

Brentwood Borough Council

# Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment



**Final Report**

October 2011

# Brentwood Borough Council

## Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

### Final Report

October 2011

#### Notice

This report was prepared by Atkins Limited (Atkins) for Brentwood Borough Council (BBC) for the specific purpose of the Brentwood Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

This report may not be used by any person other than BBC without BBC's express permission. In any event, Atkins accepts no liability for any costs, liabilities or losses arising as a result of the use or reliance upon the contents of this report by any person other than BBC.

#### Document History

JOB NUMBER: 5089785.1525.001			DOCUMENT REF: Brentwood Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment			
1	Final Draft Report	L Thorne	D Brierley	D Brierley	L Thorne	24/05/2010
2	Final Report Client Review	H Trubshaw	M Bromley	D Brierley	H Trubshaw	08/04/2011
3	Draft Final Report	H Trubshaw		D Brierley	H Trubshaw	17/06/2011
4	Draft Final Report	H Trubshaw		D Brierley	H Trubshaw	17/08/2011
5	Final Report	H Trubshaw		D Brierley	H Trubshaw	28/10/2011
Revision	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Background &amp; Context</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3. Methodology &amp; Consultation</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4. Review of Assessment, Findings &amp; Housing Trajectory</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5. Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</b>	<b>39</b>

## List of Tables

Table ES/1: Overall Quantification of Housing Supply by Source

Table 2/1: Housing Provision (East of England Plan)

Table 2/2: Summary of BBC's Annual Monitoring Report 2010

Table 2/3: Urban Capacity Dwellings Summary

Table 3/1: Density Multipliers

Table 4/1: Overall Quantification of Housing Supply by Source

Table 4/2: Trajectory Period 1: 2010 – 2015 by Source

Table 4/3: Trajectory Period 2: 2015 - 2020 by Source

Table 4/4: Trajectory Period 3: 2020 - 2025 by Source

Table 4/5: Trajectory Period 4: 2025 – 2030 by Source

Table 5/1: Summary of Assessment & Trajectory Findings

## List of Appendices

Appendix 1: 'Call for Sites' Pro Forma

Appendix 2: Sites with Un-implemented Planning Consents

Appendix 3: Site Visit Pro-Forma

Appendix 4: Brownfield Sites Assessed & Deemed to Have Potential for Residential Development

Appendix 5: Brownfield Sites Assessed & Discounted for Residential Development

Appendix 6: Greenfield Sites Assessed & Deemed to Have Potential for Residential Development

Appendix 7: Greenfield Sites Assessed & Discounted for Residential Development

Appendix 8: Summary of Stakeholder Workshop Comments

Appendix 9: Summary of BBC Councillors Discussion Session Comments

Appendix 10: Sites Passed to ELR Team for Consideration for Employment/Mixed Use Development

Appendix 11: Brentwood Borough Housing Trajectory 2011 – 2025 (Source Appendix 3 AMR 2009/10)

# Executive Summary

## The Study

Atkins Limited (Atkins) has undertaken a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) on behalf of Brentwood Borough Council for the Brentwood Borough in accordance with the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Practice Guidance' produced in 2007. The Assessment was undertaken between October 2009 and May 2010. Atkins and Carter Jonas Limited (Carter Jonas) were commissioned by BBC to assist in this Assessment.

## The Need for the Study

Government Guidance in the form of Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' (PPS3), produced in November 2006, requires that Local Planning Authorities set out policies and strategies for delivering the Government's housing objectives through their Local Development Documents (LDDs) to enable a continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years.

PPS3 places an emphasis on the importance of housing delivery advising that sites should only be included as part of a housing supply where there is genuine evidence that a site is deliverable in the timeframe envisaged. For sites to be considered deliverable, they must be 'suitable, available and achievable'. In order to ensure that sufficient housing sites are delivered and that a continuous supply of land is maintained, PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to prepare a SHLAA for their administrative area. These assessments provide the main mechanism for identifying potential housing sites and assessing their deliverability. As such, SHLAAs represent a key part of the evidence base which supports LDDs.

The draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) continues to place an emphasis on the importance of housing supply stating that Local Authorities should 'identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing'. Local Authorities should also identify deliverable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6 - 10 and where possible years 11 - 15.

## The Housing Requirement for Brentwood

On 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010, The Coalition Government announced their intention to revoke all Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) with immediate effect. However, this revocation was ruled unlawful by the High Court on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010, resulting in the immediate re-instatement of all RSSs. Communities Secretary Eric Pickles immediately advised that the ruling 'changed very little' as the Government intend to abolish RSSs through the Localism Bill, and this intention should be deemed as a material consideration. The Government's Chief Planner issued a letter to this effect on the same day that the High Court ruling was issued.

The Localism Bill was presented to Parliament on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2010, outlined within the Bill was the Government's intention to abolish RSSs and transfer the power of strategic planning decisions to Local Planning Authorities. To this date the East of England Plan remains part of the Statutory Development Plan until the Localism Bill is enacted in November 2011 or formal notice had been

laid before Parliament. Consideration to the requirements of the East of England Plan is outlined below.

The East of England Regional Plan adopted in May 2008 requires that the Brentwood Borough provides 3,500 dwellings over the period 2001 to 2021. This equates to 175 dwellings per year of which at least 60% should be constructed on previously developed land. During the period April 2001 to March 2010, 1,795 dwellings were completed within the Brentwood Borough. This equates to 199 dwellings per annum (an extra 24 dwellings per annum) and indicates an oversupply above the Regional Plan requirements of 220 dwellings during that period.

Prior to the coalition Government's announcement to abolish all Regional Plans through the Localism Bill, the Regional Plan was being revised to consider the needs of the Region for the period 2011 to 2031. The Regional Plan Draft Review, which was published in March 2010 seeks to retain housing levels within Brentwood in line with current targets and requires that 3,400 dwellings (170 dwellings per annum) are constructed within the Borough during the period 2011-2031.

BBC is currently at an early stage of its Local Development Framework (LDF) preparation. Consultation on the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document ended on the 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2009. Further Issues and Options Workshops were held in January 2010. The high level consultation largely described the context of the Borough and discussed a variety of themes and issues which are likely to affect the development of the Borough both now and in the future. In discussing the future development of the Borough the document presented four alternative scenarios for future growth, which are:

- Option 1: Centralised Growth;
- Option 2: Transport Corridor Led Growth;
- Option 3: Semi-Dispersed Growth; and
- Option 4: Dispersed Growth.

Spatial Option 1 would direct all growth to within or adjacent to the Brentwood urban area, concentrating development on suitable infill plots, changes of use, redevelopment and urban extensions. Spatial Option 2 also focuses development on Brentwood but seeks to provide housing and jobs in other sustainable locations at Ingatestone and West Horndon that have existing and established public transport connections. Spatial Option 3 would result in semi dispersed growth across the Borough which would direct development to the main settlements of Brentwood, Ingatestone, West Horndon, Doddinghurst, Ingrave, Mountnessing and Blackmore. However this option would be more reliant upon the provision of new infrastructure. Finally, Spatial Option 4 would provide dispersed growth across all settlements in the Borough. This option would add vitality and viability to the smaller settlements across the administrative area.

## The Use of the Study

The Brentwood SHLAA has been produced to identify in a systematic manner, land likely to be suitable, available and achievable for housing development in the Borough to meet the currently adopted housing targets during the period 2010-2031. It also gives an insight into the ability to meet the proposed growth levels beyond the current Regional Plan's identified needs.

The SHLAA will serve as an evidence base document for BBC's emerging LDF. The findings of the SHLAA along with other Evidence Base Documents will be used to inform the Core Strategy and

Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) in relation to areas of growth and the need, if any, for the release of Greenfield land to meet housing requirements between now and 2031. It should be noted that the SHLAA is not a Site Allocations DPD and will not direct the Site Allocations DPD, but will merely serve as one piece of evidence taken into account in determining the location of housing development.

## The Assessment

Below are the Stages of the Assessment undertaken in accordance with Government Guidance. BBC undertook Stages 1 to 4 of the SHLAA with input and advice from Atkins and Carter Jonas

- Stage 1: Planning the Assessment;
- Stage 2: Determining which sources of sites shall be included in the SHLAA;
- Stage 3: Desktop Review of Existing Assessment; and
- Stage 4: Determining which sites and areas are surveyed.

Atkins and Carter Jonas then independently undertook Stages 5 to 8 of the SHLAA:

- Stage 5: Carrying out the Survey;
- Stage 6: Estimating the housing potential of each site;
- Stage 7: Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed; and
- Stage 8: Review of the Assessment.

At the outset of the Assessment, BBC initially identified 540 sites. Those sites which fell below a minimum site size threshold of 0.05ha or were covered by specific environmental designations (such as Flood Zone 3b, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Historic Parks and Gardens etc) were removed from the Assessment. Sites located within the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) were included within the Assessment. Given the coverage of the MGB in the Borough, to exclude sites would have meant that a significant percentage of sites identified would have to be removed from the Assessment at the outset. This exercise resulted in the removal of a total of 242 sites. The remaining 299 sites were taken forward for survey in the Assessment.

Site densities were calculated for each site using density multipliers. The density multipliers were developed for four key area types within the Borough which reflected the location, characteristics and existing development in these areas. These were:

- High Density: Minimum of 80 d/ph with no maximum density;
- Medium Density: Minimum of 40 d/ph with a maximum of 80d/ph;
- Low Density: Minimum of 30 d/ph with a maximum of 50 d/ph; and
- Very Low Density: Minimum of 20 d/ph with a maximum of 40 d/ph

The densities were not applied rigidly. Each site was assessed on its own merits taking into account the site characteristics, neighbouring development and area of the site suitable for development. Adjustments to the densities were then made as appropriate. Densities are net and are not prescriptive. They have been applied to give a reasonable estimate of likely dwelling capacity of each site.

Each of the 299 sites was visited by Atkins and Carter Jonas and assessed on the basis of suitability, availability and achievability for housing development. If sites were deemed to meet

these three criteria, then consideration was given to when the site may be likely to come forward for development. Each site was categorised as either having 'potential' for residential development or 'discounted' as not having potential for residential development. The sites were also categorised according to whether they were Brownfield or Greenfield.

Based on the findings of the assessment work undertaken, each of the sites identified as having potential for housing development were split down into the following four, 5-year housing trajectories based upon when they are likely to come forward for development:

- Trajectory 1: 2010 – 2015;
- Trajectory 2: 2015 – 2020;
- Trajectory 3: 2020 – 2025; and
- Trajectory 4: 2025 – 2030.

## Consultation

Four elements of consultation were undertaken at various stages of the study. These were:

- 'Call for Sites' requested at Stage 2;
- Stakeholder Workshop at Stages 5 & 6;
- BBC Councillors Discussion Session at Stages 6 and 7; and
- Open consultation on this Draft Report following Stage 8.

At the start of the Assessment, BBC advertised the undertaking of the SHLAA through various media with a 'Call for Sites' exercise which enabled anyone with a land interest to put forward a site for consideration within the Assessment. All sites which were put forward and met the specified criteria were assessed.

A Stakeholder workshop and a BBC Councillors Discussion session were held at the beginning of February 2010. These events enabled the methodology and approach to undertaking the SHLAA to be presented and discussed and feedback provided.

The draft report was published on BBC's website at the start of March for a period of 11 days. In respect of individual sites, BBC only wished to receive comments if they provided new information in respect of a site relating to its suitability, availability or achievability for residential development. Comments were not invited on the methodology for the study which was dealt with through the Stakeholder Workshop and Councillor's Discussion Session. Feedback on the draft report was taken into consideration when producing this final report.

## Key Findings

The Stage 7 assessment undertaken by Atkins and Carter Jonas considered the suitability, availability and achievability of 299 sites. The Assessment has identified that of these 299 sites, 26 Brownfield sites and 40 Greenfield sites have the potential to be developed for residential development over the period to 2031.

The Assessment discounted 78 Brownfield sites and 107 Greenfield sites as not presently having potential for residential development. A further 48 sites were discounted because they were either

duplicate sites or had already been built out. This is unsurprising given that a large number of the sites which were identified came from the 2002 Urban Capacity Study.

The Council's Annual Monitoring Report 2009/2010 also identified that there are (at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010) currently a total of 977 dwellings with unimplemented planning consent within the Borough, with a further 16 dwellings on a Local Plan allocated site.

An assessment of historic Windfall data indicated that the Borough receives an average of 78 dwellings per year from Windfall sites. Contributions to the Borough's housing supply need, however, only are included for the period 2021-2031.

A summary of the overall quantification of housing supply in the Borough as identified by the Assessment is summarised in Table ES/1.

**Table ES/1: Overall Quantification of Housing Supply By Source**

Ref	Source of Supply	Total Number of Sites	Total Dwelling Contribution
1	Brownfield Call for Sites	10	340
2	Brownfield Other	16	222
<b>Sub Total From Brownfield Sites</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>562</b>
3	Greenfield Call for Sites	29	3,538
4	Greenfield Other	11	67
<b>Sub Total From Greenfield Sites</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>3,605</b>
5	Extant Planning Permissions on Allocated Sites	5	549
6	Extant Planning permission on Unallocated Large Sites	8	269
7	Extant Planning Permission on Small Sites	-	159
8	Residual Allocated Sites	1	16
<b>Sub Total From Sites with Unimplemented Planning Consent</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>993</b>
9	Historic Windfall Completions (78 x 10 years – 2021-2031)	-	780
-	Over Supply from Completions During Period April 2001 to March 2010	-	220
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>66*</b>	<b>5,380**</b>

\* Acceptable SHLAA Sites Only 1-4

\*\* All Sites (excluding windfall)

## Key Conclusions from the SHLAA

Taking into account the current over supply from completions during April 2001 to March 2010 and the total from sites with unimplemented planning consent, the SHLAA indicates that there is an adequate amount of available land to meet the current and proposed housing requirements on Brownfield sites for the first 9.9 years (2010 – 2019/2020). The Local Authority may need to release a minimal amount of Greenfield land during this period to provide 0.1 years supply. During the second 10 years (2020 - 2030), other than a reliance on Windfall sites, there would be a minimal amount of Brownfield land (89 dwellings) to deliver the required housing supply. There would however be sufficient land available to meet the remaining requirement on Greenfield sites. Greenfield land may therefore need to be released during this period.

## Recommendations

The potential Greenfield release which may be required during the trajectory periods should be done through a detailed assessment of potential sites through BBC's Site Allocations DPD and would build upon the work done to date in this SHLAA.

The SHLAA represents a 'snapshot in time' in terms of the housing land availability position in the Brentwood Borough. Sites will be developed out and other, additional sites will become available for development over time. Some sites which have been discounted in this Assessment may become available for development or the constraints currently associated with them overcome. It is therefore important that the SHLAA is updated regularly to ensure that housing land availability is regularly monitored and the SHLAA kept up to date.

Due to the economic climate, current slowdown in the housing market and changes to national planning policy, it is considered appropriate to update the SHLAA on an annual basis for at least the next two years. This will help to ensure that information on sites and supply remains up to date and will also record at an early stage, any flurries of activity which may take effect once an upturn in the market.

**It is recommended that readers of this document take account of the 'Caveats & Key Points to Remember' set out in within Section 1 of this report.**

# 1. Introduction

## Appointment

- 1.1 Atkins Limited (Atkins), in conjunction with Carter Jonas Ltd (Carter Jonas) was commissioned by Brentwood Borough Council (BBC) in October 2009 to undertake a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as an evidence base to inform BBC's emerging Local Development Framework. The SHLAA (hereafter referred to as 'the Assessment') was undertaken between October 2009 and May 2010.

## The Study

- 1.2 The SHLAA has been undertaken in accordance with the staged approach set out in the 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Practice Guidance' produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in 2007. This guidance recommends that SHLAAs are undertaken in the following 10 stages:

**Stage 1:** Planning the Assessment;

**Stage 2:** Determining which sources of sites shall be included in the SHLAA;

**Stage 3:** Desktop Review of Existing Assessment;

**Stage 4:** Determining which sites and areas are surveyed;

**Stage 5:** Carrying out the Survey;

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

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

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

**Stage 9:** Identifying and assessing the housing potential of broad locations; and

**Stage 10:** Determining the potential of Windfalls (where justified).

- 1.3 BBC undertook Stages 1 to 4 of the SHLAA with advice and input from Atkins. Atkins then independently undertook Stages 5 to 8 inclusive of the assessment with assistance from Carter Jonas. Following the publication of this report, BBC will determine whether Stages 9 and 10 of the assessment are required.

## The Need for the Study

- 1.4 Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' (PPS3) which was published in 2006 requires Local Planning Authorities to undertake a SHLAA to provide an assessment of the opportunities which exist for housing development in their administrative area. The Assessment acts as a tool to identify all sites with potential for housing within the Borough and when they are likely to be developed. PPS 3 also requires Local Planning Authorities to identify and maintain a five year rolling supply of deliverable land for housing. This means that BBC must identify sufficient sites which are capable of delivering housing land over the first five years of the Local Development Framework (LDF) period.
- 1.5 The SHLAA will serve as an evidence base document for BBC's emerging LDF, the suite of documents being produced to replace the Adopted Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005. The findings of the SHLAA will indicate whether there is sufficient land available in the Borough to accommodate the community's need for more homes over the next 20 years. The findings of the SHLAA will therefore be used in part to inform the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) in relation to areas of growth and the need, if any, for the release of Greenfield land to meet housing need between now and 2031. It should be noted that the SHLAA is not a Site Allocations DPD and will not direct the Site Allocations DPD, but will merely serve as one piece of evidence taken into account in determining the need for, and location of, site allocations for housing development.

## Caveats & Key Points to Remember

- 1.6 There are a number of important issues which must be considered when referring to the results of this study. These are:
- The Assessment provides a 'snapshot' in time and is based on the information available at the time of undertaking the study. It is not possible to identify every site which may at some point in time be suitable, available and achievable for development. Additional sites which may be identified over time will be assessed when the study is reviewed on an annual or bi-annual basis.
  - Sites assessed within the study have been considered on the basis of the information available and have been assessed as either having 'potential' for residential development or 'discounted' for clearly specified reasons. These assessments are independent, professional judgements made by Atkins and Carter Jonas based on the information available at the time.
  - If a site is identified as having 'potential' for residential development, this does not mean that a planning consent will be forthcoming or that the site will be included as a Site Allocation in the BBC's forthcoming Site Allocations Document. All planning applications will be considered in detail on their merits. Conversely, if a site has been 'discounted' in this study, it does not mean that this site may not be considered as suitable, available and achievable at a later date should circumstances change which mean that the reasons for discounting the site are removed or overcome.
  - Densities applied to individual sites within this Assessment are not fixed. They have been applied based upon the circumstances of individual sites and the localities in which they sit and based on the information available at this time. All densities are net. They have been applied to demonstrate the likely level of residential development that could be accommodated

on each site and are not prescriptive. It will be the responsibility of detailed design exercises for individual planning applications and the Site Allocations Development Plan Document to determine the exact density and mix of residential development suitable for any particular site.

- It is recommended that the Assessment is updated by BBC on an annual basis. This will be undertaken in parallel with the production of the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and will include an update of the housing trajectories. This will ensure that the findings of the study are kept up to date and that the identified housing supply in the District is regularly monitored. This will also enable BBC to consider any additional sites which may be identified and/or any additional information which may arise in relation to the sites assessed in this Study. Once the residential development market returns to a more stable level, this review is likely to be undertaken on a bi-annual basis.
- Windfall sites have been included for the second 10 years of the trajectory and are based on historic completions from this source over the past 10 years. This data will continue to be monitored and recorded each year and used to update the likely annual supply from this source over the trajectory period. If necessary the likely supply from these sources will be adjusted to demonstrate decreased or increased provision as appropriate.
- It is recognised that not all sites with planning permission/unimplemented consents may come forward for development. However, it is not possible to quantify what percentage of sites will come forward. Therefore it has been assumed that sites with existing planning permissions/unimplemented consents will come forward within the first five years of the housing trajectory or are otherwise likely to have expired. The annual review of the SHLAA will monitor this to ensure that as sites are implemented or fall out of the system, this information is recorded and an up to date and clear picture of implemented and expired planning permissions is obtained. This will be used to inform the housing trajectories.

## Relationship with Brentwood & Epping Forest Employment Land Review

- 1.7 In parallel to this SHLAA, BBC, in conjunction with Epping Forest District Council (EFDC), has undertaken an Employment Land Review (ELR) to identify all sites with the potential for employment use within the two administrative areas. The ELR was undertaken by Atkins and completed in September 2010. Undertaking assessments of different uses in parallel with each other is highlighted as best practice in recent Central Government guidance and ELRs and SHLAAs. By undertaking these two studies in parallel, an exchange of information on the assessed sites has been undertaken to ensure that any sites discounted for one use, were also assessed in terms of their potential for the other use. This also applies to sites which may have been suitable for mixed use development. Further details are provided in Section 3 of this report.

## Report Structure

- 1.8 This report is divided into five Sections. Following on from this introduction, Section 2 of the report sets out the background and policy context to the study and study area, whilst Section 3 sets out the full details of Atkins' scope of work and methodology for undertaking the SHLAA. Section 4 sets out the findings of Stages 5 to 8 and also provides a Housing Trajectory for the Borough based on these findings. Section 5 of the report provides conclusions to the Assessment and recommendations for the future. Details of all assessed sites are provided within the appendices to the report.

## 2. Background & Context

### Characteristics of the Brentwood Borough

- 2.1 The Borough of Brentwood covers an area of approximately 15,300 hectares and is home to approximately 71,500 people (2007 estimate). The Borough is situated in the south-west of the county of Essex, immediately to the east of the Greater London Metropolitan area. The Borough is located entirely within the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB). As such over 80% of the Borough is categorised as rural and comprises of villages set within an attractive rolling landscape, comprising a mix of agricultural land, woodland and parks.
- 2.2 In terms of landscape quality, there are three distinct landscape character areas in the Borough, the River Valley (to the north-west), wooded farmland (the majority of the Borough) and fenland (to the south). The majority of these areas are considered to have relatively high sensitivity to change. In addition, the Borough has three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a number of County and Local Wildlife Sites all afforded protection by national, regional and local planning policies. The Borough contains 13 Conservation Areas, 518 Listed Buildings and 12 Scheduled Ancient Monuments which are also protected by national, regional and local planning policies.
- 2.3 The majority of the Borough is at low risk from flooding. The areas at most risk are those surrounding existing watercourses, the most significant area being along the River Roding.
- 2.4 Approximately 50,000 people live within the contiguous urban area of Brentwood. Ingatestone is the largest village settlement. The remaining settlements are smaller villages and hamlets. The town of Brentwood is separated from Greater London by a narrow gap of open land through which passes the M25 Motorway. The close proximity to London means that the Borough is well located in relation to the national and regional road and rail networks.
- 2.5 The road and rail network also provides easy access to Stanstead Airport (via the M11), London City Airport and Southend Airport, as well as both Gatwick and Heathrow Airports via the M25. Connections can also be made with port facilities at Tilbury to the south and the East Coast ports of Harwich and Felixstowe. The Thurrock/Dartford Crossing also provides access to the south coast ports and the continent via the Channel Tunnel.
- 2.6 Such locational advantages have meant that Brentwood has been, and will continue to be, an attractive choice for both businesses and housing. The Borough is therefore subject to considerable pressures for development. The Green Belt, however, acts as a significant constraint.

