Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area		

Site Size:	11.1 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	Priv			W: Pub Priv		
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: 0-L	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: H Priv:	W: Pub: H Priv: L	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Variable – limited tree cover – reasonably open even in summer from north							
Site visual amenity:		Good		Locality visual amenity:		Good			

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: Grassed field	E: Trees and railway	S: trees/hedge/wooden fence	W: trees/hedge	
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey residences				

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		E 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:Other Comments:

Road noise

Railway adjacent to east - View from trains

Small businesses to S (Vet 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	Whilst the Site is well contained by rail line (E) and A12/Roman Road (W), Site is weakly connected to northern extent of Ingatestone – Site is primarily to rear of ribbon development and is not contained to existing 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 would represent reduction in gap to Margeretting and Chelmsford to northeast of Ingatestone, but overall settlements 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		
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 Size:	1.0 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: M	S: Pub: Priv:		E: Pub: Priv:		W: Pub: Priv: M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Variable in winter due to tree cover								
Site visual amenity:		Good				Locality visual amenity:		Good		

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/hedge	S: Trees/hedge		W: Trees, hedgerow, garden hedge/none
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey detached traditional/historic preferences. Listed buildings inc. care home, Button Hall, Heron Court etc				

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	Q		G 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: hedgerow/trees	

Heritage Assets/Notes:

-Listed buildings nearby

Other Comments:

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 weakly associated with settlement edge of Herongate
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:	Woodland lies to east of Site. Scale of Site and potential encroachment would not be perceived as a reduction in the gap to Basildon or Billericay				

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:	Adjacent to Heron Court and Herongate Conservation Area – part of surrounding setting in close proximity to settled area		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:			

Site Size:	5.5 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: L Priv: L	S: Pub: H Priv: M	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some variation in winter due to tree belts							
Site visual amenity:		Very good		Locality visual amenity:		Very good			

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, hedgerow, post n wire fence	E: Post n wire fence, trees	S: Post n wire fence, hedgerow, trees	W:	
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Two storey dwellings, Bakers Farm, single storey barns				

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	N	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:

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	Large Site, clearly separate from Mountnessing 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 all of Site would encroach towards Doddinghurst, reducing the separation from Mountnessing – but not significantly				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Grazing land, ponds and lake
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 Site that would encroach in to countryside if developed – but settlements would not merge		

Site Size:	4.6 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: - Priv: M-H	E: Pub: - Priv: -	W: Pub: H Priv: H	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Variable – still partly well screened in winter due to dense woodland							
Site visual amenity:		ExceleInt – grass, woods			Locality visual amenity:		Ok to poor – Housing, Tower block		

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: Woodland			S: Woodland			W: Woodland/Trees/Path		
Buildings on Site:						Approx. Footprint:					
Adjacent Buildings:	School, commercial, residential including tower block.										

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
	I, J	-		G	A, 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:

Playing Fields/Sports Pitches bounded by woodland.

Several story residential tower block to south, not immediately overlooking

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	Overall, Site is loosely connected to SE edge of Warley – separated by playing fields to the west. Large woodland areas to east
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:	Bounded by large mature woodland to east and south – no views or perception of reduction in gap to other built up areas				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical ‘Countryside’ uses	Playing fields considered appropriate countryside function – with open general access
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 weakly associated with existing built up area, where development would lose open access playing fields in countryside location		

Site Size:	1.9 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: L	E: Pub: Priv:		W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Variation in winter along Church Lane (N of Site) due to boundary treebelt							
Site visual amenity:		V Good			Locality visual amenity:		V Good		

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: Woodland	E: Woodland	S: Woodland, fence		W: Trees
Buildings on Site:	-			Approx. Footprint:	n/a
Adjacent Buildings:	Detached residential dwellings				

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
	A	F, C		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:

Partly Densely wooded

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 is separated from Doddinghurst in countryside
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:	The countryside gap between Doddinghurst and Wyatts Green would be halved. Development would also likely lead to the loss of large numbers of trees that current prevent intervisibility between the villages				

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:	Uncontained Site situated in narrow gap between Doddinghurst and Wyatt's Green – separation between villages substantially reduced		