## National Planning Policy & Guidance

### *Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing'*

- 2.7 Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' (PPS3) provides guidance on planning for housing and requires that Local Planning Authorities set out policies and strategies for delivering the Government's housing objectives. In pursuit of this, Paragraph 53 requires Local Authorities to set out in their Local Development Documents (LDDs) policies and strategies for delivering the level of housing provision, including broad locations and specific sites that will enable the continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years.
- 2.8 In developing housing policies and strategies, Local Authorities must have due regard to the housing requirements set out for their administrative area in the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy. Failure to identify sufficient housing supply may result in their LDDs being found to be unsound at Independent Examination.
- 2.9 PPS3 places an emphasis on the importance of the delivery of housing sites advising that sites should only be included as part of the housing supply where there is genuine evidence that a site is deliverable within the timeframe envisaged. For sites to be considered deliverable, they must be 'available, suitable and achievable'. Once sites have been identified, PPS3 requires that Local Authorities manage the supply of land to ensure that a continuous five year supply can be maintained.
- 2.10 In order to ensure that sufficient housing sites are delivered and that a continuous supply of land is maintained, PPS3 requires Local Authorities to prepare a SHLAA for their administrative area. These assessments provide the main mechanism for identifying potential housing sites and assessing their deliverability. As such, SHLAAs represent a key part of the evidence base which supports LDDs.
- 2.11 The Government has produced practice guidance to assist Local Planning Authorities in the preparation of their SHLAAs. This guidance sets out the broad approach that should be followed and where the individual SHLAAs adopt an alternative approach this should be justified. In preparing the methodology for the Brentwood SHLAA, the Borough Council has followed the approach in the practice guidance. The Council has also sought to consult on the methodology, process and draft findings with a range of stakeholders.

### *Supplement to PPS 1: Planning & Climate Change (2007)*

- 2.12 The Supplement to PPS1 sets out the Government's policies in respect of integrating the need to tackle the issue of climate change in the planning system. In assessing and determining the suitability and scale of sites for development account should be taken of the following:
- The potential of new development to contribute to renewable or low-carbon energy consumption;
  - A realistic choice of access by means other than the private car;
  - The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure to service the site;

- The ability to build and sustain socially cohesive communities;
- The effect of development on biodiversity and its capacity to adapt to likely changes in the climate;
- Opportunities for open space and green infrastructure to urban cooling, sustainable drainage systems, and conserving and enhancing biodiversity; and
- Known physical and environmental constraints on the development of land.

2.13 In deciding on areas and sites to identify for development, priority should be given to those that will perform well against the above criteria.

*Draft National Planning Policy Framework (July 2011)*

2.14 The draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is currently out for consultation which culminates on 17th October 2011. This Framework aims to streamline the current Planning Policy Statements into one document. Delivering sustainable development remains at the forefront of planning policy and the document stipulates that sustainable development can be delivered through the following means:

- Planning for prosperity;
- Planning for people; and
- Planning for Places.

2.15 The document continues that these three objectives should be 'pursued in an integrated way' to ensure that there is a presumption in favour of economic development.

2.16 With regard to housing, the NPPF seeks to 'boost' the supply of high quality, mixed tenure housing to create inclusive sustainable communities. There is a continued emphasis placed on the Local Planning Authority to provide a rolling five year housing land supply of "*specific deliverable sites*". The Framework also states that an "*additional allowance of at least 20 per cent to ensure choice and competition in the market for land*". As in PPS3: Housing, Local Planning Authorities are not encouraged to allow for windfall sites within the first 10 years of housing supply. With regard to density, Local Authorities are encouraged to "*set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances*".

## Regional Planning Policy & Guidance

2.17 On 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010, The Coalition Government announced their intention to revoke all Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) with immediate effect. However, this revocation was ruled unlawful by the High Court on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010, resulting in the immediate re-instatement of all RSSs. Communities Secretary Eric Pickles immediately advised that the ruling 'changed very little' as the Government intend to abolish RSSs through the Localism Bill, and this intention should be deemed as a material consideration. The Government's Chief Planner issued a letter to this effect on the same day that the High Court ruling was issued.

2.18 The Localism Bill was presented to Parliament on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2010, outlined within the Bill was the Government's intension to abolish RSSs and transfer the power of strategic planning decisions to Local Planning Authorities. To this date the East of England Plan remains part of the

Statutory Development Plan until the Localism Bill is enacted in November 2011 or formal notice had been laid before Parliament.

*The East of England Plan (May 2008)*

2.19 The East of England Plan sets the planning policy framework for the period to 2021 whilst also setting the vision, objectives and strategy for the longer term sustainable growth of the Region. The Plan seeks to secure sustainable forms of development to sustain and improve the quality of life for people who live, work and visit the region. A key component of the Plan is the Spatial Strategy for the Region. For the Borough this means:

- The provision of the appropriate amount of growth in housing, employment, public transport and other facilities to continue to support an urban and rural renaissance (Policy SS4).
- Brentwood is identified as a settlement within the London Arc and is therefore subject to Policy LA1, which seeks to continue to restrain development within the MGB and support the use of green infrastructure whilst encouraging urban regeneration and greater sustainability in urban areas (Policy LA1).
- It is considered that Brentwood should retain and develop its existing role within the London Arc's polycentric settlement pattern, recognising and making as much provision for new development within the built-up area as possible without disturbance of Brentwood's character and identity (Policy LA1).
- The Regional Plan also seeks to encourage Brentwood to work with Local Authorities in Greater London and their neighbours, to ensure that opportunities to develop new public transport routes are exploited to support sustainable development opportunities, within the wider area but also ensuring the provision of local routes (Policy LA1).
- As stated above, the broad extent of the Green Belt is appropriate and should be maintained. Brentwood is not identified as a location for a strategic review of the Green Belt (Policy SS7);
- The Plan sets an indicative target of 56,000 new jobs in the 'Rest of Essex' (Braintree, Brentwood, Chelmsford, Epping Forest, Harlow, Maldon and Uttlesford) (Policy E1). The Plan requires that LDDs provide sites of sufficient range, quantity and quality at appropriate locations to meet this need.

2.20 In terms of housing provision, Policy H1 of the Plan requires that the Brentwood LDF makes provision for 3,500 dwelling between 2001 and 2021. This equates to an average of 175 dwellings per annum and is a minimum target. The identified need for the County as a whole and Brentwood are summarised in Table 2/1 below.

**Table 2/1 - Housing Provision (East of England Plan)**

Area/District	Minimum Dwelling Provision 2001 to 2021 (net increase, with annual average rates in brackets)		
	Minimum to build	Of which already built	Minimum still to build
	April 2001 to March 2021	April 2001 to March 2006	April 2006 to March 2021
Brentwood	3,500	920 (180)	2,580 (170)
Essex, Thurrock & Southend*	127,000	28,380 (5,670)	98,620 (6,580)

\*Essex, Thurrock and Southend numbers include Harlow urban extensions in East Hertfordshire.

*The East of England Plan >2031: Draft Revision (March 2010)*

- 2.21 Although the East of England Plan was only published in May 2008, the Government asked the East of England Assembly to carry out an immediate review, in particular to make provision for the East of England’s development needs for the period 2011 to 2031. This is because Regional Plans should set out a long term strategy for at least 20 years but the current Plan now only covers the next 12 years. The current Plan therefore needs to be rolled forward to 2031 to allow industries and public authorities to plan for the challenges and opportunities ahead. The Draft Revision document published in March 2010 seeks to take the Region forward to 2031 and deepen and refresh key policy areas where necessary.
- 2.22 The Draft Revision sets a target of 500,700 new dwellings within the Region over the period 2011 to 2031 and requires that Local Planning Authorities plan for the delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption of their relevant Development Plan Documents. For the Brentwood Borough, the Draft Revision seeks to retain housing provision at levels similar to current rates, requiring the provision of 3,400 new dwellings over the period April 2011 to March 2031. This equates to the provision of 170 dwellings per annum.

## Local Planning Policy & Guidance

*Brentwood Local Plan ‘Saved’ Policies*

- 2.23 Following the introduction of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, a number of the policies within the Brentwood Local Plan have expired and only the ‘saved’ policies remain as the approved Development Plan. Having due regard to the SHLAA the ‘saved’ policies of relevance are discussed below:
- **Policy CP2: New Development and Sustainable Transport Choices** seeks to reduce the need to travel by private car and improve accessibility to other modes of transport. Therefore new development should be located in close proximity to encourage sustainable transport choices.

- **Policy H5 ‘Changes to the Use of Upper Floors’ and H8 ‘Conversions’** permit the conversion of upper floors of commercial development into residential and the sub-division of dwelling houses respectively.
- **Policy H14 ‘Housing Density’** requires that residential development should be of an appropriate density that makes efficient use of land but retains the special character of the surrounding area. Residential densities under 30 dwellings per hectare are not considered to be acceptable by the Council unless special circumstances dictate otherwise. Densities of up to 65 dwellings per hectare are considered to be acceptable in areas where there are good public transport connections or District or Town centres.
- With regard to residential development, **‘Hutton Mount’** is afforded its own policy, **Policy H15** which dictates the density and distribution of development. The policy requires a minimum plot size of 0.1ha per dwelling, a minimum building line frontage of 18.3m and a minimum distance of 1.2m of any building to the plot boundary.
- **Policy GB1 ‘New Development’** offers protection to the Metropolitan Green Belt, reiterating the RSS policies and restricting new development within the Green Belt. **Policy GB2 ‘Development Criteria’** states that when considering proposals for redevelopment, the Local Authority will be mindful that the development does not undermine the Green Belt objectives, affect public rights of way or harm any existing landscape features.
- **Policy GB3** identifies **‘Settlements Excluded from the Green Belt’** these are listed as:
  - Blackmore;
  - Brentwood;
  - Doddinghurst;
  - Herongate;
  - Hook End;
  - Ingatestone;
  - Ingrave;
  - Kelevdon Hatch;
  - Mountnessing;
  - Stondon Massey;
  - West Horndon; and
  - Wyatts Green.
- Finally, **Policy GB4 ‘Established Areas of Development’** permits change of use, new residential development on infill plots, replacement of existing dwellings or extensions to existing dwellings in areas of established ribbon development subject to a number of criteria. The established areas are:
  - 169-293 Chelmsford Road;
  - 39-47, 51-109 Coxtie Green Road;
  - 1-19 Bellhouse Lane between Coppersfield and Greenoaks, Doddinghurst Road;
  - 1-13 (excluding 2), 21-56 (excluding 24,26) Nags Head Lane;
  - The Thorns/The Briars, Ongar Road;
  - 54-88 Billericay Road; and
  - 554-664 Rayleigh Road.

*Brentwood Borough Council Local Development Framework*

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Issues and Options Consultation Document)

- 2.24 BBC is currently at an early stage of its LDF preparation. Consultation on the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document culminated on the 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2009. Further Issues and Options Workshops were held in January 2010. The high level consultation largely described the context of the Borough and discussed a variety of themes and issues which are likely to affect the development of the Borough both now and in the future. In discussing the future development of the Borough the document presented four alternative scenarios for the future growth, which are:
- Option 1: Centralised Growth;
  - Option 2: Transport Corridor Led Growth;
  - Option 3: Semi-Dispersed Growth; and
  - Option 4 Dispersed Growth.
- 2.25 Spatial Option 1 would direct all growth to within or adjacent to the Brentwood urban area, concentrating development on suitable infill plots, changes of use, redevelopment and sustainable urban extensions. Spatial Option 2 also focuses development on Brentwood but seeks to provide housing and jobs in other sustainable locations of Ingatestone and West Horndon that have existing and established public transport connections. Spatial Option 3 would result in semi dispersed growth across the Borough which would direct growth to the main settlements of Brentwood, Ingatestone, West Horndon, Doddinghurst, Ingrave, Mountnessing and Blackmore. However this option would be heavily reliant upon the provision of new infrastructure. Finally, Spatial Option 4 would provide dispersed growth across all settlements in the Borough. This option would add vitality and viability to the smaller settlements across the administrative area.

*Annual Monitoring Report (December 2010)*

2.26 The Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) was published in December 2010 and details the dwelling completions across the Borough between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010. The AMR outlines that at the end of the 2009/2010 period dwelling completions have been slightly higher than the Adopted Regional Plan cumulative rate (1,795 dwellings compared to 1,575 dwellings) as detailed in Table 2/2 below.

**Table 2/2: Summary of BBC's Annual Monitoring Report 2010**

Year	2001/ 2002	2002/ 2003	2003/ 2004	2004/ 2005	2005/ 2006	2006/ 2007	2007/ 2008	2008/ 2009	2009/ 2010
<b>Net Actual Completions in the Borough</b>	182	263	204	151	116	218	244	251	166
<b>Total Cumulative Net Completions in the Borough</b>	182	445	649	800	916	1134	1378	1629	<b>1795</b>
<b>Regional Plan Annual Average Completion Rate</b>	175	175	175	175	175	175	175	175	175
<b>Regional Plan Cumulative Completion Rate</b>	175	300	525	700	875	1050	1225	1,400	<b>1575</b>

2.27 Table 2/2 above demonstrates that the current completions exceed the RSS targets by approximately 220 dwellings (1,795 dwelling completions against 1,575 required completions), therefore the remaining dwellings left to build within the RSS period (2001-2021) equates to 1,705 dwellings. These are to be delivered over the remaining 11 year period to 2021 (inclusive of 2010/11) and equate to 155 dwellings per annum for the remainder of the RSS period. Appendix 3 of the Annual Monitoring Report 2009/2010 outlines that there are currently 977 dwellings within the Borough benefiting from unimplemented planning consent, a further 16 dwellings form part of a residual housing allocation.

2.28 Dwelling completions during 2010/11 period are predicted to rise to approximately 251 during the year ending 30<sup>th</sup> April 2011. This would further decrease the required annual average completions in order to meet the approved RSS requirements.

## Housing Delivery in Brentwood

### *Urban Capacity Study 2001 - 2011(2002)*

- 2.29 The production of the Urban Capacity Study (UCS) was based on the guidance detailed in Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 'Housing' (PPG3) which has since been replaced by PPS3 (as detailed above) and the need to produce a SHLAA. However, the UCS is considered to be of relevance, and a large number of sites identified within the study have been considered within the SHLAA.
- 2.30 The role of the UCS was to concentrate the majority of new development within the urban area, therefore preventing urban/suburban sprawl and maintaining the openness of the countryside and Green Belt. The UCS also sought to make the best use of previously developed land and buildings and assessed the capacity of the urban area to accommodate more housing.
- 2.31 Discounting sites of 0.4ha or less the UCS identified two alternative scenarios for the number of dwellings to be delivered on identified sites. The first scenario was based on an average density multiplier and the second was based on a higher density multiplier, the results of which are detailed in Table 2/3 below.

**Table 2/3 – Urban Capacity Dwellings Summary**

	Average Density	Higher Density
Intensification/Redevelopment	648	895
Subdivision	0	33
Flats over Shops	10	30
Review of Local Plan Allocations	13	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>974</b>

- 2.32 The average density figures represent the minimum number of units that the Council would anticipate to come forward upon the identified sites. The higher density number represents an aspirational figure that the Council would consider acceptable based on the application of the relevant policies and standards.

### *London Commuter Belt Strategic Market Housing Assessment*

- 2.33 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was produced in 2010 and covers the administrative areas of Brentwood, Broxbourne, East Hertfordshire, Epping Forest, Harlow and Uttlesford. The document provides an understanding of how housing markets operate and assess the need and demand for housing.
- 2.34 In consideration of Brentwood, the SMHA states that Brentwood is in need of 3,200 dwellings in the period 2007 to 2026 of which, a total of 300 market houses are required, 2,100 intermediate affordable dwellings and 1,000 social rented dwellings. The study therefore, clearly highlights issues of affordability within the Borough. However it is noted that although there is a low

requirement for additional market housing in Brentwood it does not mean that none should be built. In practice developers will continue to bring sites forward for planning consent where they believe a market exists. It is also essential to deliver housing growth in a sustainable way.

- 2.35 The development of the SMHA has included consultation and involvement with partners and stakeholders to develop a Housing Market Partnership (HMP). This process enabled those involved to share and pool information and intelligence, and help to ensure that SHMA findings are regularly reviewed, assist in the analysis and interpretation of housing market intelligence and consider the implications of the assessment. A viability assessment of the SHLAA is currently underway.

## The Brentwood SHLAA

- 2.36 The Brentwood SHLAA has been produced to identify in a systematic manner, land likely to be suitable, available and achievable for housing development in the Borough to meet the currently adopted housing targets during the period 2010-2031 and gives an insight into proposed growth levels beyond the current Regional Plan requirements.
- 2.37 The assessment has been produced with the intention that it will not be a rigid document but subject to change over time. This will allow for flexibility to take into account changes in both the planning system and housing and employment markets. The Borough Council will also give due regard to SHLAAs that are being undertaken and have been completed in neighbouring Local Planning Authority areas. In view of this the SHLAA will need to be updated annually as part of the Annual Monitoring Report process and feed into the Borough Council's implementation strategies.

## 3. Methodology & Consultation

### General

- 3.1 The Brentwood SHLAA has been undertaken in accordance with the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments Good Practice Guidance' (2007).

### Stages 1-3: Planning the Assessment, Determining Sources to be Included & Desktop Review of Existing Information

- 3.2 The initial stages of the Assessment were undertaken by BBC with input from Atkins and Carter Jonas. The timescales for undertaking the assessment were identified with a start date for the Assessment of October 2009 and a completion date of May 2010. BBC identified the key sources of sites to be considered in the assessment as follows:
- Sites identified in the Brentwood Urban Capacity Study 2002;
  - Sites identified as a result of enquiries to and discussions with BBC Development Control;
  - Sites known to BBC as a result of historic planning permissions;
  - Sites with unimplemented planning consents; and
  - Site identified through an open 'Call for Sites' exercise.
- 3.3 At the outset of the project, BBC invited all interested parties to put forward sites for consideration in the study which they felt had the potential to be suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The 'Call for Sites' was advertised on BBC's website from 11th November 2009 and letters were sent to parties who had previously expressed an interest to BBC in being involved in the SHLAA. The 'Call for Sites' exercise was also advertised in BBC's 'Vision' magazine, a quarterly publication, delivered to all households in the Borough.
- 3.4 A pro-forma was provided for interested parties to complete to ensure that as much information as possible could be gained for each suggested site in a consistent and co-ordinated manner. The deadline for receipt of site suggestions through the Call for Sites exercise was 4<sup>th</sup> December 2009. A total of 98 sites were suggested through the Call for Sites exercise. All of these sites were considered in the Assessment. A copy of the pro-forma is attached as Appendix 1.
- 3.5 Historic Windfall completion data was also identified as a source of supply to be reviewed. PPS3 sets a clear expectation that the supply of land for housing should be based upon specific sites and where necessary broad locations. It does however recognise that there may be genuine local circumstances where a Windfall allowance is justified.<sup>1</sup> Due to their nature, it is difficult to estimate the contribution which Windfall sites may make to a supply. The DCLG Practice Guidance suggests that an estimate should be identified by reviewing historic Windfall completion data and

---

<sup>1</sup> Windfall sites are those which have not been specifically identified as available but comprise previously developed sites that have unexpectedly become available. For example, large sites resulting from a factory closure or small sites such as a residential conversion or a new flat over a shop.

identifying an annual average completion rate. A review of BBC's historic Windfall data has identified an average annual completion rate of approximately 78 dwellings per annum<sup>2</sup>.

- 3.6 PPS 3 advises that Windfall contributions should not be included within the first 10 years of a housing supply unless Local Planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified. In these circumstances, an allowance should be included but should be realistic having regard to the SHLAA, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends. It was considered appropriate at this stage to assess historic Windfall completions for the Borough based on average annual completion rates, but only include them in the potential housing supply post 2020. However, given BBC's location within the Green Belt, there could in the future be genuine local circumstances that would deem it appropriate to include Windfalls earlier in the trajectory.

## Stage 4: Determining Which Sites & Areas will be Surveyed

- 3.7 104 sites with unimplemented planning consents were identified during Stages 2 and 3. It was agreed that sites which were identified as having an unimplemented but unexpired planning consent would not be surveyed. The information relating to planning consents is based on the latest Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) produced in December 2010 for the period up to April 2010 and is considered to be the most up to date information available. As these sites have planning consent and therefore the principal of residential development on the sites has been accepted, it was not considered necessary to re-survey these sites. As all of these consents have either a three or five year validity, then they will either be completed or come forward for development within the next five years or will expire. It is therefore considered that these sites would contribute to the first five years of housing supply within the Borough and the Assessment has therefore treated them in this way. A list of the sites and consents is attached at Appendix 2.
- 3.8 Approximately 540 sites were identified during Stages 2 and 3. A sieving exercise was then undertaken to determine which sites should be surveyed. A minimum site size threshold was set at 0.05ha and any sites which fell below this were removed from consideration and survey in the Assessment. Sites were also excluded from the Assessment if they were covered by any of the following designations:
- Flood Zone 3b (high probability of flooding and incompatible with residential development);
  - Historic Parks and Gardens;
  - Scheduled Ancient Monuments;
  - Sites of Special Scientific Interest; and
  - Local Nature Reserves.
- 3.9 Sites located within the Green Belt were not excluded from the Assessment. To do so would have meant that a significant percentage of the sites identified would have to be removed from the Assessment at the outset. It was determined that the results of the Assessment would identify whether or not there would be any requirement for the release of Green Belt land and that it would be the role of the LDF documents to determine what and where this should be at a later stage.

---

<sup>2</sup> Future windfalls have been estimated based on an annual average small site completion rate of 48 dwellings (net), which equates to the average for the period 1996/97 to 2007/08. There is an annual average large site windfall completion rate of 30 dwellings (net) arising from those permissions and projected completion rates over the period 2001-2013.

## Stage 5: Carrying Out the Survey

- 3.10 A total of 299 sites were taken forward for assessment. Each site was visited by two members of the Atkins team between November 2009 and January 2010. Sites were also visited by Carter Jonas in January 2010.
- 3.11 Prior to the site visits being undertaken by Atkins, a site visit pro-forma was developed. The pro-forma was designed to ensure that all of the sites were surveyed in a consistent manner and provided a checklist of issues to be considered when assessing each site. A copy of the site pro-forma is attached at Appendix 3.
- 3.12 The physical attributes and characteristics of each site were recorded by Atkins in accordance with Stage 5 of the DCLG Practice Guidance. The physical attributes of each site facilitated Atkins in undertaking Stage 6 'Estimating the Housing Potential of Each Site' and Stage 7 'Assessing When and Whether Sites are Likely to be Developed'.

## Stage 6: Estimating the Housing Potential of Each Site

- 3.13 Based on Government Guidance, the densities applied in the 2002 Urban Capacity Study, historic and recent completion rates and future aspirations of BBC, a range of density multipliers were developed which reflect the character and existing development densities in the various parts of the District. These density multipliers were developed for four key types of area, the existing high density areas which include Brentwood and Shenfield Centres and those main roads coming out of these centres, the medium density suburbs and district/village centres, the low density outer villages and the very low density rural areas. Carter Jonas provided input to these figures using their knowledge of the local area, the local market and the needs and aspirations of local developers. The densities set out in Table 3/1 overleaf were then agreed for application to sites identified as having potential for residential development later in the study.

**Table 3/1: Density Multipliers**

Name	Description	Areas Included	Density for SHLAA (dwellings per hectare)	
			Min	Max
High	Close to central shopping areas/ transport nodes with good access to facilities. Predominantly flats, apartments and terraced housing.	Brentwood centre, Shenfield centre plus sites on the main roads coming out of these centres	80	No Max
Medium	Suburban town areas, comprising mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached houses OR smaller district/village centre, close to transport connections and local services.	Brentwood suburbs, Shenfield suburbs, Ingatestone centre (within 500m of centre), West Horndon centre (within 500m of centre), Doddinghurst centre, plus those sites adjoining the edges of Brentwood and Shenfield suburbs	40	80
Low	Villages and outer suburbs, comprising detached and semi-detached properties on narrow plots.	All other villages, including sites adjoining the edge of villages	30	50
Very Low	Large detached and semi-detached properties. Rural and edge of urban areas	Rural and remote areas detached from services and facilities	20	40

- 3.14 It was considered appropriate that densities were applied to sites using both the figures set out in Table 3/1 above and through best judgement based on the characteristics of the site and surrounding area. Based on the information gathered from the site surveys, sites were placed into one of the four locational categories. For a significant number of sites, density multipliers were then applied as appropriate from that specific locational range. However, some sites, for example, where only frontage or infill development was deemed to be appropriate or where sites were only capable of realistically accommodating a very small number of dwellings, best judgement was used to determine an appropriate number of dwellings for the site/plot without the need to apply the locational multipliers.
- 3.15 Density judgements were also made in respect of specific sites based on recent development trends in that locality, identified constraints which would render parts of some sites undevelopable or where stand offs would be required for environmental or amenity reasons etc, potential S106 requirements (e.g. provision of public open space etc) and where additional information was provided by landowners/developers which indicated that densities may need to be increased or reduced.

- 3.16 It should be noted that the densities applied to each of the sites are net figures and are not fixed. They have been applied based on the characteristics of a site, its location and the surrounding development to identify the amount of development that the site may be capable of accommodating. They represent reasonable estimates and are not prescriptive. It will be the role of detailed design at the planning application stage and through the production of the Site Allocations DPD to identify the exact residential capacity and dwelling mix for a site. It is however considered that such fluctuations are likely to offset one another with losses on one site offset by gains on another.
- 3.17 Caution has been built into the density multipliers and their application. In areas where densities are high such as the town centre sites and edge of centre sites, recent trends would suggest that these locations would include a high proportion of flats/apartments and in the current climate such units are not proving to be popular. However, as there are likely to be some variations in the types of developments on these sites and also the popularity of some sites, it was considered appropriate to retain the densities for these locations at this stage but to apply the densities with caution.

## Stage 7: Assessing When & Whether Sites are Likely to be Developed

- 3.18 In addition to the assessment of the physical attributes of each site, each site has been assessed by Atkins and Carter Jonas on the basis of its:
- Suitability for housing development;
  - Availability for housing development; and
  - Achievability of housing development.

### Stage 7a: Assessing the Suitability for Housing

- 3.19 In considering suitability for housing development, sites were assessed by Atkins and Carter Jonas on the basis of whether or not the site was situated in a suitable location for housing and whether the site for housing would contribute to the creation of a sustainable mixed community. Consideration was given to the location of the site in relation to essential services such as shops, schools and public transport. In addition, the following issues were also assessed:

#### Policy Restrictions

- Is the site covered by an existing planning policy specifying appropriate/acceptable use?
- Is the site covered by any local designations?
- Are there any Listed Buildings on or adjacent to the site?
- Does the site form part of a larger policy/strategy area?

#### Physical Problems & Limitations

- Is there an existing access to the site (vehicular/pedestrian), is this adequate, can a new access be provided?
- Is there potential for the site to be polluted or contaminated from existing or previous uses?
- Are there any evident ground conditions which may impact upon development?

- Is the site in an area at risk from flooding/any watercourses on site?
- Are there any hazards on or adjacent to the site?
- Are there any potential noise/air quality issues?
- Would the topography of the site restrict development?

#### Potential Impacts

- Would the development have detrimental impacts upon/loss of landscape features?
- Would the development result in detrimental/positive impacts upon conservation/heritage features?
- Would the development have adverse impacts upon neighbouring uses or residents?

#### Environmental Conditions

- Would development of the site result in an attractive residential environment?
- Are neighbouring uses appropriate/compatible with residential development?

## Stage 7b: Assessing Site Availability for Housing

3.20 Each site was assessed on the basis of its likely availability for housing. A number of observations were made whilst undertaking the site visits and supplemented by further investigations. Such measures included:

- Site checks for potential shared access issues, requirements for land take to provide access etc;
- Site observations checking for Agent's boards supplemented by follow up phone calls to check site availability;
- Follow up of site information provided by landowners who suggested sites for inclusion within the SHLAA; and
- Intelligence gathering from Local Agents on sites being promoted by them or which their clients may own or have an interest in.

3.21 The methods set out above enabled a realistic assessment to be made as to whether or not sites were immediately available for development and if they were not considered to be immediately available, when they may become available. In the current economic climate with many developers halting work or in some instances going out of business, this information is particularly important. Carter Jonas used their local knowledge of sites, operators and landowners to assist in gaining this information.

## Stage 7c: Assessing Site Achievability for Housing

3.22 Once each site had been assessed on its suitability and availability for housing, consideration was given to the prospects of each site being realistically developed at a particular point in time. Each site was assessed in relation to the following:

### Market Factors

- What is the current market demand?
- What is the potential future market demand?
- What is the land value for residential use on the site versus the existing use and potential competing uses?
- How attractive is the location for residential development?
- What is the projected rate of sale for the site?

### Cost Factors

- Are there any significant site preparation/remediation costs?
- Are there any measures required to address identified constraints?
- Are there any relevant planning obligation costs which may affect viability?
- Will public funding need to be sought and if so, is funding available to help to meet any abnormal costs/funding gaps?

### Delivery Factors

- What are the realistic build out rates for each site?
- Is site development likely to be phased?
- Is the site going to be delivered by a single developer or several developers?
- What is the size and capacity of the developer?

3.23 The consideration of this information enabled realistic and informed views to be made as to when a site was likely to commence development and how long it would take to build out. This enabled an estimation to be made as to over what period of time dwellings constructed on a site were likely to be contributing to the housing supply in the District. It was assumed that a reasonable assumption for outputs from large development sites would be 100 dwellings per annum. This figure was derived from discussions with local agents and developers on the basis of the current and anticipated future market.

## Stage 7d: Overcoming Constraints

3.24 As part of the assessment work undertaken in Stages 7a-c inclusive, where constraints to successfully developing a site for residential development were identified, consideration was given to whether it was possible to overcome these constraints. If it was deemed possible to overcome identified constraints, an assessment was then made as to whether the measures required would retain the viability of the site for residential development.

3.25 Identified constraints varied from those which were easy to overcome (e.g. allowing for stand-offs within a development, reducing the overall developable area of a site and only identifying part of a site as having potential for development) to those which were more fundamental (e.g. ransom strips and the need to obtain land in a number of ownerships to enable development to go ahead). In some instances, the measures for overcoming constraints were identified as being easy to implement and not likely to adversely affect viability to unacceptable levels. Therefore, subject to being suitable sites in all other respects, these sites were able to remain in the Assessment as

suitable, available and achievable sites. Other sites which had constraints that could not be overcome or which would reduce viability to unacceptable levels were discounted.

### Recording of Site Assessment & Data Collection

3.26 Each site assessed has been summarised in tabular format to provide a quick reference guide to the suitability, availability and achievability of each site. Sites were categorised as follows:

- Potential Brownfield Sites;
- Potential Greenfield Sites;
- Discounted Brownfield Sites; and
- Discounted Greenfield Sites.

3.27 A copy of the tabular databases is provided in Appendix 4 – 7 inclusive.

### Consultation

3.28 Four elements of consultation were undertaken at various stages of the study. These were:

1. 'Call for Sites' request at Stage 2;
2. Stakeholder Workshop at Stages 5 & 6;
3. BBC Councillors Discussion Session at Stages 6 and 7; and
4. Open consultation on Draft Report following Stage 8.

#### Call for Sites Request

3.29 Full details of the 'Call for Sites' request is set out within paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 above. The 'Call for Sites' pro-forma provided for interested parties to complete is attached at Appendix 1.

#### Stakeholder Workshop

3.30 A workshop was held with stakeholders on 10th February 2010 to present the methodology being used for the SHLAA and enable attendees to ask questions and discuss the various elements of the study in small groups. Representatives from the following organisations were invited to attend the workshop:

- BBC Housing Services\*
- Brentwood Borough Council Officers;
- Essex County Council\*;
- GO East;
- East of England Development Agency
- Council for the Protection of Rural Essex\*;
- Rural Community Council for Essex\*;
- Environment Agency;
- Homes & Communities Agency;
- Lighthouse;

- Network Rail;
- Rural Housing Trust;
- Essex Design Initiative;
- North East London Foundation Trust\*\*;
- The Highways Agency\*;
- Anchor Trust
- Circle Anglia;
- Estuary Housing;
- Home Group;
- Brentwood Housing Trust\*;
- London & Quadrant Group;
- Sanctuary Housing;
- Springboard Housing;
- Genesis Housing;
- Swan Housing \*;
- Flagship Housing;
- GEE Homes\*;
- East Thames Housing Association\*;
- AGS Property Consultants;
- Alan Pipe & Partners;
- Alan Wipperman & Co\*;
- Andrew Martin Associates\*;
- Bidwells;
- Colliers CRE\*;
- Countryside Properties\*;
- Croudace Strategic Limited\*;
- David Russell Associates;
- DPP LLP;
- Drivers Jonas\*\*;
- Gilmartin Ley;
- Hilbery Chaplin\*;
- Icen Projects\*;
- J Hancock & Associates\*;
- John Daldry Partnership\*;
- JTS Partnership;
- Lambert Smith Hampton\*;
- Robert Savage & Associates;
- Robin Escott Planning for Trueloves;
- Strutt & Parker;
- Sworders\*;
- The Livemore Partnership;
- Whirledge & Nott;
- Zada Capital Limited\*;
- Bellway Estates;
- Countryside Properties; and
- Taylor Wimpey.

- 3.31 The workshop was attended by 25 representatives from the above organisations and included a mix of agents/developers, BBC and Essex County Council representatives, housing associations and environmental protection groups. An \* on the list above denotes attendance by one or more representatives. All attendees were given the opportunity to comment further after the workshop if required. Although the National Housing Federation was not invited to the Stakeholder Workshop, they will be invited to comment on this draft report.
- 3.32 Comments raised at the workshop were varied. There was a wide range of comments on the densities that were to be applied with some attendees commenting that they felt the figures were a little on the high side, some attendees feeling they were just right and some feeling they were a little low. Some attendees felt that high density developments including flats were not required in Brentwood and that the local population wanted large dwellings. Other attendees disagreed with these comments and felt that the market would reflect what was required as and when planning applications came forward.
- 3.33 It was agreed the method of using density multipliers whilst also applying judgements to the appropriate density for development on a site based on its character and surroundings should be used. Therefore in identifying appropriate densities to determine the potential capacity of a site, all information gathered during the site surveys have been used to ensure that a blanket density approach is not used. Each site has therefore been considered individually.
- 3.34 A number of questions were asked regarding sustainability and it was agreed that the SHLAA was more of an overview process and that detailed sustainability appraisals of the Greenfield sites included in the SHLAA as having potential for residential development would be undertaken as appropriate by BBC when preparing the Site Allocations DPD. It should be noted that the SHLAA is an evidence base document and not the Site Allocations DPD. It is one of many pieces of evidence which will inform that document when it is produced.
- 3.35 Questions were also raised regarding the assessment of the sites and whether sites could be considered partially suitable for residential development if a section of the site was suitable, available and achievable but other parts of the site were not. It was agreed that sites would be assessed in this manner. Where constraints need to be overcome to ensure that sites or sections of sites can be developed adequately and it is considered that this is possible, then comments to this effect are provided in the summaries to each of the sites.
- 3.36 It was agreed at this workshop that the draft SHLAA report would be made available for stakeholders to view.
- 3.37 A full summary of the comments made and issues raised at the workshop are attached as Appendix 8.

#### BBC Councillors Discussion Session

- 3.38 A presentation was made to members of Brentwood Borough Council on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2010. The presentation set out details of why and how the study was being undertaken. Questions and feedback were invited from members following the presentation. The following members attended the session:

- Councillor Linda Golding;
- Councillor Michael Golding;
- Councillor Reg Straw;
- Councillor Mike Le-Surf;
- Councillor David Minns;
- Councillor Roger McCheyne;
- Councillor Alan Braid;
- Councillor Jan Pound; and
- Councillor David Tee.

3.34 A summary of the comments from this session is attached at Appendix 9.

Open Consultation on Draft Report

3.35 The draft SHLAA report was placed on BBC's website for a period of 11 days at the start of March 2010 so that interested parties could make comments if required. In respect of individual sites, BBC stated that they only wished to receive comments if they provided new information in respect of a site relating to its suitability, availability or achievability for residential development. Comments were not invited in respect of the methodology used for the study as this was consulted on through the Stakeholder Workshop and Councillor's Discussion Session. Comments received were taken into consideration when producing the final report.

## Co-ordination with the Employment Land Review

3.36 Atkins completed a Joint Employment Land Review (ELR) for BBC and Epping Forest District Council in September 2010. Some sites assessed as part of this Assessment have been discounted for residential development but may have potential for employment development. Therefore details of these sites were passed to the ELR team within Atkins for consideration in the ELR.

3.37 Some sites which were assessed as part of the SHLAA have been identified as having potential for mixed use development including an element of residential and employment development. These sites were also passed onto the ELR team and their comments obtained on the suitability of the sites for mixed use development from an employment perspective. These comments have assisted in the assessment of such sites. Conversely, any sites identified in the ELR which may be more appropriate for consideration for residential development were passed to the SHLAA team.

3.38 A list of the sites considered by the SHLAA and passed to the ELR team for consideration is attached as Appendix 10.

## 4. Review of Assessment, Findings & Housing Trajectory

### Stage 8: Review of the Assessment

- 4.1 Following a review of all assessment work in Stage 7, a review of all data collected was undertaken to enable an indicative housing trajectory to be prepared, which sets out how much potential housing land is available for development over the next 20 years.

### Key Findings

- 4.2 The Stage 7 assessment undertaken by Atkins and Carter Jonas considered the suitability, availability and achievability of 299 sites. The Assessment has identified that of these 299 sites, 26 Brownfield sites and 40 Greenfield sites have the potential to be developed for residential development over the period to 2031 in addition to the 977 dwellings with unimplemented planning consent within the Borough and the 16 units on the outstanding Local Plan allocation.
- 4.3 The Assessment discounted 78 Brownfield sites and 107 Greenfield sites as not presently having potential for residential development. The remainder of the sites, 48 in total either comprised duplicate sites or had already been built out. This is unsurprising given that a large number of the sites which were assessed came from the 2002 Urban Capacity Study.
- 4.4 An assessment of historic Windfall data indicated that the Borough receives an average of 78 dwellings per year from Windfall sites. It has been decided that contributions to the Borough's housing supply from Windfall sites will only be included for the period 2021-2031 at this stage. Trends in contributions from Windfall sites will continue to be monitored by BBC through the annual review of the SHLAA. This will ensure that assumptions regarding these contributions remain up to date and that the appropriate level of contribution is assumed, if appropriate, going forward.
- 4.5 During the period April 2001 to March 2010, a total of 1,795 dwellings were constructed in the Borough against the Regional Plan Requirement of 1,575 dwellings for that period. This equates to an additional 220 dwellings which can be carried forward when considering future supply.
- 4.6 A summary of the overall quantification of housing supply for the Borough as identified by the Assessment is set out in Table 4/1 overleaf.

**Table 4/1: Overall Quantification of Housing Supply By Source**

Ref	Source of Supply	Total Number of Sites	Total Dwelling Contribution
1	Brownfield Call for Sites	10	340
2	Brownfield Other	16	222
<b>Sub Total From Brownfield Sites</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>562</b>
3	Greenfield Call for Sites	29	3,538
4	Greenfield Other	11	67
<b>Sub Total From Greenfield Sites</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>3,605</b>
5	Extant Planning Permissions on Allocated Sites	5	549
6	Extant Planning permission on Unallocated Large Sites	8	269
7	Extant Planning Permission on Small Sites	-	159
8	Residual Allocated Sites	1	16
<b>Sub Total From Sites with Unimplemented Planning Consent</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>993</b>
67	Historic Windfall Completions (78 x 10 years – 2021-2031)		780
-	Over Supply from Completions during Period April 2001 – March 2009	-	220
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>66*</b>	<b>5,380**</b>

\*Acceptable SHLAA Sites Only 1-4

\*\* All dwellings(excluding windfall)

- 4.7 As Table 4/1 demonstrates, the potential identified sites could provide a total of 5,380 dwellings (excluding Windfall completions) across sites over the period 2010 - 2030. Of this total, approximately 562 dwellings could be provided on Brownfield sites and 3,605 dwellings provided on Greenfield sites. In addition, a total of 977 dwellings arising from sites with planning consent and an additional 16 from a residual housing allocation.
- 4.8 Overall the Assessment demonstrates that approximately 562 dwellings could be constructed within the Borough on Brownfield sites. Based on an annual requirement of 170 dwellings per annum, this equates to approximately 3.3 years supply. However of this total 473 are assessed as coming forward within the first 10 years, which equates to 2.7 years supply. In addition a further 5.8 years supply is derived from sites with un-implemented planning consent and the 16 dwellings allocated in the Local Plan. The oversupply of 220 dwellings carried forward from the period April 2001 to March 2010 equates to a further 1.3 years supply. The total supply from just three sources, therefore, equates to some 9.9 years supply, or just over the first half of the twenty year period 2010-2030.
- 4.9 In addition, approximately 780 dwellings may come forward from Brownfield sites post 2020 as a result of Windfall completions. This equates to approximately 4.5 years additional supply.
- 4.10 The Assessment demonstrates that approximately 3,605 dwellings could be constructed within the Borough on Greenfield sites. Based on an annual requirement of 170 dwellings per annum, this equates to approximately 21.2 years supply.

- 4.11 When considering the overall supply against the housing targets set out within the Regional Plan and the Regional Plan Draft Review to 2031, it is evident that there is sufficient land supply to meet the growth target. However, it should be noted that to meet the target, there would need to be some release of Greenfield land and this would be likely to include Green Belt land.

## Housing Trajectory

- 4.12 Based on the findings of the assessment work undertaken in Stage 7, each of the sites identified as having potential for housing development have been split down into the following four, 5-year housing trajectories based upon when they are likely to come forward for development:
- Trajectory 1: 2010 – 2015;
  - Trajectory 2: 2015 – 2020;
  - Trajectory 3: 2020 – 2025; and
  - Trajectory 4: 2025 – 2030.
- 4.13 Where a site is capable of accommodating a large number of dwellings and therefore is unlikely to be completed within one trajectory period, the site is identified in more than one trajectory period to reflect this. The identified trajectory for each of the sites deemed to have potential for residential development is shown in the site summaries contained in Appendix 4 and Appendix 6.
- 4.14 It is not possible to accurately quantify the percentage of Brownfield and Greenfield sites contained within the 220 dwelling current oversupply from the period April 2001 to March 2010. As all of this oversupply has already been built, for the purposes of the trajectories, the oversupply is assumed to come from Brownfield site completions. It is also not possible to quantify the percentage of Brownfield and Greenfield sites with unimplemented planning consent contained within the 977 dwellings. However it has been assumed that given the time constraints attached to any planning consent, the consented dwellings would be constructed within the period 2010 – 2015/16 (as outlined in Appendix 3 of BBC's AMR 2009/2010 (Appendix 11)).
- 4.15 The four housing trajectories are set out in Table 4/2 to 4/5 overleaf.

Table 4/2: Trajectory Period 1: 2010 – 2015 by Source

TRAJECTORY PERIOD 1: 2010-2015	
Housing Supply Source	Contribution
Brownfield Call For Sites	284
Brownfield Other	37
Windfall Contributions	N/A
Greenfield Call for Sites	516
Greenfield Other	41
Oversupply Carried Forward from Completions during the Period April 2001 to March 2010	220
Extant Planning Permissions on Allocated Sites	496
Extant Planning Permissions on Unallocated Large Sites	269
Extant Planning Permissions on Small Sites	159
Residual Allocated Sites	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,022</b>
<b>Total Contribution Required (5 Year Supply)</b>	<b>630**</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Greenfield</b>	<b>+557</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Brownfield</b>	<b>+321</b>
<b>Oversupply to be carried forward from Completions during the Period April 2010 – March 2015*</b>	<b>+294</b>

\*Only those dwellings highlighted in Appendix 11 would be rolled over into Trajectory 2. In accordance with Brentwood Borough Council's Annual Monitoring Report it is assumed that all of the dwellings with existing unimplemented planning consent (924) would be constructed during this period, this would result in an oversupply of 294 dwellings which can be counted as an oversupply in Trajectory 2. The planning applications need to be closely monitored to ensure that once implemented the consents are not included in future Trajectory Periods

\*\*Total Supply over the 5 year period reduced from 170 dwellings per annum to 126 dwellings per annum to take into account the current oversupply during the period 2001-2010.

4.16 It can be seen from Trajectory 1 that the total number of dwellings required to meet the 126 dwelling a year target from 2010 to 2015, of 630 dwellings can easily be met from Sites with existing unimplemented planning consent. There should therefore be no requirement within this period to release any Greenfield land for development. Indeed, there is surplus Brownfield capacity of 321 dwellings and an oversupply of 294 dwellings that can be taken forward into Trajectory 2.

Table 4/3: Trajectory Period 2: 2015 – 2020 by Source

TRAJECTORY PERIOD 2: 2015-2020	
Housing Supply Source	Contribution
Brownfield Call For Sites	56
Brownfield Other	96
Windfall Contributions	N/A
Greenfield Call for Sites	1,707
Greenfield Other	26
Oversupply Carried Forward from Completions during the Period April 2010 to March 2015	294
Extant Planning Permissions on Allocated Sites	53*
Extant Planning Permissions on Unallocated Large Sites	0
Extant Planning Permissions on Small Sites	0
Residual Allocated Sites	16*
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>2,248</b>
<b>Surplus Brownfield Carried Forward From Trajectory 1</b>	<b>321</b>
<b>Surplus Greenfield Carried Forward From Trajectory 1</b>	<b>557</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,126</b>
<b>Total Contribution Required (5 Year Supply)</b>	<b>487**</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Greenfield</b>	<b>+2,276</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Brownfield</b>	<b>-14</b>

\*See Appendix 11: Brentwood Borough Housing Trajectory 2011 – 2025. Only 53 dwellings of the 977 have been rolled over into Trajectory 2 as it is assumed that the other commitments would have been built during Trajectory 1. This would result in an oversupply of 294 dwellings which has also been rolled over into Trajectory 2.

\*\*Total Supply over the 5 year period reduced from 170 dwellings per annum to 98 dwellings per annum to take into account the oversupply during the period 2010-2015.

4.17 Trajectory 2 demonstrates that a total of 473 dwellings could be provided on Brownfield land during the Trajectory 2 period (2015 – 2020). This includes the oversupply carried forward from Trajectory 1 (321 dwellings), and those dwellings that benefit from either an existing planning permission or Local Plan allocation. An additional 14 dwellings would be required from Greenfield release.