Site Size:	9.8 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: Priv:	S: Pub: Priv:		E: Pub: M-H Priv:		W: Pub: Priv: M		0	Low (1 - 10)		Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Slightly variability in winter due to boundary tree belts										
Site visual amenity:		Good				Locality visual amenity:		Good				

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 belt, A12	E: Trees/railway	S: Treebelt/woods	W: trees	
Buildings on Site:	-			Approx. Footprint:	-
Adjacent Buildings:	Residences, McDonalds				

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			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:

N- Heavily filtered view/no view from road – Site is to rear of existing ribbon development

Railway to E/SE

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 is clearly separate from Shenfield – to rear of ribbon development and bounded by A12 and rail line
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 it is recognised that development would lead to some substantial encroachment in to the countryside between Shenfield and Mountnessing, the Site lies to rear of Ribbon Development in between significant infrastructure (A12/rail line). These substantial barriers and interlying treebelts would prevent large built up areas merging. The existing ribbon development already provides a relatively developed appearance along the road route 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:	Overall, Site is considered Moderate, albeit it is recognised that development would result in the loss of a large area of countryside between Mountnessing and Shenfield, partly obscured by the Sites location between major infrastructure routes (A12 and rail line)		

Site Size:	0.55 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: Priv:	E: Pub: - Priv: L		W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		More visible in winter							
Site visual amenity:		OK – scrub woodland with a single house			Locality visual amenity:		OK – ribbon dev to NE along road		

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: Woodland & Road	E: Woodland/tree belt	S: Woodland/tree belt	W: Woodland/tree belt	
Buildings on Site:	Yes – single dwelling			Approx. Footprint:	1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Dwellings to NE (Ribbon Dev)				

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
	A	G		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:

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	Small scale woodland site set within ribbon development along Roman Rd
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:	Small scale site within ribbon dev				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Despite a single dwelling – overall considered countryside due to woodland cover
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:	Small scale woodland plot within existing ribbon dev – not associated with existing large built up area		

Site Size:	11.39ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S/M	E: S/M	W: S/M	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub, Priv		S: Pub, Priv		E: Pub, Priv, school		W: Pub, Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M/H Priv: M	S: Pub: H Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: L/M	W: Pub: Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Y – Boundary tree cover especially along A12							
Site visual amenity:		OK-Good			Locality visual amenity:		Ok-Good		

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: Fencing/trees	E: Trees/hedge	S: Trees/hedge	W: Trees/hedge	
Buildings on Site:	Y- Drury's Farm			Approx. Footprint:	5%
Adjacent Buildings:	Residential dwellings (Roman Road to North) and Mountnessing Primary School				

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	B, G		E	B, 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:Other Comments:

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	Overall Not Contained relative to existing Mountnessing area – large Site
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	Part of perceived gap between Mountnessing and Shenfield – large area relative to Mountnessing encroaching towards A12 junction
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:					

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:	Typical countryside use and large Site in comparison to Mountnessing, encroaching across gap to A12 junction and perceptually closer to Shenfield		

Site Size:	0.87 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 Housing		S: Pub Priv Footpath		E: Pub Priv Footpath		W: Pub Priv Road and Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Partial – Hedge on boundary will change slightly in winter							
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: hedge/trees/fence	E: hedge/tree line	S: hedge	W: hedge/fence + road	
Buildings on Site:	No – some sheds potentially			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Semi-detached housing to west and north overlooking site				

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	B		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:

Land lies west of Hanging Hill Lane on edge of settlement area.

Road to west is natural physical boundary to settlement

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 is opposite side of road from main residential area. Not significantly separated from Hutton –considered an extension rather than discreet housing development
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:	Small scale site with the existing gap between Brentwood/Hutton area and Ingrave village to the South unchanged. Woodland barriers restrict any views east from the 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	
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 of town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of 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:	Small scale Site, would not cause coalescence if developed or large scale urban sprawl.		

Site Size:	1.21 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: S	E: L	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv Footpath		E: Pub Priv		W: Pub Priv Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: M Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: Priv: L - M	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Some effects from hedgerows and treelines bounding the Site and in the area							
Site visual amenity:		OK		Locality visual amenity:		OK/Good			

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, hedge/trees	E: Fence, footpath, hedge	S: Fence, footpath, wood, garden	W: Fence, gardens	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Detached and semi-detached 2-storey properties of Ingrave (Modern/Traditional).				