Table 4/4: Trajectory Period 3: 2020 – 2025 by Source

TRAJECTORY PERIOD 3: 2020-2025	
Housing Supply Source	Contribution
Brownfield Call For Sites	0
Brownfield Other	54
Windfall Contributions	390
Greenfield Call for Sites	1,025
Greenfield Other	0
Oversupply Carried Forward from Completions during the Period April 2015 to March 2020	0
Extant Planning Permissions on Allocated Sites	0
Extant Planning Permissions on Unallocated Large Sites	0
Extant Planning Permissions on Small Sites	0
Residual Allocated Sites	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1,469</b>
<b>Surplus Brownfield Carried Forward from Trajectory 2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Surplus Greenfield Carried Forward from Trajectory 1 &amp; 2</b>	<b>2,276</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,745</b>
<b>Total Contribution Required (5 Year Supply)</b>	<b>850</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Greenfield</b>	<b>+2,895</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Brownfield</b>	<b>- 406</b>

4.18 Based on current site suitability and availability, it is likely that over half of the dwellings (444 dwellings) of the 850 required within Trajectory 3 (2020-2025) would be provided on Brownfield sites. These 444 dwellings would come from Windfall sites and from Brownfield provision identified as being suitable, available and achievable within Trajectory 3. It is therefore likely that the remainder of the dwelling provision (406 dwellings) would be met from Greenfield sites. It should be noted that the release of Green Belt land may be required to meet this requirement.

Table 4/5: Trajectory Period 4: 2025 – 2030 by Source

TRAJECTORY PERIOD 4: 2025-2030	
Housing Supply Source	Contribution
Brownfield Call For Sites	0
Brownfield Other	35
Windfall Contributions	390
Greenfield Call for Sites	290
Greenfield Other	0
Oversupply Carried Forward from Completions during the Period April 2020 to March 2025	0
Extant Planning Permissions on Allocated Sites	0
Extant Planning Permissions on Unallocated Large Sites	0
Extant Planning Permissions on Small Sites	0
Residual Allocated Sites	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>715</b>
<b>Surplus Greenfield Carried Forward from Trajectories 1, 2 &amp; 3</b>	<b>2,895</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,610</b>
<b>Total Contribution Required (5 Year Supply)</b>	<b>850</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Greenfield</b>	<b>+2,760</b>
<b>Capacity: Surplus/Deficit Brownfield</b>	<b>-425</b>

- 4.19 Trajectory 4 demonstrates that there would be limited Brownfield supply available within the period 2025 – 2030, a total of 425 dwellings could be provided on Brownfield land. All other provisions would need to come from Greenfield sites. The release of Green Belt land may be required based on the assessment at this stage.

## 5. Conclusions & Recommendations

### Key Conclusions

- 5.1 Atkins and Carter Jonas were appointed by BBC to provide input and advice into Stages 1 to 4 and undertake Stages 5 to 8 of the Brentwood SHLAA. The SHLAA is the main mechanism for identifying potential housing sites within the Brentwood Borough and assessing their deliverability in order to ensure that sufficient housing sites are delivered and that a continuous supply of land is maintained.
- 5.2 The East of England Plan requires that the Brentwood Borough accommodate 3,500 new dwellings over the period 2001 – 2021. This equates to 175 dwellings per annum. Of these 175 dwellings, at least 60% should be developed on previously developed, Brownfield land. The current Draft Review of the East of England Plan, which rolls the plan forward to 2031, seeks to retain housing growth in Brentwood at similar levels to the 2008 Regional Plan and requires the provision of 3,400 dwellings (170 dwellings per annum) over the period 2011-2031. During the period April 2001 to March 2010, average annual completion rates averaged 199 dwellings per annum, approximately 24 dwellings per annum above the Regional Plan requirement. This equates to an oversupply of 220 dwellings during that period. Furthermore, the draft NPPF requires the five year supply of deliverable housing sites to include provision for an additional 20 per cent, to ensure choice and competition in the land market.
- 5.3 The Stage 5 to 7 Assessment undertaken by Atkins and Carter Jonas considered the suitability, availability and achievability of 299 sites. The Assessment has identified that of these 299 sites, 26 Brownfield sites and 40 Greenfield sites could be developed for housing over the period 2010 – 2030. In addition, there are 977 dwellings with un-implemented consents and an additional 16 dwelling allocated in the Local Plan.
- 5.4 The 66 sites identified as having potential for residential development have a combined dwelling capacity of approximately 4,167 dwellings. Approximately 562 of these dwellings could be achieved from the development of Brownfield sites, whilst approximately 3,605 could be achieved from Greenfield sites. In addition a further 977 dwellings already benefit from planning consent and a further 16 benefit from a Local Plan allocation. The remainder of the supply, approximately 780 dwellings, could be achieved from Windfall sites. A further 220 dwellings are provided within the Assessment from sites which have already been completed during the period April 2001 to March 2010 and therefore represent a current oversupply. Table 5/1 overleaf provides a summary of the findings.

**Table 5/1: Summary of Assessment & Trajectory Findings**

	Trajectory Period 1: 2010 - 2015	Trajectory Period 2: 2015 - 2020	Trajectory Period 3: 2020 – 2025	Trajectory Period 4: 2025 - 2030	Total
<b>Total Brownfield Capacity Over Trajectory Period</b>	321	152	54	35	562
<b>Total Greenfield Capacity Over Trajectory Period</b>	557	1,733	1,025	290	3,605
<b>Brownfield Capacity From Windfalls</b>	N/A	N/A	390	390	780
<b>Sub Total Capacity over Trajectory Period</b>	878	1,885	1,469	715	4,947
<b>Over Supply during period Apr 2001 – Mar 2010</b>	220	N/A*	N/A	N/A	220
<b>Planning Permission on allocated, unallocated and residual allocations (Appendix 11)</b>	924	69	NA	N/A	993
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,022 (924 with PP)</b>	<b>1,954 (53 with PP &amp; 16 RA)</b>	<b>1,469</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>6,160 (993 with PP/RA)</b>

\*There would be an actual oversupply of 294 dwellings with unimplemented planning consent rolled over from Trajectory 1. To avoid double counting these are included as Sites with Planning Permission.

## Conclusions on the Trajectory Figures

- 5.5 The summary shows that during Trajectory 1, approximately 2,022 dwellings which equates to approximately 11.8 years supply. All of the required 850 dwellings required during Trajectory 1 (2010 – 2015) could come forward from sites that already benefit from planning consent. Indeed, during Trajectory 1, there exists the potential for Brownfield sites to be developed which would

provide 1.88 years housing supply at 170 dwellings per annum. The overall five year supply requirement in this period is reduced from 850 dwellings (170 dwellings per annum) to 630 dwellings (approximately 126 dwellings per annum) to take account of the current oversupply of 220 dwellings achieved during the period April 2001 to March 2010. No Windfall sites have been accounted for in Trajectory 1. An oversupply of 321 Brownfield dwellings can therefore be rolled forward into Trajectory 2 along with 557 Greenfield dwellings, in addition to 294 dwellings constructed from existing consents. There should therefore be no requirements within this period to release any Greenfield land for development.

- 5.6 Again the overall supply requirement in Trajectory 2 has been reduced from 170 dwellings per annum to 98 dwellings per annum, to take into account the oversupply of dwellings with planning consent carried over from Trajectory 1. All of the required 487 dwellings could be provided in Trajectory 2 with land identified as being suitable, available and achievable to deliver approximately 2,248 dwellings over the period 2015 – 2020. This equates to approximately 13.3 years supply (at 170 dwellings per annum). The additional rollover of Brownfield provision from Trajectory 1 means that the majority of all of the dwellings required during Trajectory 2 could be delivered on Brownfield sites. There would be a deficit of 14 dwellings which may need to be provided on Greenfield land (based on the assessment at this stage). A cumulative oversupply of 2,276 Greenfield Dwellings can be rolled forward into Trajectory 3.
- 5.7 Looking at Trajectory 3 (2020 – 2025), approximately 45% of Brownfield provision in this period is likely to be from Windfall completions which would account for 390 dwellings if historic Windfall rates continue (approximately 2.2 years supply). A further 54 dwellings could be provided on Brownfield sites which have been identified as being suitable, available and achievable within this period. Greenfield sites would need to be released in this period to accommodate the remaining 406 dwellings (2.4 years supply). There is capacity within this Trajectory period, as a result of surplus roll over from Trajectories 1 and 2, for 2,895 dwellings to come forward from Greenfield sites. Based on the assessment at this stage there may need to be some release of Greenfield sites in this period.
- 5.8 Trajectory 4 demonstrates provision from Windfall sites that total approximately 390 dwellings (approximately 2.2 years supply) during the period. A further 35 dwellings would be derived from Brownfield land. Based on the assessment so far all surplus requirements may need to come from Greenfield sites. However, given the over provision in the previous three trajectories of Greenfield sites, meeting this requirement should not be a problem. This will need to be monitored over the whole preceding 15 year period. Greenfield sites would need to be released within this period to accommodate at least 425 dwellings. This equates to 2.5 years supply.

## Overall Conclusions & Recommendations

- 5.9 The Brentwood SHLAA is now at the end of the Stage 8 'Review of the Assessment' in the SHLAA process. Overall there exists sufficient potential housing land to meet the East of England Regional Plan identified need of 175 dwellings per annum (3,500 dwellings over a 20 year period) and the targets set out within the March 2010 Draft Review of the Regional Plan (3,400 dwellings over a 20 year period/170 dwellings per annum).
- 5.10 During the first ten years (2010 – 2020) of the trajectory period the provision can be provided on Brownfield land or on sites that currently benefit from planning consent. The second ten years of the trajectory period (2020 – 2030) sees a reliance on Windfall sites (4.4 years provision) and Greenfield land to deliver the required housing numbers. However, it should be acknowledged

that as the SHLAA is constantly updated new Brownfield land that is currently discounted may become suitable, available and achievable for housing.

- 5.11 The potential Greenfield release which may be needed during the SHLAA period (2020 – 2030) should be done through a detailed assessment of potential sites through BBC's Site Allocations DPD and would build upon the work done to date in this SHLAA.
- 5.12 It should be noted that in developing the housing trajectories and considering whether and when each potential site may come forward for development, an element of caution has been applied to ensure that a realistic, sufficient timeframe has been given to each site. This acts as a risk assessment to ensure that the number of dwellings likely to come forward at one time is not over-estimated.
- 5.13 The SHLAA represents a 'snapshot in time' in terms of the housing land availability position in the Brentwood District. As aforementioned, sites will be developed out and other, additional sites will become available for development over time. Some sites which have been discounted in this Assessment may become available for development or the constraints currently associated with them overcome. It is therefore important that the SHLAA is updated regularly to ensure that housing land availability is regularly monitored and the SHLAA kept up to date.
- 5.14 Atkins and Carter Jonas would normally recommend that the SHLAA is updated on a bi-annual basis. However, due to the current economic climate, the slowdown in the housing market and recent changes to planning policy, it is considered appropriate to update the SHLAA on an annual basis for at least the next two years. This will help to ensure that information on sites and supply remains up to date and will also record at an early stage, any flurries of activity which may take effect once an upturn in the market takes effect.

## **Appendix 1:**

# **Call for Sites Pro Forma**



# Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 'Call for Sites'

## Site Suggestion Form

### Brentwood Borough Council

Brentwood Borough Council is preparing a Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment and is inviting local residents, developers, landowners and businesses to suggest sites that they consider might be suitable for residential development. The Council needs to collect information on such land in order to assess sites with the potential to accommodate future development needs in the Borough.

It is important to note that this is just a preliminary assessment. The identification of a site at this stage does not guarantee that it will be allocated for residential development or that planning permission would be granted. All sites will need to be assessed against relevant planning policies, suitability and other considerations.

All site submissions should be accompanied by a clear and accurate site plan. This should be at an appropriate scale and must clearly show the location and boundaries of the site. Where the site has more than one ownership, the areas of separate ownership should also be shown. Electronic site plans should be provided in JPEG format.

Please send completed submission forms and site plans to:

- **E-mail** [planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk)
- **Post** Holly Gilbert, Planning Policy Team, Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY.

If you require any further assistance, it is also possible to contact the Planning Policy team:

- **Telephone** 01277 312530

All site submission forms must be received by **5pm on 4th December 2009**.

Your Details		
Where provided, we will use your Agent's details as our primary contact.		
	Your Details	Agent's Details (if applicable)
<b>Name</b>		
<b>Position</b>		
<b>Organisation</b>		
<b>Address</b>		
	Town	
	Postcode	
<b>Telephone</b>		
<b>E-mail address</b>		
<b>What is your Interest in the site?</b> (Owner / Lessee / Prospective purchaser / Neighbour etc.)		

Site Details					
<b>Name of site /other names it's known by</b>					
<b>Address</b>					
	Town				
	Postcode				
<b>Ordnance Survey Grid Reference</b>		Easting		Northing	
<b>Site Area (hectares)</b>					

Site Ownership				
<b>Please record the details of the owner(s) of the site.</b>				
If there are more than three owners, please record the 4 <sup>th</sup> owner, etc. on a separate sheet.				
Please indicate the extent of individual landholding(s) on the site map.				
If you do not know who owns the site, please state so below.				
		<b>Owner 1</b>	<b>Owner 2</b>	<b>Owner 3</b>
<b>Name</b>				
<b>Address</b>				
	Town			
	Postcode			
<b>Or: I do not know who owns the site</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Has the owner (or each owner) indicated support for proposed redevelopment?</b>				
Please also record these details for the 4 <sup>th</sup> and subsequent owners (where necessary).				
<b>Yes</b>				
<b>No</b>				
<b>Don't know</b>				

Current Site Use				
<b>Please record the current use(s) of the site</b> (or for vacant sites, the previous use, if known).				
<b>Current use(s)</b>				
<b>If vacant</b>	Previous use(s)			
	Date last used			
<b>What proportion of the site is made up of buildings, and what proportion is (open) land?</b>				
Proportion covered by buildings		%	Proportion not covered by buildings	%
<b>If there are buildings on the site, please answer the following questions:</b>				
How many buildings are there on the site?			buildings	
What proportion of the buildings are currently in use?		% in use:	%	
		% derelict:	%	
Approximately what year were the buildings built?				
<i>(If there is a mix of buildings, please give the age of the predominant building type.)</i>				

<b>For the parts of the site not covered by buildings, please answer these questions:</b>			
What proportion of the land is currently in active use?			%
What proportion is <b>greenfield</b> (not previously developed)?			% <b>(A)*</b>
What proportion is <b>previously developed</b> and cleared?			% <b>(B)*</b>
What proportion is <b>previously developed</b> but not cleared? (e.g. demolition spoil, etc.)			% <b>(C)*</b>
<i>* A plus B plus C should add to 100%.</i>			
<b>What are the surrounding land uses?</b>			
<b>Does the site have a road frontage?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>Please provide a planning history for the site, including application reference numbers.</b>			
<b>Please provide any additional comments on a separate sheet if necessary.</b>			

<b>Potential Future Site Use</b>					
<b>Please indicate the preferred use that you would like the site to be considered for.</b>					
<b>Please also indicate any other uses you would consider acceptable.</b>					
(If you wish the site to be considered for a mix of uses, please tick all uses that apply.)					
	<b>Residential</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Retail</b>	<b>Commercial Leisure</b>	<b>Other*</b>
<b>Preferred future use</b>					
<b>Alternative future use(s)</b>					
<b>Potential Capacity</b> (if known)	# houses: _____	_____ m <sup>2</sup>	_____ m <sup>2</sup>	_____ m <sup>2</sup>	_____ m <sup>2</sup>
	# flats: _____				
* If "Other", please indicate which use(s):					
<b>Has any design work been done (for any use)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			

<b>Site Availability</b>	
<b>Excluding planning policy constraints, when do you believe this site could be available for development?</b>	
Immediately	<input type="checkbox"/>
1-5 years (2009/10-2014)	<input type="checkbox"/>
5-10 years (2015-2020)	<input type="checkbox"/>
10-15 years (2021-2025)	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 years + (2025 onwards)	<input type="checkbox"/>

**If the site is not available immediately, please explain why** – e.g. the main constraint(s) or delaying factor(s) and actions necessary to remove these:

## Market Interest

**Please choose the most appropriate category below to indicate what level of market interest there is in the site:**

	Any comments
Site is owned by a developer <input type="checkbox"/>	
Site under option to a developer <input type="checkbox"/>	
Enquiries received <input type="checkbox"/>	
Site is being marketed <input type="checkbox"/>	
None <input type="checkbox"/>	
Not known <input type="checkbox"/>	

## Site Constraints

**Please tell us about any known constraints that will affect development for the proposed use, details of what action is required, how long it will take and what progress has been made.**

**Please use a separate sheet where necessary to provide details.**

	Yes, No or Don't know	Nature and severity of constraint *	Action needed, timescales and progress	Confirmed by technical study or by service provider?	
				Yes	No
Land contamination					
Land stability					
Mains water supply constraint					
Mains sewerage constraint					
Electricity supply constraint					
Gas supply constraint					
Telecommunications constraint					

	Yes, No or Don't know	Nature and severity of constraint *	Action needed, timescales and progress	Confirmed by technical study or by service provider?	
				Yes	No
Highways constraint					
Physical constraint (eg topography, severe slope)					
Ownership, leases etc.					
Ransom strips, covenants					
Relocation of current uses required					
Surrounding uses (eg power lines, railway lines, major highway)					
Drainage, flood risk					
Other (Please provide details)					

#### Any Other Information

**Please tell us anything else of relevance regarding this site, if not already covered above. Please use a separate sheet if necessary.**

The information collected on this form will be used by Brentwood Borough Council to inform the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, subsequent components of the Local Development Framework and to contact you, if necessary, regarding the answers given on your form. Anonymous submissions cannot be accepted.

**By submitting this form, you are stating that you understand that the name details of the person submitting this site may be published in the public domain during future stages of the LDF.**

The above purposes may also require public disclosure of any data received by Brentwood Borough Council under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Where this is necessary, contact details will be retained by the Council.

## **Appendix 2:**

# **List of Sites with Un-implemented Planning Consents**

**Appendix 2: Sites with Unimplemented Planning Consent**

Site Ref	Site Address/Location	Permission Number (if applicable)	Approx Site Area (ha)	Approximate Site Capacity (where known)	Source (LPH=Local Plan housing allocation; LPO=Local Plan allocation for other uses, that is undeveloped and no longer required; UPP=unimplemented planning permission; PP=planning permission and under construction; LPP=lapsed planning permission; B=unallocated brownfield)	Site Type (B=brownfield; G=greenfield)	Current Use(s)	Development Progress	Development Description
1	72 Arnold Avenue, Hutton.	BRW/0796/08	0.00	1	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Erect 1 - 3 bed dwelling.
2	38 St Stephens Crescent, Brentwood.	BRW/0986/08	0.02	4	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Two storey side & rear extensions and conversion of dwelling to 2 - 2 bed and 2 - 1 bed flats.
3	Land adj 367 Ongar Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0589/07	0.03	1	PP	B	Other Land Res	Under Construction	Erect 1 - 5 bed dwelling.
4	26 Warley Hill, Warley, Brentwood.	BRW/0298/08	0.03	4	PP	B	Retail	Under Construction	Demolish existing side extension and outbuildings and erect new extension to form ground floor retail and 3 - 1 bed and 1 - 2 bed flats.
5	Land rear of 65-67 Cromwell Road, Warley.	BRW/0634/08	0.04	4	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Erect 4 - 2 bed flats.
6	503 Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch.	BRW/0649/08	0.04	2	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Demolish existing, erect 2 - 3 bed dwellings.
7	Land adj 35 St Charles Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0449/07	0.05	1	PP	B	Residential	Under Construction	Construct 1 - 4 bed dwelling.
8	Merrymeade House, Merrymeade Chase, Brentwood.	BRW/0177/08	0.05	9	PP	B	Education	Under Construction	C/U to community centre and 4 - 1 bed & 5 - 2 bed flats.
9	Putwell Bridge Farm, Brook Street	BRW/0521/92	0.06	1	PP	G	Residential	Under Construction	Single Dwelling.
10	Blacksmiths Cottage, Church Street	BRW/0013/03	0.06	1	PP	B	Residential	Under Construction	Single Dwelling
11	319 Rayleigh Road, Brentwood.	BRW/1056/07	0.10	4	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Demolish 319 and garage of 321, erect 3 - 2 bed apts and 1 - 5 bed dwelling.
12	15 Avenue Road, Warley, Brentwood.	BRW/0707/07	0.11	11	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Demolition of existing dwelling, erect 4 - 2 bed and 7 - 1 bed apts.
13	Searchlight, School Road, Kelvedon Hatch.	BRW/0012/08	0.13	3	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Demolish existing dwelling, erect 1-2, 1-3, & 1-4 bed dwellings.
14	39 Ridgeway, Hutton.	BRW/1061/06	0.16	1	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Erect 1 - 5 bed dwelling.
15	William Hunter Way car park site	BRW/729/2008	0.16	14	PP	B	Car Park	Not Started	14 1-bed flats as part of residential use of mixed use application
16	R/O 35 and between 27/35 Crow Green Road	BRW/0852/87	0.17	3	PP	B	Residential	Under Construction	Erection 3 New Dwellings
17	Land at 22 Newmans Drive and land rear of 196, 198, 200 and 200A Hanging Hill Lane, Hutton, Brentwood	BRW/0063/06	0.22	5	PP	B	Residential	Under Construction	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 5 - 4 bed detached dwellings including garaging together with construction of access road
18	Land adj Britannia Road and 19 Tyrell Rise, Warley, Brentwood.	BRW/1092/07	0.26	14	PP	B	Market Housing	Under Construction	Demolish 6 dwellings and erect 14 dwellings.
19	Rawden, Herrington Grove	BRW/0011/93	0.28	2	PP	B	Residential	Under Construction	Erection of 2 New Dwellings
20	St Helens RC Infants School, Queens Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0297/05	0.41	40	PP	B	Education	Under Construction	Demolish school buildings, erect 6 - 1 bed, 34 - 2 bed apartments.
21	Sam's Night Club and 47A Ongar Road, Brentwood	BRW/0369/07	0.44	54	PP	B	Mixed Commercial Use	Under Construction	Demolition of existing buildings (night club and car show-room) and redevelopment for 54 no. category 2 sheltered housing residential units and 6 no. ground floor commercial units

**Appendix 2: Sites with Unimplemented Planning Consent**

Site Ref	Site Address/Location	Permission Number (if applicable)	Approx Site Area (ha)	Approximate Site Capacity (where known)	Source (LPH=Local Plan housing allocation; LPO=Local Plan allocation for other uses, that is undeveloped and no longer required;UPP=unimplemented planning permission; PP=planning permission and under construction;LPP=lapsed planning permission; B=unallocated brownfield)	Site Type (B=brownfield; G=greenfield)	Current Use(s)	Development Progress	Development Description
22	Former N V Tools Site, St James Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0989/05	0.47	81	PP	B	Industry / Warehouse (B1 or B2 or B8)	Housing completed, office outstanding	Mixed use dev, 81 dwellings inc 28 affordable + 4934 sq m (GEA) commercial floorspace (= net internal area 2995 sq m) + car parking. (ALL HOUSING NOW COMPLETE, OFFICE BUILDING OUTSTANDING)
23	Former British Gas/Transco Site, St James Street/Wharf Road, Brentwood.	BRW/1103/06	0.65	147	PP	B	Utility Services	Under Construction	Construct 147 dwellings phase 3b BG site dev (97 market housing, 50 affordable) (98 completed)
24	Dytchleys, Coxtie Green Road	BRW/0260/88	2.61	11	PP	B	Residential	Under Construction	Redevelopment Existing Building into 11 New Dwellings
25	Warley Hospital core buildings, Warley Hill, Warley	BRW/0021/05	4.05	131	PP	B	Health and Community Services	Under Construction	Demolish extensions & internal & external alterations to convert main hospital building to 131 residential units (21 affordable)
26	Warley Hospital core buildings, Warley Hill, Warley (reorganisation to provide extra residential units)	BRW/0269/08, BRW/0414/06, BRW/0415/06, BRW/0416/06, BRW/0417/06, BRW/0421/06, BRW/0425/06, BRW/0595/06	4.05	37	PP	B	Health and Community Services	Under Construction	Various applications in addition to BRW/0021/05, including internal reorganisation and formation of units within roofspace, to provide a total of 37 additional units (added to 131=168)
27	Former St Charles Youth Treatment Centre, weald Road, Brentwood.	BRW/1081/06	6.79	120	PP	B	Health and Community Services	Under Construction	Construct 120 dwellings.
28	5 Security House, Ongar Road	BRW/0171/04	0	1	UPP	B	Offices	Not Started	Change of use from offices to 2 bed flat
29	3 High Street, Brentwood.	BRW/0469/07	0	1	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	Single storey rear extension to existing retail unit; two storey rear extension over retail unit to extend existing 1st floor flat and create additional 2nd floor 1 - 1 bed flat.
30	56 Hutton Road, Shenfield.	BRW/0470/08	0.00	1	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	C/U 1st floor retail to 1 - 1 bed flat at rear.
31	60 Ongar Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0171/08	0.01	1	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	C/U from A1 to A2 and c/u of first floor from storage to residential withfirst floor extension..
32	(Jewellers) 58 Ongar Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0450/08	0.01	1	UPP	B	Industry / Warehouse (B1 or B2 or B8)	Not Started	C/U 1st floor store and workshop to 1 - 2 bed flat.
33	54 Ongar Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0624/08	0.01	1	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	C/U and extension to form 1 - 1 bed flat on 1st floor..
34	Daylite Windows, 49 Ongar Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0766/08	0.01	1	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	C/U 1st floor & part ground floor to 1 - 1 bed dwelling.
35	60 High Street, Ingatestone.	BRW/0749/08	0.01	1	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	Change of use of 1st & 2nd floors to 1 - 2 bed flat.
36	Imperial Peking, 67A High Street	BRW/0544/04	0.02	1	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	Alterations and extension to form third storey . First floor as part of existing restaurant and third floor as four bed flat
37	19-23 Crown Street, Brentwood.	BRW/0025/08	0.02	2	UPP	B	Offices	Not Started	2nd floor and rear extension to 2 - 1 bed flats.
38	17, 19, 21, 23 Border Edge House, Firsgrove Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0110/09	0.02	8	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Conversion of 4 - 4 bed flats to 8 - 1 bed flats.
39	1 Kelvedon Close Hutton	BRW/0525/04	0.02	1	UPP	B	Residential	Not Started	Erection of 2 bed dwelling
40	Land adj 12 Alexander Lane, Shenfield.	BRW/0458/07	0.02	2	UPP	B	Other Land Res	Not Started	Erect 2 - 2 bed dwellings.
41	Land at 51 High Street, Ingatestone, Brentwood.	BRW/0162/06	0.02	3	UPP	B	Unknown	Not Started	Demolish elements at rear and erect 3 - 1 bed flats.

**Appendix 2: Sites with Unimplemented Planning Consent**

Site Ref	Site Address/Location	Permission Number (if applicable)	Approx Site Area (ha)	Approximate Site Capacity (where known)	Source (LPH=Local Plan housing allocation; LPO=Local Plan allocation for other uses, that is undeveloped and no longer required; UPP=unimplemented planning permission; PP=planning permission and under construction; LPP=lapsed planning permission; B=unallocated brownfield)	Site Type (B=brownfield; G=greenfield)	Current Use(s)	Development Progress	Development Description
42	87 Hatch Road, Pilgrims Hatch, Brentwood.	BRW/0482/07	0.02	1	UPP	B	Other Land Res	Not Started	Erection of 1 - 2 bed dwelling.
43	50 Balmoral Road, Pilgrims Hatch.	BRW/0072/08	0.02	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erection of a 2 bed dwelling.
44	182a Hutton Road, Shenfield.	BRW/0379/07	0.02	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Second floor extension at the side and rear and conversion of existing flat into 2 - 2 bed flats.
45	Land adj 14 Blackmore Mead, Blackmore.	BRW/0270/08	0.02	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Construct 1 - 2 bed dwelling.
46	12 Western Road	BRW/0875/04	0.03	2	UPP	B	Residential	Not Started	Change of use of dwelling to 2 n.o 1 bed flats
47	21 The Vale, Brentwood.	BRW/0002/07	0.03	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erection of new dwelling.
48	242 Ongar Road, Brentwood.	BRW/1134/07	0.03	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Conversion to 2 - 2 bed flats.
49	Brentwood Academy of Health & Beauty, 7-11 Ongar Road, Brentwood.	BRW/1080/07	0.03	2	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	Formation of 2nd floor incorporating 2 - 2 bed flats.
50	30 Westbury Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0534/07	0.03	1	UPP	B	General Business Use (B1)	Not Started	Demolish existing commercial premises, erect 1 - 4 bed dwelling.
51	Garden land of 8 Ashford Avenue, Brentwood.	BRW/0268/08	0.03	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect 1 - 3 bed dwelling.
52	Land adj to 1 Fox Hatch, Kelvendon Hatch, Brentwood.	BRW/0930/08	0.03	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect 1 - 1 bed dwelling.
53	164 Brentwood Road, Herongate, Brentwood.	BRW/0432/06	0.03	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect 1 dwelling
54	54 Station Road, West Horndon, Brentwood.	BRW/0393/08	0.03	2	UPP	B	Retail	Under Construction	C/U retail to 1- 1 bed & 1 - 2 bed flat.
55	201-207 rayleigh Road, Hutton.	BRW/0562/07	0.03	4	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Formation of additional storey to provide 4 - 1 bed flats.
56	119 Shevon Way, Brentwood.	BRW/0906/06	0.03	4	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Proposed roof extension to accommodate 2 - 2 bed & 2 - 1 bed flats.
57	33 Henrys Terrace, Ongar Road, Stondon Massey.	BRW/0444/08	0.03	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect 1 - 4 bed dwelling.
58	21 & 23 Eastfield Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0454/04	0.04	4	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish 2 dwellings and erect 4 dwellings.
59	96 Queens Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0403/06	0.04	4	UPP	B	Health and Community Services	Not Started	C/U dental surgery to 4 dwellings, 3 - 1 bed and 1 - 2 bed flats.
60	25 Warley Hill and 4-6 Crescent Road	BRW/0424/04	0.04	7	UPP	B	Offices	Not Started	Change of use of part of ground floor and first and second floor offices to 1x1 bed 5x2 bed and 1x3 flats
61	Long Meadow Mill Green Road	BRW/0330/04	0.04	1	UPP	B	Residential	Not Started	Demolition of bungalow and erection of 2 storey 5 bed dwelling
62	3 & 5 High Street, Ingatestone.	BRW/0814/08	0.04	4	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	Change of use from shop to 4 - 2 bed flats.
63	1-5 Chelmsford Road, Hutton.	BRW/0157/07	0.04	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	First floor extension and alterations to form 1 -1 and 1 - 2 bed flats above existing shop.
64	52a Robin Hood Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0477/08	0.05	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwelling, erect 2 - 4 bed dwellings.
65	Land rear of 54 Cromwell Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0663/06	0.05	2	UPP	B	Transport	Not Started	Demolish garages and erect 2 - 3 bed dwellings.
66	The Barn, Doddinghurst Road, Doddinghurst, Brentwood.	BRW/0931/08	0.05	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Change of use of site from 1 residential unit, storage and office, to 2 (3-bed) residential units.
67	Land adj 14 Lancaster Close, Pilgrims Hatch, Brentwood.	BRW/1036/06	0.05	2	UPP	B	Recreation and Leisure	Not Started	Demolish existing hall, erect 1 - 2 bed & 1 - 3 bed dwellings.
68	6 Kensington Road, Pilgrims Hatch, Brentwood.	BRW/0044/09	0.05	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwelling, erect 2 - 4 bed dwellings.
69	7 Honeypot Lane, Brentwood.	BRW/0443/06	0.06	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing and erect 1 - 5 bed & 1 - 2 bed dwellings.

**Appendix 2: Sites with Unimplemented Planning Consent**

Site Ref	Site Address/Location	Permission Number (if applicable)	Approx Site Area (ha)	Approximate Site Capacity (where known)	Source (LPH=Local Plan housing allocation; LPO=Local Plan allocation for other uses, that is undeveloped and no longer required;UPP=unimplemented planning permission; PP=planning permission and under construction;LPP=lapsed planning permission; B=unallocated brownfield)	Site Type (B=brownfield; G=greenfield)	Current Use(s)	Development Progress	Development Description
70	Rear of 101 - 107 Warley Hill, Warley.	BRW/0169/07	0.06	5	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erection of 3 storey building containing 5 - 2 bed flats.
71	1 Chelmer Drive, Hutton, Brentwood.	BRW/0987/08	0.06	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erection of 1 - 3 bed dwelling, attached to existing dwelling.
72	Land to the rear of 28 - 30 Pine Drive, Ingatestone.	BRW/0573/06	0.07	1	UPP	G	Other Land Res	Not Started	Erect 1 dwelling.
73	35 Brook Street, Brentwood.	BRW/0724/08	0.07	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Conversion of ground floor res to create one A1 retail and convert 1st floor res to 1 - 2 bed flat.
74	Former Blackmore Youth Centre and library, The Green, Blackmore.	BRW/1173/07	0.07	1	UPP	B	Health and Community Services	Not Started	Demolish library, extend youth centre to form 1 - 4 bed dwelling.
75	Blackmore Centre & Library, Blackmore Road.	BRW/0034/09	0.07	1	UPP	B	Health and Community Services	Not Started	Conversion of building to 1 - 4 bed dwelling.
76	29 Rose Valley, Brentwood.	BRW/0505/08	0.08	9	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwelling, erect 9 - 1 bed flats.
77	Grasmere, Alexander Lane, Hutton.	BRW/1129/07	0.08	5	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwelling and erect 5 - 2 bed flats.
78	Tipps Cross Garage, Blackmore Road, Hook End, Brentwood.	BRW/0460/07	0.08	5	UPP	B	General Business Use (B1)	Not Started	Demolition of existing workshop building adj Hillview" and erection of 1 dwelling. Conversion of existing gargae building and apt into 4 flats."
79	63-65 High Street, Brentwood.	BRW/1107/07	0.09	10	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	Demolish outbuilding, erect extension to existing retail and formation of 10 flats.
80	31 St Charles Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0802/08	0.09	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing 4 bed dwelling and erect 2 - 4 bed dwellings.
81	31 Queens Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0996/07	0.09	6	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect extension to form 4-2 bed flats & 2-1 bed flats..
82	St Ninian, Alexander Lane, Hutton.	BRW/0983/06	0.09	7	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwelling, construct 7 - 2 bed dwellings.
83	10 Park Avenue, Hutton, Brentwood.	BRW/0027/09	0.10	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect dwelling on land adjacent to 10 Park Avenue exisiting dwelling
84	Land rear of St Ninian, Alexander Lane, Shenfield.	BRW/0897/08	0.10	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect 2 - 4 bed dwellings.
85	Brickhouse Farm Doddinghurst Road	BRW/0645/02	0.11	1	UPP	G	Agriculture	Not Started	Conversion of barn to residential dwelling
86	Jacqueline, Friars Close	BRW/1056/06	0.11	1	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Erect 1 - bed dwelling.
87	79 Priests Lane, Shenfield.	BRW/1143/07	0.12	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwelling, erect 2 dwellings.
88	73-73a High Street, Brentwood. (Between Barclays Bank & Currys).	BRW/0728/08	0.14	4	UPP	B	Retail	Not Started	Erection of a 3 storey building 1 x A1, 1 x A1-A3 and 4 apartments at 2nd floor.
89	122-124 Station Road, West Horndon.	BRW/0883/07	0.15	13	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish 2 dwellings and erect 13 flats.
90	77 Shenfield Place, Shenfield.	BRW/0674/08	0.16	2	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwelling, erect 2 - 4 bed dwellings.
91	Land rear of 118a High Street Ingatestone.	BRW/0509/04	0.17	9	UPP	B	Recreation and Leisure	Not Started	Demolish of existing gym, erect 9 - 2 bed dwellings.
92	Land rear of the Crown Public House, High Street, Ingatestone.	BRW/0903/08	0.22	5	UPP	G	Other Land Non Res	Not Started	Erect 3 - 3 bed & 2 - 4 bed dwellings.
93	43-53 Ingrave Road	BRW/1148/03	0.23	15	UPP	B	Open Storage	Not Started	Erection of building containing 15 n.o. two bed apartments
94	1 Bermans Close, Hutton, Brentwood.	BRW/1038/08	0.28	2	UPP	B	Social rented or health and community services?	Not Started	Erect 2 - 1 bed dwellings attached to existing almshouses, demolish exisiting 3 bed dwelling
95	Rose Valley House, Rose Bank, Brentwood.	BRW/0696/06	0.3	9	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Convert dwelling into 8 - 2 bed apts and 1- 3 bed dwelling.

**Appendix 2: Sites with Unimplemented Planning Consent**

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>Site Address/Location</b>	<b>Permission Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Approx Site Area (ha)</b>	<b>Approximate Site Capacity (where known)</b>	<b>Source</b> (LPH=Local Plan housing allocation; LPO=Local Plan allocation for other uses, that is undeveloped and no longer required; UPP=unimplemented planning permission; PP=planning permission and under construction; LPP=lapsed planning permission; B=unallocated brownfield)	<b>Site Type (B=brownfield; G=greenfield)</b>	<b>Current Use(s)</b>	<b>Development Progress</b>	<b>Development Description</b>
96	Fryerning Fisheries, Dog Kennel Lane, Ingatestone, Brentwood	BRW/0309/2008	0.33	1	UPP	G	Agriculture	Not Started	Erection of dwelling for use in association with Fryerning Fisheries
97	Land rear of The Grange, 93 Queens Road, Brentwood.	BRW/0610/07	0.35	12	UPP	B	Other Land Res	Not Started	Erect 6 - 1 bed and 6 - 2 bed flats.
98	Larkrise Farm, The Tyburns, Hutton.	BRW/0896/07	0.38	1	UPP	G	Agriculture	Not Started	Erection of agricultural workers dwelling.
99	Lathams timber yard, Wrights Lane, Wyatts Green, Brentwood.	BRW/0273/08	0.62	1	UPP	B	Light Industrial Building (B1)	Not Started	Demolish existing commercial buildings, erect 1 - 5 bed dwelling.
100	Rear of Netherton & Three Hedges, Hutton Mount Brentwood.	BRW/0119/06	0.70	5	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish existing dwellings, erect 5 dwellings.
101	Land rear of Sylvia Avenue and Brindles Close, hutton.	BRW/1053/06	0.84	20	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish no 32 Sylvia Avenue and erect 33 dwellings, inc 13 affordable.
102	Land between The Lembic & Gomeldon, Hallwood Crescent, Shenfield	BRW/979/2008	0.09	1		G	Garden Land	Started	Construction of detached 5 bedroom house with integral garage
103	Trueloves, Trueloves Lane, Ingatestone (Greenfield portion, to south of site)	BRW/558/2009	2.5	30	UPP	G	Agricultural	Not Started	Conversion of building and erection of new dwellings to create 30 dwellings
104	Land rear of Sylvia Avenue and Brindles Close, hutton.	BRW/1053/06	0.84	13	UPP	B	Market Housing	Not Started	Demolish no 32 Sylvia Avenue and erect 33 dwellings, inc 13 affordable.

## Appendix 3:

# Site Visit Pro Forma

## Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Site Checklist

General																													
<b>Site Number:</b>																													
<b>Photo Reference:</b>																													
<b>Site Address:</b>																													
<b>Site Grid Reference</b>																													
<b>Site Area (Ha):</b>																													
Site Designations																													
<b>Site Designations:</b>																													
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Local Plan Allocation (Housing)</td> <td style="width: 5%; padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Conservation Area</td> <td style="width: 5%; padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Local Plan Allocation (Employment)</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Listed Building</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Local Plan Allocation (Other Uses)</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">SSSI</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Business/Housing Opportunity Site</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">County Biological/Geological Site</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Open Countryside</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Other Nature Conservation Interest</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Green Belt/Green Wedge</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Flood Risk Zone</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Urban Green Space/Green Corridor</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Other</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> </table>	Local Plan Allocation (Housing)		Conservation Area		Local Plan Allocation (Employment)		Listed Building		Local Plan Allocation (Other Uses)		SSSI		Business/Housing Opportunity Site		County Biological/Geological Site		Open Countryside		Other Nature Conservation Interest		Green Belt/Green Wedge		Flood Risk Zone		Urban Green Space/Green Corridor		Other		
Local Plan Allocation (Housing)		Conservation Area																											
Local Plan Allocation (Employment)		Listed Building																											
Local Plan Allocation (Other Uses)		SSSI																											
Business/Housing Opportunity Site		County Biological/Geological Site																											
Open Countryside		Other Nature Conservation Interest																											
Green Belt/Green Wedge		Flood Risk Zone																											
Urban Green Space/Green Corridor		Other																											
<b>Comments (Local Plan References/Known Planning History etc):</b>																													
Current Site Uses																													
<b>Current Site Use</b>																													
<b>Previous Uses</b> (If evident)																													
<b>Greenfield Land</b> (Inc Use)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																												
<b>If In Existing Housing Stock:</b>	<b>If Brownfield Land :</b>																												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%; padding: 2px;">Subdivision of Existing Housing</td> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Flats Over Shops</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Empty Homes</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Intensification of Existing Residential Areas</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Redevelopment of Existing Housing Areas</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Other</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> </table>	Subdivision of Existing Housing		Flats Over Shops		Empty Homes		Intensification of Existing Residential Areas		Redevelopment of Existing Housing Areas		Other		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%; padding: 2px;">Vacant/Derelict Land</td> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Car Park</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Currently In Use (Land/Buildings)</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Conversion of Existing Buildings</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Other</td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> </tr> </table>	Vacant/Derelict Land		Car Park		Currently In Use (Land/Buildings)		Conversion of Existing Buildings		Other							
Subdivision of Existing Housing																													
Flats Over Shops																													
Empty Homes																													
Intensification of Existing Residential Areas																													
Redevelopment of Existing Housing Areas																													
Other																													
Vacant/Derelict Land																													
Car Park																													
Currently In Use (Land/Buildings)																													
Conversion of Existing Buildings																													
Other																													
<b>Comments:</b>	<b>Comments:</b>																												
<b>Ownership</b> (If evident or known)	<b>Developer Interest?</b> (If known)																												

**Site Characteristics**

**Topography** (Inc potential constraints)

--

**Site Boundaries** (Inc Physical Description & Height)

North	
South	
East	
West	

**Vehicular Access:** (Existing & Potential)

--

**Pedestrian/Cycle Access:** (Existing & Potential)

--

**Nearest Public Transport Provision:**  
(Bus/Train etc)

--

**Location of Nearest Services:**  
(Shops/Leisure/Schools)

--

**Environmental Constraints:**

Potential Contamination	
Adjacent Land Uses (Bad Neighbours)	
Potential Noise Issues	
Potential Air Quality Issues	
Other	

**Comments:**

**Physical Constraints:**

Pylons/ Power/Telephone Lines	
Watercourses	
Listed Buildings/Buildings Worthy of Retention	
Significant Trees/Vegetation	
Other	

**Comments:**

**Surrounding Area Characteristics**

**Surrounding Land Uses & Building Heights**

North	
South	
East	
West	

**Initial Conclusions on Suitability for Inclusion Within Assessment:**

--

## **Appendix 4:**

# **Brownfield Sites Assessed & Deemed to Have Potential for Residential Development**

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
KH	B166	Woodlands, School Road, Kelvedon Hatch	0.25	Low	10	Private	Residential Dwelling and Garden	Yes. The site is suitable for residential development as the site is in a central location within the village and is screened by mature trees. Development in this location would not have a detrimental impact upon the neighbouring residents and therefore development is considered wholly suitable.	Yes. The site comprises one residential dwelling and a significant garden that appears to be vacant at the time of survey.	The site provides an attractive setting for residential development and is currently allocated for residential development. The site is unlikely to be contaminated or need significant investment in infrastructure or environmental mitigation therefore the cost of bringing the site forward should not be prohibitive. Development would be acceptable in this location as it would provide potential to intensify the use of the site and could possibly add character to the street scene (dependent on the design). The development is for 10 dwellings and in private ownership therefore a smaller developer would bring the site forward.	*			
HUT	B094	Land adjacent to the Adult Education Centre, Rayleigh Road, Hutton	0.14	Medium	15	ECC	Adult Education Centre	Yes. The land surrounding the building appears to be available (grassed area and partially used car park) and could be rationalised to accommodate residential development.	Yes. The site comprises land adjacent to the adult education centre and appeared to be under used.	Yes. The site is within an attractive setting. The site is within Local Authority ownership. There is currently no developer interest in this site.		*		
HUT	B101	Land between 12 & 13 Magdalen Gardens, Hutton	0.1	Medium	4	BBC	Vacant	Yes. The site is considered to be suitable for residential development, as it lies within an established residential area. Residential development in this location would infill the existing cul-de-sac.	Yes. The site is currently vacant and appears to be available.	Yes. Due to its location investment into infrastructure or services is likely to be minimal. However, there may be some issues of contamination unknown at present. Development would be medium density. There is currently no developer interest in this site.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
HUT	B096	Land between Tendring Court and Tillingham Bold, Hutton	0.1	High	10	Private	Garages & Gardens to Flats	Yes. The site comprises a number of garages and gardens to flats. The site also lies within an established residential area and development would be compatible with surrounding land uses.	Yes. The site is considered to be available for residential development as the garages to the rear of the flats appear to be run down, whilst the car park provided was full, therefore suggesting that the garages are no longer in use.	Yes. The site is an attractive location for residential development and whilst the issues of contamination appear unknown at present it is unlikely that there will be high costs associated with provision of infrastructure and services which. Development on the open space would be subject to neighbour consultation as the gardens to Tillingham Bold appear to be well used, however, a precedent for this type of development has been made at Tip Tree Court. The site is in private ownership and for 10 dwellings therefore would be brought forward by a small developer.		*		
HUT	B102	Between 31 & 45 Goodwood Avenue, Hutton	0.11	Medium	3	Private	Vacant Stud Farm	Yes. The Stud Farm is located on the edge of a residential housing estate, and would therefore be suitable for development in order to create a frontage on the street and infill the existing gap in the street scene	Yes. At the time of visit the site appeared to be a vacant Stud Farm. Due to it being vacant, the site is considered to be available.	Yes. The site is currently vacant and would provide an attractive setting for residential development. The site has a significant road frontage and can be accessed from the public highway. No exceptional costs to site delivering would be expected.	*			
HUT	B041	Long Ridings, Roundwood Avenue, Hutton	0.43	Low	3	Private	Residential House and Garden	Yes. The site would be suitable for development as it is located within an existing residential area.	Yes. The site comprises land adjacent to a residential dwelling and garden.	Yes. The site benefits from a lapsed planning permission therefore suggesting that there is owner interest in developing the site and it is therefore considered to be achievable. The site is an attractive residential area with access to existing infrastructure and services which would require relatively low costs to bring the site forward. It is not known what level of	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
BLM	B140	R/O Little Jerico, Church Street, Blackmore	0.05	Low	1	Private	Vacant Barn/Farm Building	Yes. The area comprises attractive residential development of a high density. The conversion of the existing vacant building would be suitable for development.	Yes. At the time of visit, the existing building appeared to be vacant.	Yes. The design of the building would also need to consider the impact upon any Conservation Area or Listed Buildings. The site is within an attractive area which adds to its achievability. The cost of bringing the site forward would be relatively low as there are good connections with existing infrastructure and services.	*			
PH	B025	Land to the Rear of 10-20 Orchard Lane, Pilgrims Hatch	0.24	Medium	12	Private	Barns/Storage	Yes. The site is currently in use as barns and informal storage with grassland to the rear. The site would be suitable for re-development due to its location on the edge of the urban area, close to services and facilities, and impact on the surrounding countryside is considered to be minimal as the barn is situated adjacent to the existing urban area.	Yes. The adjacent land has been put forward through the call for sites process suggesting it may be available.	Yes. The site is within an attractive area that is suitable for residential development. A suitable access would need to be developed, this could be a constraint to the achievability of the site. The site is for 12 dwellings and is in private ownership, and attractive to a small/medium sized developes.		*		
PH	B031	Land to the rear of 146-148 Hatch Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.18	Low	3	Private	Garages	Yes. The site is located on the edge of the urban area between existing properties and would be suitable for development, having no significant impact on the countryside. .	Yes. The site currently comprises 21 garages which appear to be underused/disused and are therefore considered to be available.	Yes. The site currently comprises under used garages within an existing residential estate. Careful consideration in the design of the development would need to be given to the adjacent retail units. There are unknown contamination issues at the site which may have cost implications for the development. The site could accommodate 3 dwellings and as such would be brought forward by a small private developer.		*		