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	B		E/F, G	L, 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:

Little or no relationship to historic town.

Some visually linkages with tower of Ingrave (St Nicholas') Church.

Other Comments:

Bounded to W by post WWII housing area within Ingrave village – open countryside to E.

Strong treelined boundaries

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	Abuts Ingrave weakly at NE side. Relatively small Site overall, but also considered relative to adjacent settled area where only a few houses.
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	
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:	Would not coalesce Ingrave with any other town. Some long range views towards Billericay are available looking E from the 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	
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 Size:	3.39 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	E: S	W: M	<u>Short (<250m)</u>	<u>Med (250m – 1km)</u>	<u>Long (>1km)</u>
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv Houses			W: Pub Priv Golf Course
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: M	S: Pub: M Priv:	E: Pub: Priv: M	W: Pub: M/H Priv:	0	<u>Low (1 - 10)</u>	<u>Med (10-20)</u>	<u>High (21+)</u>
Seasonal visibility:		Minor but Site comprises woodland plantation – some effect at periphery trees							
Site visual amenity:		OK-Good			Locality visual amenity:		OK-Good		

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/Garden boundary	E: Trees/Garden boundary	S: Trees/footpath	W: Trees/Golf course	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern/traditional – mix of two storey houses (large scale to north)				

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
	A			G	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:

Falls within Thorndon Park RPG.

Other Comments:

Footpath to southern boundary

Golf course abuts to west

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	Bounded to north and east by existing housing at Herongate – golf course to west. Relatively large area compared to existing settled area. Borderline Not Contained – on balance judgement of Partly Contained
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:					

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Note footpath to south and Golf Course to West
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:	Falls within Thorndon Park Registered Park and Garden which may influence the local settlement pattern / extent		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site would be a fairly large extension to Herongate and fall within a Registered Park and Garden which may influence pre-existing settlement extents.		

Site Size:	9.49 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M	S: M	E: M	W: S	Short (<250m)	Med (250m – 1km)	Long (>1km)
Views in:	Viewer Types:	N: Pub Priv		S: Pub, Priv Road		E: Pub, Priv Houses			W: Pub Priv
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv: L	E: Pub: H Priv: M/H		W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes – from boundary hedgerows and roadside treeline							
Site visual amenity:		OK-Good			Locality visual amenity:		OK-Good		

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: Hedgerow	S: Hedgerow/Treeline/Road	W: Hedgerow/Trees/Garden fences	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern/traditional – mix of two storey houses and bungalows to west (also traditional barns)				

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	A		G, N, 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:

Hutton Village Conservation Area abuts southern boundary.

Other Comments:

Large single field delineated by hedgerows. A129 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	Weakly associated to large built up area via boundary with housing off Goodwood Avenue. Relatively large scale countryside encroachment.
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 would lead to the encroachment of Hutton (Shenfield) towards Billericay and the interlying hamlet of Havering’s Grove, but would not cause Coalescence. Local high point if developed may offer some visibility from wider areas and other towns – filtered by interlying woodland/hedgerows.				

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:	Hutton Village Conservation Area abuts southern boundary.		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Site is weakly associated to Hutton via single boundary with Goodwood Ave. Abuts Hutton Village Conservation Area. Some minor narrowing of gap from Hutton to Billericay. Relatively large scale countryside encroachment.		

Site Size:	0.33 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: Priv:		E: Pub: Priv: L		W: Pub: Priv: L		0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Some changes in leaf cover during winter										
Site visual amenity:		Moderate				Locality visual amenity:		Good				

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	E: fence	S: fence	W: fence	
Buildings on Site:				Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern 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
	F			G	J/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: Community hall	

Heritage Assets/Notes:Other Comments:

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	
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:	Entirely within confines of existing settled area				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Pasture land
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 is well contained within built development area – comprises pasture land		

Site Size:	15.61 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: MS	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: H		S: Pub: M Priv: L/M		E: Pub: M/H Priv: M		W: Pub: M/H Priv:		0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes due to boundary tree cover										
Site visual amenity:		Good				Locality visual amenity:		OK-Good				

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/road	E: Trees/road	S: Trees/gardens/road/fence	W: Road/gardens/fence	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern/traditional – mix of two storey houses, apartments to SE. BT Offices to south – major business dev.				