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
PH	B186	Garages adjacent to 25 King George's Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.12	Medium	6	BBC	Garages & scrub land	Yes. The site currently comprises a number of garages and could incorporate some adjacent scrub land/garden land. The site lies within an established residential area	Yes. The site appears to be available for development given that the garages appear disused/under used and would be a suitable location for residential development, within the existing urban area.	Yes. The site is under used garages. The site is within a existing residential area therefore costs associated with infrastructure and services would be relatively low. Contamination issues and any associated costs are unknown at the site.	*			
PH	B142	Garage Courts Adjacent to 49 Lavender Avenue, Pilgrims Hatch	0.19	Medium	10	Private	Garages	Yes. The site does not appear to be in regular use and most of the properties surrounding it have driveways. A suitable site on the edge of the existing residential area, with minimal impact on the surrounding countryside,	Yes. It is considered that the site is available for residential use, as the site is not in regular use and most properties have their own vehicular access/ outdoor parking areas.	Yes. This site is currently in use for garages, however they appear under used and most properties have their own private drive. The cost associated with infrastructure and services should be relatively low due to the location of the site. Contamination issues at the site are unknown. The site is for 10 dwellings in private ownership and would be brought forward by a small developer.	*			
IGE	B135	R/O Garage & Adjacent to 126 Brentwood Road, Ingrave	0.07	Medium	4	Private	Vacant Land	Yes. The site is relatively flat and comprises areas of hardstanding with overgrown vegetation and is bordered by residential development.	Yes. The site is vacant and is therefore considered to be available.	Yes. Access would need to be taken through the filling station which may be a potential constraint to the site and could affect the achievability of the site coming forward. However it is considered that through the appropriate design these issues can be overcome.		*		
BWD	B190	Brentwood Train Station Car Park	1.35	High	54	Network Rail	Car Park	Yes. The usable area of land appears to be restricted by the railway line on one side and roadway on the other. The site would be suitable for mixed use, including residential, if the car park was proven to be no longer required by Network Rail. Assume 50% developable area.	Yes. This site is currently use for car parking associated with the rail station, which it adjoins, although not to capacity. However, car parking would need to be retained in any scheme.	Yes. However, this is an important transport node and new development on this site should complement that function. Car parking would need to be provided - decked car parking facilities are costly and this could affect the viability of the development.			*	

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
BWD	B079	Rear of the Bull Public House Brook Street, South Weald, Brentwood	0.39	Medium	10	Private	Car Park and Areas of Hardstanding	Yes. The site comprises a large pub car park and areas of hardstanding. The site is suitable for residential development due to its location within the urban area close to services and facilities. Whilst development could not detract from the operation of the pub, the car park could be rationalised. An appropriate design for the residential development would be required.	Yes. The site is considered to be available given the amount of vacant/underused space at the time of visit.	Yes. Development upon this site is considered to be achievable due its location within a residential area. One constraint is the continued operation of the pub. This could detract from achievability of the site. The contamination level of the site is unknown, however cost of connection to infrastructure and services is likely to be minimal due to the residential setting of the site. This site is likely to be brought forward by a small to medium size developer due to its size.		*		
BWD	B181	Keys Hall, Eagle Way, Brentwood	0.44	Medium - High	35	BBC	Community Hall	Yes. This site currently comprises a community hall which is no longer in use. The site lies within the urban area with access to a range of facilities, services and public transport. The site is therefore considered suitable for residential development.	Yes, the site is available for residential development and was marketed in 2008.	Yes. Residential development is considered to be achievable due to the site having been marketed for development. Any contamination on the site is currently unknown. Connection to infrastructure and services should be relatively low cost due to the sites location and former uses. The site should be brought forward by a medium size developer. There is not currently a developer on board.				*
WHD	B189	West Horndon Industrial Estate, West Horndon	0.93	Medium	42	Private	Industrial Estate	Yes. The site comprises an industrial estate within the West Hordon village envelope.	Yes. The site is in single ownership and the units are leased out. It is understood that the leases are all due to expire and the owners are interested in mixed use residential development. Alternative employment land provision may be required.	Yes. The existing site is an industrial estate and likely to require remediation prior to development. Development could only be achieved through the comprehensive development of the entire site.		*		

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity (net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
WG	B212	Land at rear of Hayden & Ardsia, Wyatts Green Road, Wyatts, Green	2.77	Low	1	A.T Fawcett; T.R. & J.A. Fawcett; M Fawcett	2 residential properties with rear gardens fronting onto Wyatts Green Road plus open land, scrub wooded areas to rear.	Yes. The site comprises two residential properties. It would only be acceptable to redevelop the current 2 residential properties to create 3 properties fronting onto Wyatts Green Road. The land to the rear is not suitable for development as it would lead to settlement coalescence with Doddinghurst. Whilst the site could accommodate 3 dwellings, two of these would be replacements with one net gain.	Yes, the site is available for residential development.	Yes. it is considered that residential development on the site is achievable. It is unlikely that the site is contaminated due to its existing uses and connection to infrastructure and services is likely to be low cost due to its setting and the current uses on site. Due to its size it is likely that a small size developer would bring this site forward.	*			
PH	B213	Sow & Grow Nursery with the Commercial Site and 2 Residential Properties, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch	1.2	Medium	42	Mr/Ms Armiger	Mixed Commercial uses, Garden Centre and 2 Residential Properties.	Yes. The site comprises a mix of commercial uses including a Garden Centre. This site is considered suitable for development as it is in a sustainable location on the edge of the built settlement of Pilgrims Hatch with amenities and transport links within walking distance.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes. The site's location on the edge of an established residential area and the number of dwellings proposed aid its achievability. Due to the sites former uses there may be issues of contamination. The site is put forward for 42 dwellings and therefore it is likely to be brought forward by a medium to large developer.		*		
MTN	B053	Meadowside, Swallows Cross Road, Mountnessing	2.5	Low	1	Rachel Milton	Derelict Residential Property with Land.	Yes. The site comprises a derelict property and adjacent land. The site could be redeveloped one for one, with the existing derelict residential property being converted into a new property. The site is not suitable for further development due to its unsustainable location, remote from the main settlements.	Yes the site is available.	Yes. Development on this site is considered to be achievable due to its existing use. It is unlikely that the site is contaminated and connection to infrastructure and services is likely to be low cost. Due to its size this site would be brought forward by a small developer.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity (net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
WAR	B214	Mascalls Hospital, Mascalls Park, Mascalls Lane, Warley	3.95	Medium	118	North East London NHS Foundation Trust	Healthcare facility - facilities to be transferred in late 2010 leaving site vacant	Yes, The site currently comprises a healthcare facility which is going to vacate the site in 2010. This site is suitable for redevelopment for residential purposes as it is located on the edge of Warley with residential areas to the east of the site.	Yes the site will be vacated by the NHS in late 2010.	Yes. Due to the known availability of this site and its potential size, along side its setting on the edge of existing residential development this site is considered achievable. There may be contamination issues at the site due to its former use. Connection to infrastructure and services should be relatively low cost due to the sites former uses and the scale of the development. Due to the site's size it is likely that it will be brought forward by a large scale developer.	*			
WAR	B215	Hall Lane Farm, Little Warley	2.5	Low	4	Mr Ernest Ramsey	Recycling / HGV operating centre	The site comprises a dwelling and agricultural/ industrial buildings. The site is located within a ribbon development with individual large detached properties fronting onto the road. This site is therefore suitable for conversion of existing buildings for residential development only. Additional development in this location would have a detrimental impact upon the countryside.	Yes the site is available.	Yes The site is achievable for conversion of existing dwellings only. Potential contamination on the site and the restriction to conversion only may be seen as a constraint to the achievability of the site. There is currently no developer interest at this site, however it is likely to be brought forward by a small developer due to its size.		*		
WAR	B220	Woodlands School, Warley	3.26	Medium	10	Woodlands School Ltd	Private school with associated playing fields and open space.	Yes. This site is a private school and grounds. The site is divorced from any settlement and therefore conversion of the existing buildings only would be appropriate.	Yes, the site is available for development.	Yes, the site is likely to be vacated and is in private ownership. However there is a sewage treatment works on the site which could constrain the achievability of the site. Contamination at the site is currently unknown. Cost to connect the site to infrastructure and services would be relatively low due to the site's current use. The size of site would mean that it would be brought forward by a medium sized developer.		*		

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Multiplier	Dwelling Capacity (net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
BWD	B216	43-53 Ingrave Road, Brentwood	0.43	Medium	43	Mr J Brook	4 Residential properties and gardens, car show room, builders yard.	Yes. The site comprises 4 residential properties, a car show room and a builders yard. This site is suitable for redevelopment for residential purposes as it is located close to Brentwood town centre within the built up area.	Yes, the site is available for residential development.	Yes, The site is located within an attractive residential area. Current site use may mean that the site has contamination issues but has been subject to developer interest. The size of the site means that it is likely to be brought forward by a large developer.	*			
BWD	B217	Land Opposite Button Common, Herongate	5	Medium	6	Giles Murray	Overgrown site with two single storey garage type buildings.	Yes, this site is overgrown with mature vegetation and with two 1950s single storey buildings. The site lies between two existing detached residential buildings, and fronts onto Brentwood Road, the site lies adjacent to the village envelope and is in close proximity to the existing services and facilities. There are no environmental constraints or other designations affecting the site. This site is suitable for residential development in keeping with the neighbouring properties.	Yes, the site is vacant and therefore appears to be available for residential development.	Yes, the site is located within a attractive residential area. However, the site borders a conservation area and area of historic interest and lies next to a sewage pumping station. There is unlikely to be any contamination on the site. Cost to connect the site to infrastructure and services should be relatively low due to its proximity to the adjacent village. Due to the size of the site it is likely to be brought forward by a small developer.	*			
HUT	B218	Essex County Fire Brigade Headquarters, Rayleigh Road, Hutton	1.26	Medium	100	Essex County Fire Brigade	Fire Brigade Headquarters.	Yes, The site is currently in use by the Essex County Fire Brigade as their headquarters set in quite large grounds. The site is suitable for residential development, located in a sustainable location with good access to local amenities.	Yes, the Fire Brigade intend to vacate the site.	Yes the site is considered achievable as the current occupier intends to vacate the site. This site is relatively large and will be attractive for a developer. Due to former land uses potential contamination could be an issue at the site. The size of the site would mean that the site is brought forward by a	*			
HUT	B219	Woodlands School, Rayleigh Road, Hutton	12.95	Medium	15	Woodlands School Ltd	Private school with associated playing fields and open space.	Yes. The site is currently in use as a private school set in quite large grounds which incorporate playing fields and open space and a nature reserve. The site is divorced from the settlement of Hutton and would only be considered for conversion of existing buildings.	Yes. The school state that the site could be available within 1-5 years.	Yes, the site is likely to be vacated and is in private ownership. There is a main gas distribution pipe through the site and overhead electricity cables to be considered. These issues could constrain the achievability of the site. Contamination at the site is currently unknown. Cost to connect the site to infrastructure and services would be relatively low due to the sites current use. The size of the site would mean that it would be brought forward by a medium sized developer.	*			

## Appendix 5:

# Brownfield Sites Assessed & Discounted for Residential Development

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
HUT	B170	Adjacent to 187 Rayleigh Road, Hutton	0.14	Private & Multiple	Residential	No. The site is already in residential use. The site would not be suitable for residential development as development would have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding residential dwellings.	No. The site is not considered to be available for development as it is an existing used garden. Loss of the garden would impact significantly on residential amenity	Yes. This is an established residential area. It would require demolition of the existing garage and loss of garden to gain access.
HUT	B169	Garage Court between 9 & 10 Carswell Close, Hutton	0.06	Private & Multiple	Garages & Parking Space	No. The development of the garages would lead to parking problems both on the street and within the estate and therefore, development of this site would be unsuitable.	No. The site comprises 16 individual garages which appear to be in use, are well kept and have new padlocks on them. It is therefore considered that they are not available.	No. The garages would need replacing.
HUT	B168	Between 156 & 158 Whittington Road, Hutton	0.16	Private	Side Garden, Access to Garages.	Yes. If the site were to become available it is considered that residential development would be suitable given the neighbouring residential development and urban location.	No. The site provides access to a number of garages. There is also a side garden to one of the flats which is clearly in use and this could not be retained if the site was to be developed. The site therefore is not considered to be available for residential development.	No. It is unlikely that the site would come forward for residential development due to the issues of multiple ownership.
HUT	B098	Garage Court R/O Willingale Close, Hutton	0.12	Private & Multiple	Garages	No. The site is considered to be unsuitable as development on this site would exacerbate/create on street parking problems and would have adverse impacts upon the local residents.	No. The site comprises approximately 30 garages, one was undergoing refurbishment at the time of visit suggesting that it is well used. The remaining garages appear to be well maintained therefore suggesting they are also well used. The site is therefore not considered to be available for development.	No. It is unlikely that the site would come forward for residential development due to the issues of multiple ownership. The garages would need replacing.
HUT	B090	1 Weston Close, Hutton	0.14	Private	Residential Dwelling and Rear Garden	No. The site is not large enough to accommodate any more residential development and would not be suitable for flats.	No. The site comprises a large residential dwelling and garden which is clearly in use. The site is therefore not considered to be available for development.	Yes. A development would be achievable if made available.
HUT	B099	Garage Court between 23 - 25 Tomlyns Close, Hutton	0.51	Private & Multiple	Garages	No. The site is considered to be unsuitable as development on this site would exacerbate/create on street parking problems and would have adverse impacts upon the local residents.	No. The site comprises a number of garages. It is considered that the site is not available for residential development as it is currently in use by existing residents as garages.	No. It is likely that residential development would be costly given the need to acquire and relocate the existing facility. It is not anticipated that there would be major infrastructure costs associated with the development.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
HUT	B091	R/O Woodbridge, Alexander Lane, Hutton	0.05	Private	Residential Dwelling and Garden	No. Access to the site would be shared with the existing residents.	No. The site comprises a residential dwelling and garden which is clearly in use and is therefore not considered to be available for development.	Yes. It is not anticipated that there would not be any major infrastructure costs associated with this development. The site lies within an attractive and popular residential estate. And would be suitable for family housing. However, the landowner is not currently marketing the site.
HUT	B095	Rawdon, Herington Grove, Hutton	0.09	Private	Dwelling and Rear Gardens	Yes. Rawdon is a large plot situated in Hutton Mount. The side garden would suitable for development as it would not have a detrimental effect upon the neighbouring properties.	No. The site is not available and is in private ownership.	Yes. Development on this site is considered to be achievable. The site lies within an attractive residential area.
HUT	B224	R/O Highview Crescent, Hutton	0.35	Private	Garages & Allotments	No. The site is constrained by the surrounding residential properties and is not considered suitable for development.	No. The site comprises a number of garages and allotments, which are not suitable for residential development.	No. The site lies within an established residential area and it is not anticipated that major infrastructure would be required to deliver development. However, replacement of existing uses would be required.
BLM	B141	Steeple View, Blackmore Road, Blackmore	0.06	Private	Residential Dwelling and Garden	No. The surrounding area is constrained by space and it is considered that development would have a negative impact upon the character of the street	No. At the time of visit the garden appeared to be in use therefore suggesting that the site is not available.	Yes. But development is restricted by space and the existing dwelling may need to be demolished.
WHD	B137	Tennis Courts, Rear of Chafford Gardens, West Horndon	0.1	Unknown	Tennis Courts	No. The site is not considered to be suitable as development of the site would result in the loss of a community sports facility.	No. This site contains good quality tennis courts which appear to be in regular use and therefore the site is not considered to be available.	Yes. Development in this location could be achievable if the issues regarding the community use of the site were overcome. An alternative tennis court may need to be provided in a similar location.
WHD	B188	22a & 22b West Horndon Industrial Estate, West Horndon		Private - Bridgman Training Services	Industrial Units	No. The site is not considered suitable for residential development on its own, due to the nature of surrounding uses. However, the site would be suitable as part of a comprehensive redevelopment with Site B189.	No. The site is currently in use as a training facility in the middle of an active industrial estate.	No. The existing site is an industrial estate and likely to require remediation prior to development. Development could only be achieved if the majority of the land was acquired as the current industrial uses are incompatible with residential development. Land assembly could therefore be costly and affect the viability of the development.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
WHD	B222	Plot 23, Childerditch Industrial Park, Childerditch Hall Drive, Warley	0.58	Private	Vacant Industrial Plot	No. The site is not considered to be suitable for development due to the neighbouring uses and relative isolation from services and public transport.	No. The site contains a vacant industrial plot in the middle of an active and otherwise well used industrial estate.	No. The existing site is an industrial estate and likely to require remediation prior to development. Development could only be achieved if the majority of the land was acquired as the current industrial uses are incompatible with residential development. Land assembly could therefore be costly and affect the viability of the development.
WHD	B138	Hall between Station Road & Thorndon Ave, West Horndon	0.14	West Hordon Parish Council	Village Hall	Yes. Should the site become available it is considered suitable for residential development given the proximity to the existing facilities and services and urban location.	No. The site contains a village hall which is in regular use as a day nursery and used for other community uses. The site is therefore not considered to be available for residential development.	Yes, development on this site is considered achievable, however an alternative location would need to be funded by the developer should a replacement hall be required.
SHN	B144	R/O 104-108 Chelmsford Road, Shenfield	0.27	Private & Multiple	Rear Garden Land, Parking Area, Rear Access	No. Formalising the access track may adversely affect the public right of way due to the restricted width, the site is therefore considered to be unsuitable.	No. This site is made up of an existing access track (also a public right of way), an area of hard standing used for parking cars, and part of three rear gardens. Ownership of the parking area is uncertain. The gardens are not currently for sale, and are unlikely to become available.	Yes. The site lies within an established residential area, it is anticipated that major infrastructure would not be required to support the development. However land acquisition and formalising access could be difficult and render the development unachievable.
SHN	B114	Site of Windyside, Ashcourt & Bretaye, Mill Hill, Shenfield	0.81	Private	Dwellings & Gardens	Yes. The site would be suitable should the site become available for development given the size of the plot and the potential to develop without impacting on the existing residents.	No. The site comprises 3 substantial dwellings set in large plots. The dwellings are in private ownership, are not up for sale and there is no evidence of any plans to redevelop the site. It is therefore considered that the site is not available for development. The substantial nature and condition of the dwellings suggests that the site is not likely to become available.	Yes. Development upon the site is considered to be achievable. Access could be easily derived. However there would be associated land acquisition costs. The site lies within an existing residential area and it is anticipated that development would not require major infrastructure in order to deliver development.
SHN	B043	97 Priests Lane and R/O 97 - 109 Priests Lane, Shenfield	1.31	Private & Multiple	Residential Dwelling, Garden and Vacant Woodland	No. The land to the rear comprises dense mature woodland and appears to be boggy with existing water bodies on the site. The railway lies adjacent to the eastern boundary and noise buffers would be required. It is considered that development would have a detrimental effect on the existing residents and appearance of the area. There may also be a risk of flooding.	No. It is not considered that number 97 is available for residential development, the dwelling is not vacant and not up for sale.	No. Development could not be achieved on this site as access could not be derived. The land also contains a number of water bodies which may constrain development.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
SHN	B116	Site of Garage, between 11 & 23 Hutton Road, Shenfield	0.24	Private - Shenfield Motor Co.	Garage/Office/ Forecourt/ Workshop	Yes. The site would be suitable for housing development in the long term. The site includes a Listed Building.	No. Located within a predominantly residential area, the site is currently in use as a car sales and repairs garage. At present the site is not available for residential development.	Yes. Consideration would need to be given to the Listed Building on site. However development is considered to be achievable.
SHN	B194	C/P between 43&69 Hunter Avenue, Shenfield	0.14	BBC & Network Rail	Rail Station Car Park & Shopper Car park	No. The car parks are well used. Development of this site would create considerable on-street parking pressure. The site would be suitable if alternative parking was available	No. The site is currently an active car park used by shoppers and users of the adjacent train station	No. Alternative parking would be required in order to achieve development on this site. This could be costly and have a negative effect on the viability of the development.
KH	B019	22-36 Stock Road, Kelvedon Hatch	0.54	Private	Residential properties	No. There is evidence that an additional dwelling has been built on the end of an existing terrace. However, this would not be possible for all of the dwellings due to the space constraints, ownership issues and access.	No. The site is in multiple ownership and there is not sufficient space adjacent to each property for additional dwellings.	No. The site already comprises residential development and is in multiple ownership. Negotiation with the necessary residents and land acquisition could be problematic and could affect the viability of the development. The site lies within an existing residential area and it is not anticipated that major infrastructure would be required in this location.
PH	B084	Garages Adjacent to the R/O 8 - 14 Albany Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.15	Private	Garages	Yes. Residential development in this location would be suitable if the garages and car parking were not required. The removal of the facility is considered to be detrimental to the existing residents and appearance of the street, the existing car parking problems would be exacerbated by the removal of this facility.	No. The site comprises 28 garages that are in private and multiple ownership. The garages appear to be in use and the site is therefore not considered to be available for residential development.	No. A replacement facility would be required prior to the development of this site. The provision of this could be costly and could affect the viability of the development. The site lies within an existing residential area and would not require major infrastructure to deliver development.
PH	B026	Land Between 410 & Public House, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.13	Private	Pub Car Park	Yes. If the car park was no longer required, given the surrounding uses the site would be suitable for residential development. The loss of the car park would lead to parking on Ongar Road and the surrounding streets detrimental to highway safety.	No. The site is currently in use as a car park for the Black Horse Vintage Inn. The car park is also used by customers of the adjacent shops.	No. A new car park would be required within close proximity to the existing facility. The provision of this could be problematic.
PH	B039	Land Adjacent to 14 Lascelles Close, Pilgrims Hatch	0.09	Private	Garages & Parking Court	Yes. If an alternative location could be found for the car parking the site would be suitable for residential development given the surrounding uses. The loss of this parking area and garages would only add to the on-street parking problems.	No. The site is very well used for garages and car parking. There is significant on street parking on Lascelles Close which makes access difficult.	No. The site is within multiple ownership, land acquisition or the construction of replacement garages could be problematic.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
PH	B186B	Garages King George's Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.12	Multiple	Garages & Parking to Front	No . The site is constrained by space and would require adjacent residential gardens which are in use.	No. The site comprises a number of garages and garden land, which are used by residents and it is therefore considered that the site is not available for development at present.	No . The site is within multiple ownership, land acquisition or the construction of replacement garages could be problematic.
PH	B030	Land to the rear of 2-8 Cornwall Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.09	BBC	Garages	No . The site is very narrow with a narrow access and a restrictive shape, therefore the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development due to the impact development is likely to have on the amenities of the existing neighbouring properties.	No. The site is in use as garages .	No . The construction of replacement garages could be problematic.
PH	B029	Land to the Rear of 52-56 Gloucester Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.11	BBC	Garages & Parking Court	No. It is considered that the site is unsuitable as development would be cramped and to the detriment of existing and future residents.	No. The site appears to be well used and therefore is considered to be unavailable.	No. Access to the rear of properties is taken from the site. Development would need to maintain this access. Also the replacement of the existing garages could be problematic.
PH	B028	Land Adjacent to 14 Lascelles Close, Pilgrims Hatch	0.09	Private	Garages & Parking Court	Yes. If an alternative location could be found for the car parking the site would be suitable for residential development given the surrounding uses. The loss of this parking area and garages would only add to the on-street parking problems.	No. The site is very well used for garages and car parking. There is significant on street parking on Lascelles Close which makes access difficult.	No . The site is within multiple ownership, land acquisition or the construction of a replacement facility could be costly - therefore the development could be unviable.
WAR	B157	Garage Courts between 20 & 22 Hammonds Lane, Warley	0.05	Private	Garage Courts	Yes. If the garages were no longer required and the car parking could be provided in an alternative location the site would be suitable for residential development. There is a significant amount of on-street parking on Hammonds Lane, which is very narrow, and the loss of these garages would add to this and exacerbate the problem.	No . The site contains 19 garages and provides vehicular access to the rear of 20 Hammonds Lane. A number of the garages appear to be in regular use.	No. The existing garages would need replacing. The site lies within an existing residential area and there are significant parking problems on the residential streets. It is therefore considered that the site is not achievable.
WAR	B196	Land to the rear of The Depot, Warley	1.71	BBC	Part Car Park/Part Woodland	No. The site would be not be suitable for development given its location adjacent to the BBC depot, its current uses and the need to access the site through the car park and depot. The development of the site would not provide acceptable residential amenity for future residents.	No. The site is currently in use partially as storage for the council depot, a public car park and dense woodland. The site is therefore not considered to be available for residential development.	No. The site is not attractive for residential development.
WAR	B158	Garage Courts Between 55 & 57 Hammonds Lane, Warley	0.05	Private	Garage Courts	No. There is a significant amount of on-street parking on Hammonds Lane, which is very narrow, and the loss of these garages would add to this and exacerbate the problem.	No. The site contains 12 garages and appears to be in regular use.	No. The existing garages would need replacing. The site lies within an existing residential area and there are significant parking problems on the residential streets. It is therefore considered that the site is not achievable.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
WAR	B125	The Brave Nelson Pub, Woodman Road, Warley	0.21	Private	Pub & Pub Garden	Yes. The site would be suitable if it was available given the surrounding land uses, urban location and residential nature of the area.	No. The site is in use as a pub and car park and therefore does not appear to be available.	Yes. If the site were to become available development could be achieved on this site.
ING	B010	Land R/O, Old Market Place, Ingatestone	0.48	Private	Commercial Buildings and Large Rear Garden	Yes. The site would be suitable for residential development if it became available.	No. The site is no currently available for development.	No. The development of the site is not considered to be achievable.
ING	B023	Land R/O 53-69 Roman Road, Ingatestone	0.29	Private and multiple	Residential development	Yes. Development of the site would be suitable; part of the site has been recently developed for residential development and the remainder of the site could be developed without causing harm to neighbouring residents.	No. The site has recently undergone residential development and it also comprises private gardens that appear to be in use.	No. There is no access to the site, due to part of the site being developed thus leaving the remainder of the site landlocked. It is therefore unachievable. Access into this part of the site would require the demolition of two existing garages.
ING	B164	Snapdragons, Ingatestone	0.28	Private	Residential Property	Yes. Part of the site has been developed for two residential properties fronting onto Fryerning Lane, the remaining smaller plot is considered suitable for development.	No. The site is not available.	No. The development of the site is not considered achievable.
BWD	B173	Adjacent to Invermay Court, Highland Avenue, Brentwood	0.27	Private	Employment Use	Yes. The site would be suitable for residential development given its location in close proximity to High Street and the surrounding residential uses.	No. The land is currently occupied by Travis Perkins Ltd, the site is currently in use as a builders merchants and there does not appear to be any sign of this use ceasing.	Yes. The site is currently in employment use and there may be some contamination issues associated with the development of the site. Minor infrastructure improvements may be required to support the development.
BWD	B197	Garage Courts to the Rear of 18 - 34 The Vale, Brentwood	0.09	Private	Garages and Electricity Substation	No. Access to the site is highly constrained by the surrounding uses and development would remove the garages currently occupied by residents and increase the number of cars that are parked on the street.	No. The garages are in multiple ownership, some of which are owned by Dudridge Holdings. It is therefore considered unavailable.	No. Due to the access being very constrained development may require land acquisition or demolition of existing properties, it is therefore considered that the development of this site would not be achievable.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	B107	Rear of 24 - 30 Greenshaw, Brentwood	0.16	Private	Garages	Yes. If an alternative location for the garages/parking could be achieved then the site would be suitable for residential development given the surrounding residential uses. However, without this, redevelopment of the garages would have an adverse impact upon the neighbouring area and would exacerbate the on street car parking problems.	No. The site is in multiple ownership and there is pedestrian access to the rear of the properties to the garages and the parking court.	No. The garages would require relocation/replacement and this could be problematic.
BWD	B092	Garage Courts to the rear of 89 - 91 Greenshaw, Brentwood	0.05	Private	Garages	Yes. If the car parking was not required or could be replaced the site would be suitable for residential development. There are already on street parking problems at Greenshaw and the redevelopment of the garages for residential development would further exacerbate this, the site is currently therefore not considered suitable for residential development.	No. The site is in multiple ownership and the garages are well used for storage and parking. It is therefore not considered to be available.	No. The garages would require relocation/replacement and this could be problematic.
BWD	B074	4 and 5 Maple Close, Brentwood	0.06	Private	35 Garages, Community Centre and Play area	Yes. If the issues of ownership could be overcome the site would be suitable for residential development. consideration needs to be given to the occupiers of the garages, which were all occupied and had new padlocks on at the time of visit. The community centre and play area would also need relocating to an area in close proximity to the existing location. In conclusion the site is well used and therefore not available for residential development.	No. The site is in multiple ownership and is used as garages, community centre and play areas.	No. The replacement of the existing facilities could considerably affect the viability of the development - therefore it is not considered to be achievable.
BWD	B198	125 Ingrave Road, Brentwood	0.06	Private	Residential House and Garden.	Yes. The site would be suitable for one residential dwelling.	No. The site comprises a residential dwelling and garden which is currently in use therefore the site is not available.	Yes, development of one residential dwelling could readily be achieved in this established residential location.
BWD	B120	Adjacent to 11 Warleywoods Crescent, Brentwood	0.06	Private	Residential Garden / Garage	No. The site is not considered to be large enough to accommodate additional residential development without creating adverse impacts upon the existing residents which neighbour the site.	No. The site is a residential garden which is in use and not available.	No. Due to the sites size and the adverse effect on neighbouring residents development is not considered to be achievable.
BWD	B119	Rear of 36 Cromwell Road, Brentwood	0.06	Private/Multiple	Garages and Garden	No. The development of this site is considered unsuitable due to the poor access and loss of garages.	No. The site is a residential garden and garages which are in use and not available.	No. Development would have an adverse impact upon the local residents as it would remove a the garages and would increase on street parking problems.
BWD	B062	Opposite 75 - 95 Rose Valley, Brentwood	0.33	National Grid	Substation and shed uses	Yes. Should this site be vacated by National Grid it would be suitable for residential development given the nature of the surrounding development.	No. The site comprises an electrical sub-station, it is considered that the site is not available for development.	No. Relocation of the sub station would be cost prohibitive and therefore development is not considered to be achievable.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	B171	Adj. 59 Capon Close, Brentwood	0.14	Private	Car Park	Yes. If an alternative location could be found for the car park then the site would be suitable for residential development.	No. This site comprises a car park that serves a large number of flats.	No. The car park is well used and its loss would result in an unacceptably adverse impact to existing residents. Therefore the parking would need to be replaced, this could be problematic.
BWD	B149	R/O 11-25 South Weald Road and R/O 2 Hill Road, Brentwood	0.44	Private and Multiple	Rear Gardens	Yes. Development would be suitable in this location as it would not have a detrimental impact upon the existing residents.	No. This site comprises parts of up to 9 rear gardens belonging to private houses.	No. There is no access to the site, and none could be created without the demolition of existing dwellings. Land acquisition due to multiple ownership is likely to be problematic.
BWD	B154	120 - 126 London Road and Garages off Shevon Way, Brentwood	0.27	Private and Multiple	6 Flats, 5 Dwellings and Garages to rear	Yes. The location is clearly suitable for residential development given the existing uses.	No. The site comprises a number of residential properties that are all in private ownership. Additionally, the garages are all in use and have new doors and padlocks.	No. Land acquisition due to multiple ownership is likely to be problematic. Access could be taken through Shevon Way. It is essential that the site is developed in a comprehensive manner.
BWD	B129	Masons Restaurant & Bar, Ingrave Road, Brentwood	0.22	Private	Bar & Restaurant	Yes. If the site were to become available it would be considered suitable for residential development given its location within the urban area and neighbouring residential uses.	No. The site is in use as a busy bar and restaurant. The business appears to have been recently refurbished and rebranded from the Fountain Pub. It is therefore considered that the site is not available for development.	Yes. the development of this site is considered to be achievable as there are no physical constraints which would affect the viability of the site.
BWD	B080	Ford Dealership, 140 London Road, Brentwood	0.61	Ford	Ford Car Garage	Yes. If the site were to become available it would be suitable for residential development given the surrounding residential uses.	No. The site is in use as a Ford car dealership and is therefore not available for development.	Yes. The development of this site is considered to be achievable as there are no physical constraints which would affect the viability of the site.
BWD	B055	Bardeswell Social Club, Bardeswell Close, Brentwood	0.24	Private	Social Club and Car Park	Yes. If the site were to become available it would be suitable for residential development given the surrounding land uses.	No. The site comprises what appears to be a well used social club and car park.	Yes. The development of this site is considered to be achievable as there are no physical constraints which would affect the viability of the site.
BWD	B104	Garage Courts to the rear of 14 - 26 Costead Manner Road, Brentwood	0.32	Private and Multiple	Garages	Yes. The site would be suitable for residential development as it is within close proximity of the existing services and facilities	No. At present the garages are in use by a number of occupiers therefore suggesting that the site is unavailable	Yes. If the site becomes available due to garages no longer being required or replaced.
BWD	B182	Rear of 13 - 27 Greenshaw, Brentwood	0.16	Private	Garages & Scrubland to rear	Yes. The site is suitable for residential development as it would be compatible with the surrounding land uses.	No. The site is currently in use as garages. At the time of survey, the site was not considered to be available due to the garages being in multiple ownership.	Yes. If the site becomes available due to garages no longer being required or replaced.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	B148	10-16 Westwood Avenue, Brentwood	0.35	Private and Multiple	Three residential properties and associated gardens	Yes. The site abuts a rail line, making potential development at the southern end of the site less attractive. Mitigation measures would be required in order to overcome this constraint.	No. The site comprises a number of residential properties that are all in private ownership, therefore it is considered that this site would be unavailable for residential development.	No. Access to the site would constrain the achievability of this Site.
BWD	B063	12 King Edward Road and land adjacent, Brentwood	0.15	Private	Offices + Parking	Yes. The site would be suitable if alternative car parking could be provided.	No. The site comprises a former dwelling that has been converted to office space, car parking ancillary to these offices, and a multi-story/underground car park associated with a large office block to the west.	No. The loss of the underground car parking facility is likely to be unacceptable for the adjacent office block.
BWD	B146	10 and R/O 12 Elm Way, Brentwood	0.19	Private and Multiple	Residential property + 2 gardens	No. The site is a backland development which may have a detrimental effect on adjoining residential amenity.	No. The site comprises an existing dwelling and associated garden, plus part of at least one other property's garden. Access to the site would require the demolition of the existing dwelling.	No. The access area would be steeply sloping and may cause disturbance to adjoining properties.
BWD	B150	Rear Of 23 - 53 King's Chase Brentwood	0.3	Unknown	Bowl's Club and Car Park	Yes. If the bowls club was vacated or an alternative site was found then the site would be suitable for residential development given the surrounding land uses.	No. The site comprises a bowls club, the site is not considered to be available for residential development.	Yes. If the site becomes available.
BWD	B133	Running Waters House & Avenue Lodge, The Avenue, Brentwood	0.12	Private & Multiple	Dwelling and Gardens	Yes. the site is considered suitable for development. It is within the urban area at the southern edge of the town between Running Waters House and Avenue Lodge.	No. the site is in private ownership and is not available.	Yes. development would be achievable in this location.
BWD	B061	Town Hall Car Park, Brentwood	0.19	BBC	Car Park	Yes. The site would be suitable for housing should an alternative car park be provided or if the car park is no longer required. The site is in an urban location in close proximity to services and facilities.	No. The site is not available and is in use.	Yes. Development could be achievable however the need to retain or replace the car parking could constrain the delivery of the development.
BWD	B121	County Infants School, Crescent Road, Brentwood	0.11	Private	Day nursery	Yes, development in this location is considered to be suitable. The site lies within an established residential area and development would not have adverse effects on the existing residents.	No. This site is currently in use as a private day nursery and is not considered to be available.	Yes. If the site becomes available.
SM	B004	Freshfield's, Ongar Road, Stondon Massey	0.08	Private	Dwelling and Garden	Yes, development in this location is considered to be suitable. The site lies within an established residential area and development would not have adverse effects on the existing residents.	No. The site is not available for residential development.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable and could be undertaken without causing detrimental harm to the existing dwelling.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
SM	B006	Telephone Exchange, Stondon Massey	0.21	Private	Telephone Exchange	Yes. The site is a Brownfield site in an established residential area. Development would not be detrimental to the existing residents.	No. The site is not available for residential development.	No. Redevelopment of this site could be costly given the need to remediate the site.
SM	B187	Hallsford Bridge Industrial Estate, Ongar Road, Stondon Massey	0.58	BBC	Vacant	No. The site is not suitable for residential development as it is divorced from other residential areas, amenities and public transport links. The Site is also allocated in the BBC Local Plan for Employment Development.	No. This site is currently allocated for industrial uses and the Council are currently disposing of the land for employment uses.	Yes. Residential development in this location would be achievable.
SM	B001	9 & 12 Cannons Mead, Stondon Massey	0.25	Private	Residential Properties and their Gardens.	Yes. Development in this location would be suitable and would be located within the village envelope. New development would be contained by the existing landscape features.	No. The site comprises two residential properties and their sizable gardens.	Yes. Development may involve the demolition of an existing property or total redevelopment of the Site.
DOD	B007	Landings Surgery, Outings Lane, Doddinghurst	0.27	Private	Doctors Surgery	Yes. The site lies within the existing village envelope for Doddinghurst and would be a suitable location for residential development.	No. The site is currently in use as a busy doctors surgery with limited car parking to the front. The site is therefore not considered to be available for development. Planning permission has recently been received for a new surgery, if implemented this site would become available.	Yes, residential development would be achievable.
DOD	B008	Oakfold to Broadmead, Hook End Road and r/o Ridgeway to Fayre Mead, Outlings Lane Doddinghurst.	0.72	Private	Residential Properties and their curtilages.	Yes. The site lies within the village envelope and development is therefore considered suitable.	No. The site is not available and in multiple ownership.	Yes. Development would be achievable, but would need removal of a number of mature trees and possible demolition of one or more existing properties.
DOD	B020	The Rectory and Oak Tree House, Church Lane, Doddinghurst	0.66	Private	Residential Properties and their curtilages	Yes. The site would be suitable for residential development, it is situated in a suitable location within the village envelope and development would not protrude into the open countryside.	No. The site is not available.	Yes. development in this location is considered to be achievable.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
KH	B199	Crown Corner Country Store, Ongar Road, Kelvedon Hatch	0.77	S.R.Bird	Retail store - animal feed/bedding	No. The site is not considered suitable for residential development as it is an unsustainable location for residential development, being detached from the urban boundary with limited services on offer in the vicinity.	Yes. The site is currently in use as a retail establishment.	Yes. However, the site may be more suited for employment use. The site does not lie in an existing urban area therefore it may require the provision of some minor infrastructure.
BWD	B200	The Brentwood Garden Centre, Vicarage Close, Brentwood	0.2	Messrs Kingston	Garden centre	No. The site is not suitable for residential development as it is an unsustainable location for residential development, as it is disjointed from other residential areas and has its boundary with the A12.	Yes. The site is in use as a garden centre.	Yes. However, the site may be more suited for employment uses given the neighbouring garage and commercial development. Consideration should also be given to the contamination of the site.
BWD	B201	Jasmine Cottage, 141 Billericay Road, Brentwood	0.1	Mr M and Mrs S Lewisdon	1 residential property	No. The site is in an unsustainable location away from services and facilities and is therefore considered to be unsustainable.	Yes. The site currently comprises 1 dwelling.	Yes. There are no environmental constraints on the site.
BWD	B221	4 Nags Head Lane, Brentwood	0.38	Mr and Mrs Savill	1 residential property	No. The site is divorced from the services and facilities and development is considered to be unsustainable.	Yes. The site currently comprises 1 dwelling.	Yes. Providing the issue of noise generated from the rail line and the M25 is addressed. There are no environmental designations on the site.
BWD	B211	Land to rear of 31-40 Nags Head Lane, Brentwood	1.33	Private	Storage Yard	No. The site is located away from facilities and services, to the rear of existing residential ribbon development and in proximity to the rail line. This site is in an unsustainable location and is therefore considered unsuitable for development.	Yes. The site is currently in use as a storage yard but the owners are willing to sell the site.	Yes. Providing any issues of contamination are addressed.
WHD	B202	East Horndon Hall Business Park, West Horndon	4.6	S. Walsh & Sons Ltd	Industrial B2 and B8 and residential	No. The site is too remote for residential development and considered to be unsustainably located.	Yes. The owner has put this site forward preferably for commercial or leisure. The site is currently in use for B2 and B8 uses along with a residential property on the site.	No. Due to its current use there is the potential for contamination on the site and noise from the adjacent A127. Residential development in this area may require the provision of additional services and infrastructure.
MTN	B207	Thoby Priory Industrial Estate, Thoby Lane, Mountnessing	4.8	Richard Gilbert	Industrial Units	No. It is considered that the site is unsuitable for residential development. The site is divorced from Mountnessing and not near any services/facilities.	Yes. The site is currently in industrial use and the industrial estate would need to be developed as a whole in order for this site to come forward.	No. There are likely to be a number of environmental constraints given the industrial uses these would need to be overcome. Additional infrastructure and services may also be required.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
MTN	B203	Land Adjacent to "Chitral", Wyatts Green Road, Swallows Cross, Mountnessing	0.4	Mr B Mortlock	Commercial uses - parking. Industrial uses	No. The site is not suitable for residential development. The site is divorced from existing services and facilities. The site comprises a number of commercial uses and parking. Possibility of contamination.	Yes the site is available	Yes. However there maybe a level of contamination which would need to be addressed.
BLM	B208	Manor House, Haygreen Lane, Blackmore	0.2	John Mansfield	House and Garden	No. The site is divorced from any settlement and development in this location would be unsustainable.	Yes. The site currently comprises a dwelling and garden.	Yes. Residential development upon the site is considered to be achievable.
DOD	B205	Hermes, Brook Lane, Doddinghurst	0.87	Mr and Mrs Scannell	Residential property with land to rear	No. The site lies some distance from the edge of Doddinghurst located away from the limited services and facilities within the village. Development on this site is considered to be unsustainable.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	No. Access constraints would need to be overcome in order to deliver development on the site. Additional infrastructure and services may be required to support development of this size.
PH	B209	144 Crow Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.5	Diane and Russell Boardman	Residential property with land to rear.	No. This site is not considered suitable for residential development. The site is in an unsustainable location away from existing facilities and services.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes. Residential development upon the site is considered to be achievable.
IST	B206	The Nutshell, Stock Lane, Ingates-tone,	0.42	Mr P A Sanders	Residential property with land (currently for sale with Hilbery Chaplin)	No. Whilst the Site abuts the edge of the existing village envelope, it is separated by the railway line and large scale development would be poorly related to the existing village form and would be out of character with the existing dispersed nature of surrounding properties.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. development would be achievable on this site. It is not anticipated that there would be any issues of contamination or major infrastructure requirements.
WAR	B204	The Forge, Great Warley Street, Warley	0.3	Mr and Mrs Todd	Forge and adjacent hard standing site (Uses B2 / B8)	No. The site is not suitable for residential development as it would have a detrimental effect upon the Conservation Area.	Yes. The site is available for residential development	Yes. The site is within an attractive residential area. There could be issues of potential contamination on the site, although cost of connection to services and infrastructure will be relatively low due to the sites existing use and its location.