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	A,F		G 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:

Abuts Historic Core of Brentwood – now BT Offices

Other Comments:

Land forms St Faiths Country Park – high promoted access

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	Broadly contained by Brentwood urban area and local road network. Some effect on openness due to scale of site but relative to existing urban area and wider land area also contained by A12
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:							

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 country park
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:	Immediately abuts former Historic Town extent and core of Brentwood (lies to South), albeit land now developed as modern BT Office complex		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Relatively well contained Site within Brentwood urban area. Land comprises open agricultural land and forms a Country Park. Also abuts former historic town core to south, albeit this are developed as modern office complex.		

Site Size:	53.03 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: S	S: M	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: M Priv:	E: Pub: M/H Priv: M	W: Pub: M/H Priv:	0	<u>Low</u> (1 - 10)	<u>Med</u> (10-20)	<u>High</u> (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Yes due to boundary tree cover							
Site visual amenity:		Good			Locality visual amenity:		OK-Good		

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/Trees/Fences	E: Hedge/Trees/road	S: Trees/hedge/ road	W: Trees/hedge/road	
Buildings on Site:	Y - farmsteads			Approx. Footprint:	<1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Modern/traditional – mix of two storey houses at western edge of Pilgrims Hatch. Local farmsteads and 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
	E	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:

Abuts Weald Country Park and RPG

Other Comments:

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 limits of Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood – generally separated by permanent pre-existing road barriers (A12 and A128)
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:	Overall, scale of Site would lead to a much wider settlement extent leading to less distinction between the Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood areas. A12 would always be separating barrier but perceptually settled areas would be viewed as one area.				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Weald country park to immediate west
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:	Abuts Weald area and Registered Park and Garden		

Overall Assessment

Overall Contribution of Site to Green Belt Purposes	Low	Moderate	High
Comments:	Large Site which will perceptually coalesce Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood, albeit roads separate areas. Abuts Registered Park and Garden and Country Park.		

Site Size:	1.77 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 Houses	S: Pub Priv		E: Pub Priv			W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv: L	S: Pub: Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: M Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Yes – dense surrounding tree cover – increased winter visibility assuming boundary trees retained								
Site visual amenity:	OK				Locality visual amenity:	Ok – Good (some detractors but woodland combines to provide screening and visual amenity)			

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: treeline/woodland	E: treeline	S: trees / hedge	W: trees / hedge/road	
Buildings on Site:	Y.- farmstead/barn			Approx. Footprint:	<5%
Adjacent Buildings:	Infant school to northeast of site. Modern housing to north				

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
	A	F	G	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:

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	Overall Not Contained - Edge of Doddinghurst settlement on opposite side of Church Lane from existing housing. Woodland to north defines extent of local school
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:	Overall, woodland combines to screen views between Doddinghurst and Kelvedon Hatch – some encroachment in to intervening gap.				

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 Size:	3.43 ha	Views Out (distance):	N: M/L	S: S	E: M/L	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 Byway				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv:	S: Pub: Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: M Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Some due to boundary hedgerow and trees – e.g. footpath to north								
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: Hedge/ fence/ footpath	E: tree line and hedge	S: tree line/garden fence	W: hedge fence and road	
Buildings on Site:	N			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	2 storey houses to the south. Farm buildings to north				

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		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:

Footpath north side of northern Site boundary. Byway to immediate west.

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	On balance Not Contained. Relatively large Site relative to local settled area. Very weakly abutting Ingrave at southwest corner
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:	Some long range views north to Hutton – but large degree 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	
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 Size:	6.12 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 Housing	S: Pub Priv Footpath			E: Pub Priv Footpath		W: Pub Priv Road and Houses	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv: L	S: Pub: L Priv:	E: Pub: L Priv:	W: Pub: L Priv: L	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Partial – Hedge on boundary will change slightly in winter. Surrounding tree cover to north							
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: hedge/trees/fence	E: hedge/tree line	S: hedge	W: hedge/fence + road	
Buildings on Site:	No – some sheds potentially			Approx. Footprint:	
Adjacent Buildings:	Semi-detached housing to west and north overlooking site				

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	B	E,F	G, 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 lies west of Hanging Hill Lane on edge of settlement area.

Road to west is natural physical boundary to settlement – but Site links to residential areas to north

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 is opposite side of road from main residential area – but abuts residential area to north. Considered an extension rather than discreet housing development –in part beyond existing settlement limits
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:	Site within the existing gap between Brentwood/Hutton area and Ingrave village - some limited intervisibility.				

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 of town	Moderate physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of town	Strong physical and/or visual relationship with Historic Town of 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:	Assessed Moderate – but note that Site would extend beyond existing settlement limits. Overall considered Partly contained under Purpose 1 due to links from residential area to north and relationship to housing to west.		

Site Size:	21.3ha	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 Houses	S: Pub Priv	E: Pub Priv	W: Pub Priv				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: M Priv: M	S: Pub: M Priv:	E: Pub: H Priv: H	W: Pub: H Priv: H	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:									
Site visual amenity:									
					Locality visual amenity:				

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: woodland , hedge fence and tree line	E: hedge fence	S: Hedge fence and tree line	W: hedge fence and tree line	
Buildings on Site:	Y – single farmhouse/dwelling			Approx. Footprint:	<1%
Adjacent Buildings:	Detached 2 storey houses to west and east of site (Doddinghurst/Wyatts Green + Hook End)				

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	A	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 comprises the countryside gap between Doddinghurst, Wyatt's Green and Hook End

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	Large Open Site but contained by local roads and surrounded on most sides by existing settlements – Wyatt’s Green, Doddinghurst and Hook End
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:	Coalescence between Wyatts Green and north of Doddinghurst				

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 would lead to coalescence of 3 settled areas in North Brentwood forming a single large settled or urban area		

Site Size:	0.86ha	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 Road		E: Pub Priv Housing		W: Pub Priv	
	Numbers:	N: Pub: Priv:	S: Pub: H Priv: L	E: Pub: Priv: L	W: Pub: Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:		Y – due to surrounding woodland tree cover to north, east and west							
Site visual amenity:		Locality visual amenity:							

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: Woodland	E: Woodland/Treeline / track/gardens	S: Shenfield Road	W: Woodland	
Buildings on Site:	Y – large dwelling (converted apartment?) and barn			Approx. Footprint:	<5%
Adjacent Buildings:	2 storey dwellings to east				

Maturity:	Full maturity: S L	Middle-aged: 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		A	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:

Contained by woodland to north and west.

Only northern half of Site falls within the Green Belt

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	South and southeast of site abuts on to A1023 and Shenfield settlement. Green Belt areas comprise agricultural land surrounded by woodland
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	Woodland features west of site.
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:	Woodland provides barrier but Site is within important gap between Shenfield and Brentwood				

Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment				
Criteria	LCF	MFC	FC	Comments:
Land-use:	e.g. Buildings	Mixed	Typical 'Countryside' uses	Dwelling in Non Green Belt area of Site – all of Green Belt area comprises typical 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:	Relatively small Site contained by woodland cover and adjacent to Shenfield		

Site Size:	2.6ha	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 School Golf	S: Pub Priv	E: Pub Priv	W: Pub Priv				
	Numbers:	N: Pub: L/M Priv: L/M	S: Pub: M/H Priv:	E: Pub: Priv:	W: Pub: M/H Priv:	0	Low (1 - 10)	Med (10-20)	High (21+)
Seasonal visibility:	Y – due to boundary vegetation cover at road side								
Site visual amenity:	Poor				Locality visual amenity:	OK - Good			

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: Road/treeline	E: Road/treeline/fence	S: Treeline/Fence	W: Road/tree line	
Buildings on Site:	Y – Commercial units and other buildings. Large car park			Approx. Footprint:	c. 60%
Adjacent Buildings:	School to north				

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	A	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:

McColl's Retail Group Limited - Business Park

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 does not abut settled area. Site is bound by A123 to the south and Ashwells Road to the north and east.
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:					

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 commercial uses and large car park dominate. Southern parts of Site comprise open grassland and tree cover Overall majority of Site has brownfield uses – but southern parts more have more natural landscaping
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:	Low/Moderate assessment primarily due to pre-existing commercial landuses at the Site. Southern parts of Site more open with naturalistic landscaping – these areas more sensitive in Green Belt terms.		