## **Appendix 6:**

# **Greenfield Sites Assessed & Deemed to Have Potential for Residential Development**

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable Available Achievable		Development Timescale				
										1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus	
WAR	G154	Land to the Rear Warley County Infants School, Evelyn Walk, Warley	0.18	Medium	12	BCC	Incidental Green Space	Yes. The site comprises an area of incidental green space within an area of local authority housing. The site is not used for formal open space and as there is significant additional incidental green space in the vicinity, its loss would not be detrimental to local use or the appearance of the locality.	Yes. The site is vacant and appears to be available for development.	Yes. Development is adjacent to existing residential development which aids its achievability. The existing open space could be replaced by usable facilities as part of the redevelopment. Connection to infrastructure and services would be relatively low cost due to the surrounding residential uses. Contamination issues at the site are currently unknown. The site would be brought forward by a small size developer due to the dwelling numbers.	*			
BWD	G153	Rear of 83 - 93 Park Road, Brentwood	0.13	Medium	6	Multiple - Private Ownership	Scrubland and Garden	Yes. Residential development in this location would be considered to be suitable given the urban location.	Yes. The site appears to be available for development as it is unkempt with no evident use.	Yes. The achievability of this site is restricted by both the topography of the site which may restrict the number of dwellings that can be accommodated in this location; alongside the issue of multiple ownership of the site which may mean development may be difficult to deliver. The location of the site would mean that connection to infrastructure and services would be relatively low cost due to the surrounding residential land uses. This site is likely to be brought forward by a small developer due to its size.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable Available Achievable		Development Timescale				
										1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus	
BWD	G095	Adjacent and Rear of 207 - 217 Crescent Road, Brentwood	0.25	Medium	2	Unknown	Gardens to Rear - Scrubland Adjacent	Yes. The scrubland adjacent to number 217 appears to be available and would be suitable for one/two terraced dwellings. The residential gardens to the rear of these properties are not suitable for residential development as they are in multiple ownership and there is no access to this land.	Yes. The scrubland appears to be available for development as it is unkempt with no evident use.	Yes. The scrubland section of the site could be achievable however mitigation for the railway line may make this site less achievable or desirable to developers. The issues of contamination at the site are currently unknown. Connection to services and infrastructure would be relatively low cost due to its proximity to residential uses. This site due to its size and constraints is likely to be brought forward by a small developer.	*			
BWD	G141	Land Adj. 50 Spital Lane, Brentwood	0.63	Medium	10	Private	Horse Paddock	Yes. This site is currently used as a paddock for a small number of ponies. The site, located within a predominantly residential area, is considered to be suitable for residential development.	There is no evidence to suggest that this site is not available and the current use could be relocated easily.	Yes. The site is within an attractive residential location. However, mitigation would be required to buffer the noise from the A12 and this may detract from the achievability of the site. Contamination at the site is currently unknown. Connection costs to infrastructure and services is likely to be relatively low due to the existing surrounding land use. Due to its size this site is likely to come forward via a medium size developer.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable Available Achievable			Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
BWD	G142	18 Westbury Drive, Brentwood	0.4	Medium	2	Private	Rear Garden	Yes. The site comprises garden land to the rear of number 18 (residential). The garden appears to be subdivided into two areas. Developing the area furthest from the existing property would allow a portion of the garden to be retained. Access to the land could be introduced from the side without detriment to the existing property. The site is on a slope, however it would be suitable for development and would represent a good infill plot. Careful consideration would need to be given to mature trees in the area.	Yes. At the time of survey the land was subdivided indicating that the second plot could be available for development.	Yes. The site forms rear gardens in an established residential area which are currently sub divided, which indicates that development on the site would be achievable. However, consideration needs to be given to mature trees on the site although this is not likely to adversely effect the achievability of the site. Connection to infrastructure and services is likely to be relatively low cost due the sites location within a residential area.	*			
BWD	G160	304 - 316 Ongar Road including Garage Courts off Highwood Close, Brentwood	0.47	Medium	20	BBC	Amenity Space	Yes. Given the neighbouring residential uses the site is considered suitable for residential development. An appropriate buffer would be required between the residential dwellings and the A12 Brentwood Bypass. The Site is also allocated for development in the BBC Local Plan by virtue of Policy H1(15).	Yes, the Site is available for development.	Yes, however access improvements would be required off Highwood Close.		*		
SHN	G143	Land Adjacent to 110 Priests Lane, Shenfield	0.09	Medium	1	Private	Side Garden Land	Yes. The site comprises an area of land to the side of a dwelling. The development of this land would not impact on the overall garden land to the property and could therefore be developed as an infill plot. The site is therefore considered to be suitable and achievable.	Yes. The side garden could accommodate one dwelling in addition to the existing development.	Yes. It is considered that this site is achievable for one dwelling. The cost associated with infrastructure and services to the site are considered relatively low as the site lies within an existing residential setting. Due to its size this site is likely to be brought forward by a small developer.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable Available Achievable			Development Timescale			
											1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus
HER	G144	Land Adjacent Gayland, Thorndon Approach, Herongate	0.17	Medium	1	Private	Side Garden Land	Yes. The site is well located to the existing facilities and services in Herongate and would therefore be suitable for residential development. This site lies in an existing residential area and forms a side garden to the an existing property,	Yes. The site comprises overgrown garden land adjacent to a large dwelling. The land appears to be an additional area of land, ancillary to the main garden . The site would be suitable for development and would represent a good infill plot.	Yes. It is considered that one dwelling is achievable on this site. Careful consideration would need to be given to the existing trees on the site which are mature and of some landscape value to the area. Due to their size, these could impact on the achievability of the site if they needed to be retained. Costs are considered relatively low to connect to infrastructure and services as the site is located within a residential setting. Due to its size this site would come forward with a small developer.	*			
ING	G145	Adj. Everglades, Avenue Road, Ingatestone	0.09	Medium	4	Private	Part Garden	Yes. The site is within an existing residential area and therefore development is considered to be suitable.	Yes. The site comprises a bungalow and garden. The driveway/access to the property and garden appear to have been unused for some time, being overgrown, and are therefore considered available.	Yes. The site is located within an established residential area on the site of an unoccupied residential property. There is unlikely to be contamination on the site and cost of infrastructure and service provision is likely to be minimal as the site lies within a residential area. As the site is for 4 dwellings it is likely to be brought forward by a small developer.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable Available Achievable		Development Timescale				
										1-5 Years	5-10 Years	10-15 Years	15 Years Plus	
BLM	G146	Adjacent to 1 & 3 Orchard Piece, Blackmore	0.07	Low	2	Private/Multiple	Front Gardens	Yes. The site would be suitable for one or two dwellings, as the village centre is approximately 300m away. The site would provide infill development. This site is relatively small but is within an existing residential area it is large enough to accommodate additional residential development without having a detrimental effect upon the surrounding residential properties.	Yes. The site comprises part of the garden area to the front of two residential properties.	Yes. The site is allocated for residential development. Due to its location the site has good connections with infrastructure and services therefore the cost of bringing the site forward would be relatively low.	*			
KH	G147	Greenways, School Road, Kelvedon Hatch	0.19	Low	7	Private	Residential dwelling and garden	Yes. The site is suitable for residential development as the site is in a central location within the village.	The site comprises a residential dwelling and a garden, that appeared to be available for development at the time of survey.	The site is within an existing village and is allocated for residential development. The site is unlikely to be contaminated or need significant investment in infrastructure or environmental mitigation therefore the cost of bringing the site forward should not be prohibitive. The site has good connections in terms of infrastructure in an attractive location with good connection to amenities. The development would contribute to the vitality and viability of these existing services and facilities. The development is for 7 dwellings and therefore a smaller developer would bring the site forward.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years
BWD	G007	Land at Honeypot Lane, Honeypot Lane, Brentwood	10.9	Medium	325	Barwood Land & Estates (current option on land)	Agricultural fields	Yes. The site comprises agricultural fields. The site would be suitable for development and would represent a good infill development. The site also lies in close proximity to public transport nodes, facilities and services. The development of the site would also be contained by the railway and A12 therefore development would not protrude into the open countryside.	Yes. The site is readily available for development.	Yes. The site is adjacent to an existing attractive residential development and is a large site, which would aid the sites achievability. However, consideration would need to be given to a buffer / screening as the site is bounded by the A12 to the west, although due to the size of the site this is unlikely to be too detrimental to the site's development. Cost of connection to infrastructure and services would be in line with what would be expected for a site of this size, as would any developer contributions required for the site. This site would be brought forward by a national house builder or a consortium.		* (200)	* (125)	
BWD	G008	Land off Doddinghurst Road, either side of the A12, Brentwood	7.2	Medium	216	Essex construction company	Scrub land / open fields	Yes. The site comprises scrubland and open fields. The site would be suitable for development and would represent a good infill development. Consideration would need to be given to a byffer / screening as both portions of the site are bounded by the A12 on one side. The site also lies adjacent to the urban area and is within close proximity to a number of services and facilities.	Yes. The site is readily available for development.	Yes. This site would infill a gap within the existing residential area, it is a large site and is considered achievable. However, dwelling numbers may be affected by the need for a buffer and screening requirements to the A12. Connection to services and infrastructure would be in line with that expected for a site of this size as would any developer contributions required. This site would be brought forward by a national house builder or a consortium.		*		
BWD	G022	Salmons Farm, Salmons Grove, Ingrave	3.65	Low	44	C. Lonergan	Pasture	This site comprises pasture land. It is generally flat, although it sits slightly higher than surrounding development and any scheme would need to take this into account to preserve the landscape character. Development would also need to be restricted to the western part of the site to reduce the impact on the countryside and outward spread of the village. However, the site does have a good connection with the village and transport links.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes, although constrained by the recommendation that only the front part of the site is developed (approx 30% of total site) to avoid protrusion into the open countryside and to take into account the topography of the site and preserve the landscape character. Connection cost to infrastructure and services are likely to be relatively higher due to the current site use. This site is likely to be brought forward by a medium size developer.	*			
BWD	G013	Sawyers Hall Farm, Sawyers Hall Lane, Brentwood	20	Medium	50	Tesco	Scrub / pasture / open fields / animal sanctuary (forms small part of site - vast majority is Greenfield)	Yes. A small part of the site bounded by the A12 to the north and development to the south and west is deemed to be suitable for development given the neighbouring urban uses. The site comprises a mixture of uses including scrub land, pasture, open fields and an animal sanctuary. The majority of this site is not suitable for development as it extends beyond the built settlement and into the green wedge between Shenfield and Brentwood.	Yes, the site is available for residential development.	Yes. Part of the site is considered to be achievable. Contamination at the site is unknown at present. Due to ownership and site size this site is likely to come forward from a medium sized developer.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years
BWD	G052	Three Oaks Meadow, Hanging Hill Lane, Hutton,	0.4	Medium	10	Patricia Lamputt	Grazing Land	Yes. The site has a horse shelter which is approx. 7 years old. The remainder of the site is grazing land. Development of the site is compatible with the existing surrounding residential land uses with good connections to public transport and community facilities. Development of this site is considered to be suitable. Development of this site is not considered to have a significant impact upon the open countryside and would represent an acceptable extension of the existing urban area.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes. The site is located adjacent to an established residential area. It is likely that the cost of connecting the site to infrastructure and services is relatively low due to its location and surrounding uses. Due to the size of the site it is likely that this site would-be brought forward by a small developer.	*			
BWD	G072	Home Meadow, Land Adjacent to 12 Tyburns, Hutton,	1.8	Medium	90	Nicola Villalard	Grazing Land	Yes. The site is on an annual tenancy agreement and is used for grazing. There are no statutory environmental designations or constraints, however there are issues of drainage, potential contamination, and existing vegetation to be addressed. The site has good connections with existing transport and community links and is therefore considered suitable for development. In addition, the development of this site would not have a significant effect on the countryside.	Yes. the site is available for residential development.	Yes. Development on the site is considered to be achievable due to its location adjacent to an attractive residential area. Its achievability could be constraint by issues of contamination and existing vegetation on the site, both of which could effect the viability of the site to come forward. The site would be subject to developer contribution payments. Due to the size of the site it is likely to come forward via a medium size developer.		*		
BWD	G032	End of Hove Close, adjacent end of Bayley's Mead, off Hanging Hill Lane, Brentwood,	0.61	Medium	27	Maryland's Green Estates	Scrub Land	Yes. The site is currently scrub land. Along with site G065 this site appears to be a natural extension on the edge of the built up area. This site would be suitable for residential development. The site is in close proximity to a range of facilities and services and development would have a minimal impact upon the open countryside.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes. the site is within an attractive residential area. However, the site may only be developable with access from site G065. Contamination issues at the site are unknown. The cost of connection to infrastructure and services is likely to be relatively low due to the sites proximity to existing residential development. Due to the size of the site it is likely to come forward via a medium size developer.		*		
BWD	G065	Land at Bayleys Mead, Bayleys Mead, Hutton	2.35	Medium	105	Mr D Fisher	Scrub land with areas of woodland	Yes. This site appears to be a natural extension to the existing residential area of Hutton and it is considered that development would have a minimal impact on the countryside. The site is within close proximity to a public transport route and services and facilities.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes. The site is within an attractive residential area. Contamination issues at the site are unknown. The cost of connection to infrastructure and services and any developer contributions is likely to be in line with what would normally be expected for a site of this size. Due to the size of the site it is likely to come forward via a national house builder.		*		

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years
BWD	G087	Land to east of Nags Head Lane, Brentwood	5.8	Medium	174	Mr A Johnson and Mr W Johnson	Paddock land	Yes. The site comprises a paddock. The site would be suitable for residential development as it is located on the edge of the Brentwood built area, and therefore bounded on one side by residential development. Development would have a minimal impact upon the open countryside. The site is located in close proximity to the services on the London Road, which is served by public transport.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes. The site is within an attractive residential area. A buffer from the railway would need to be considered but due to the size of the site this should not pose a major constraint to the viability of the site. The cost of connection to infrastructure and services is expected to be in line with any site of this size, this also applies to any developer contributions which will apply to this site. Due to the size of the site it is expected that the site will be brought forward by a national house builder.		*		
BWD	G040	Land East of Brentwood	435 (26.5)	Medium	690	Copy farm (Blackmore) Ltd	Site is currently in use for agricultural purposes	Yes. The site is a large area of agricultural land to the east of Brentwood. The parcel of land stretches from Hutton to the east, Ingrave to the south to Havering's Grove to the west. If all of the site was developed there would be a coalescence of these settlements and therefore it is not recommended that the full site is developed. It is considered that only a small part of the site is suitable for development, providing an extension of Hutton along Running Waters.	Yes. The site is readily available for development.	Yes. Part of the site adjacent to the existing urban area would be achievable. The southern part of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 which would restrict development in this area. Cost of connection to infrastructure and services is unlikely to be abnormal due to the site's proximity to existing residential areas. Contamination is unknown at the site. The number of dwellings that the site could support is currently a general indication, however it is likely that the site would be brought forward by a national house builder.		* (200)	* (300)	* (190)
BWD	G089	Land to the South East of Hutton	1.31	Medium	13	Private	Paddock land	Yes. This site comprises a paddock and lies adjacent to existing two storey residential dwellings. There is access to the road network and existing community facilities. Residential development would be compatible with the existing surrounding land uses. There are existing trees and hedgerows on site. The development of this site would represent an extension of the existing urban area and would have a minimal impact upon the countryside. However, the site does lie within the Hutton Village Conservation Area and consideration needs to be given to how development may impact upon the conservation area.	Yes the site is available	Yes. The site is within an attractive residential area. The site lies within Hutton Village Conservation Area and a sympathetic design would be required. Cost of connecting the site to infrastructure and services is likely to be relatively low cost due to the sites proximity to existing residential areas. Contamination at the site is currently unknown. Due to the size of the site development is likely to come forward via a medium sized house builder.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years
BWD	G021	Land at Ingrave Road (198, 198a, 198b & 176), Brentwood	2.2	Medium	70	Private	Gardens	Yes. The site comprises 3 residential dwellings and garden land. There is an existing access to the site. The development of the site would not have a significant impact upon the open countryside or green wedge. The development would follow the alignment of the existing settlement boundary. The site is in a sustainable location adjacent to the urban area and is in close proximity to the services and facilities provided within the urban area.	Yes. All owners are willing to redevelop the site and it is therefore considered to be available.	Yes. The sites is in an attractive residential location. Connection cost to services and infrastructure would be in line with that expected for a development of this size as would any developer contributions. This site would be brought forward by a large developer.		*		
SM	G059	Land of Penny Pots Barn, Ongar Road, Stondon Massey	0.14	Low	7	Mrs Diana Hiscox	Scrub land	Yes. The site comprises overgrown scrubland. Development of this site would form a logical boundary to Stondon Massey, adjacent to the current settlement boundary. Consideration would need to be given to access off Penny Pots Barn / Exchange Road. Stondon Massey is a village with limited services, new development in this location could enhance the viability of these services.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. This site is within an attractive residential area. Contamination issues at the site are currently unknown. Connection cost to infrastructure and services is likely to be relatively low due to its proximity to existing residential development. Due to the size of the site it is likely to be brought forward by a small developer.	*			
SM	G046	Land to West of Nine Ashes Road, Stondon Massey	1.98	Low	60	G Gann, David Lee, Sarah Wright	Agricultural	Yes. The site comprises agricultural fields. This site would be suitable for development as it would constitute a sensible edge to Stondon Massey village. The village centre lies to the south of the site, beyond existing residential development. Open fields lie to the north of the site. Development would have a limited impact upon the open countryside.	Yes, the site is available	Yes. The site is considered achievable as it is adjacent to existing, attractive residential development. Contamination issues at the site are currently unknown. Connection cost to infrastructure and services is likely to be relatively low due to its proximity to existing residential development. Due to the size of the site it is likely to be brought forward by a medium/large size developer.		*		

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years
DOD	G086	Land adjacent to St Margaret's Church, Doddinghurst	1.0	Low	30	Mr R Parrott	Scrub	Yes. The site comprises overgrown scrubland. This development of this site would be in keeping with the character of Doddinghurst. The site represents an extension to Doddinghurst. Development may have a positive impact upon the existing village services and facilities.	Yes. The site is available for development	Yes. This site is adjacent to an established residential area. Development in this location may assist the viability and improvement of local services. Contamination issues at the site are currently unknown. Connection cost to infrastructure and services is likely to be relatively low due to its proximity to existing residential development. Any developer contributions are likely to be in line with what is expected for a site of this size. Due to the size of the site it is likely to be brought forward by a medium size developer.	*			
WG	G029	Wyatt's Field, Wyatt's Green	2.0	Low	60	SJ & CM Norris	Agricultural	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land. This site would be suitable for development as it would follow the existing build line and would form a logical boundary to the Wyatt's Green settlement. The site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary. The development of this site would not lead to settlement coalescence and it would not encroach any further into the countryside. The impact upon the open countryside is therefore considered to be minimal.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. The site is within an attractive residential area. Access could be achieved via the hammerhead at Wyatt's Green Lane. Contamination levels at the site are unknown at present. Costs associated with connection to infrastructure and services are not expected to be higher than expected for a site of this size, as would any developer contributions which would apply. Due to the size of the site a medium size developer would bring the site forward.	*			
WG	G090	Land adjacent to Whitelands, Wyatt's Green	0.8	Low	24	Mr and Mrs Palmer	Scrub / Wooded	Yes. The site comprises overgrown scrubland and pockets of woodland. This site would be suitable for development and would follow the existing building line. The development of this site would not result in settlement coalescence and it would not encroach any further into the countryside compared to the existing development.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Development is adjacent to an established attractive residential development. Access could be achieved via the hammerhead at Whitelands. Contamination issues at the site are currently unknown. Cost of connection to infrastructure and services is likely to be in line with what is expected of a site of this size, as would any developer contributions which would be required. The site of this size is likely to be brought forward by a medium sized developer.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale				
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years	
SHN	G091	Officers Meadow, east of Chelmsford Road/land off Alexander Lane, Shenfield	20.4	Medium	500	SAJAS Ltd. / Mssrs. Flint	Grassland / Scrub	The site comprises scrubland with no use evident. This site is suitable for development as it is located in a sustainable location, close to the Shenfield shopping area and rail station. It is enclosed by the Chelmsford Road and railway line, and therefore limiting further encroachment into the countryside. The site is also located on a public transport route which provides direct access to the town centre.	Yes, the site is available.	Yes. Development at the site is considered achievable as it is within an established residential area and is a large site, attractive to a developer. The site would require a buffer adjacent to the railway line, but for a site of this size it would not effect viability. Cost of connection to infrastructure and services would be in line with that expected of a site of this size, as would any developer contributions. Developer information is unknown at present however it is likely that the site would be brought forward by a national house builder.		* (200)	* (300)		
MTN	G093	Land Adjacent to Mountnessing Primary School	1.26	Low	32	Mr T Field	Open field	Yes. This site comprises ploughed agricultural land with no buildings on the site. The site is bound by residential properties and the Primary School and therefore impact on the open countryside would be minimal. The site would be suitable for development as it is on the edge of the village with associated amenities.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Development at this site would be within an attractive area. Due to the location it is recommended that only low density housing would be appropriate. Contamination issues are unknown at the site at present. Connection to infrastructure and services would be relatively low cost as the site is adjacent to existing residential development. Development of this size would be brought forward by a medium size developer.	*				
KH	G054	Land at Church Road, Kelvedon Hatch	1.4	Low	56	J A Parrish and Sons	Agricultural	Yes. The site comprises land in agricultural use. This site would be suitable for development as it is located on the edge of the settlement close to the village centre and with access to services and facilities. There is already development on either side of it, meaning that there would be a reduced impact on the open countryside.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Given the residential nature of the site location within an attractive area, residential development is considered achievable. Contamination issues are currently unknown at the site. Connection to infrastructure and services is considered likely to be relatively low cost due to the proximity to existing residential areas. Due to the site size this site is likely to be brought forward by a medium size developer.		*			
KH	G028	Swedish Field, Stocks Lane, Kelvedon Hatch,	1.0	Low	30	Scott Norris	Agricultural	Yes. The site comprises land in agricultural use. This site would be suitable for development as it would not result in an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. The site's location on the edge of Kelvedon Hatch would provide suitable access to services and facilities in the village.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. The site is located with an attractive residential area. Contamination issues are unknown. Connection cost to infrastructure and services is expected to be in line with a site of this size, as would any developer contributions required. A site of this site would be brought forward by a medium size developer.	*				

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years
BLM	G070A	Land south of Redrose Lane, backing onto Orchard Piece, Blackmore,	3.4	Low	89	R Swift, V Stiff, C Blythe	Grazing land	Yes. The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary and contained by Redrose Lane, Fingrith Hall Lane and Chelmsford Road. The site comprises land used for grazing. The site is bounded on one side by residential properties. Development in this location would help to support the viability and vitality of existing services and potentially provide new services.	Yes. The site is available for development.	Yes. Residential development on this site would be achievable due to its location within an attractive area. The connection cost of infrastructure and services are likely to be in line with what would be expected for a site of this size as would any developer contributions that would be applied to the site. Due to its size this site would be brought forward by a medium sized developer.	* (40)	* (49)		
BLM	G070	Land south of Redrose Lane, backing onto Woollard Way, Blackmore,	4.2	Low	110	Micheal King	Grazing Land	Yes. The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary and contained by Redrose Lane, Fingrith Hall Lane and Nine Ashes Road. The site comprises land used for grazing. The site is bounded to the south by residential properties. Development in this location would help to support the viability and vitality of existing services and potentially provide new services.	Yes. The site is available for development.	Yes. Residential development on this site would be achievable due to its location within an attractive area. The connection cost of infrastructure and services are likely to be in line with what would be expected for a site of this size as would any developer contributions that would be applied to the site. Due to its size this site would be brought forward by a medium sized developer.	* (50)	* (60)		
ING	G020	Land at Parklands, High Street, Ingatestone	1.8	Low	54	Barnoakes Management	Grazing land	Yes. The site comprises land used for grazing. This site would be suitable for development as it is located on the edge of the settlement and would form a logical extension to Ingatestone. It is considered that the development of this site would not effect the overall character of the special landscape designation. The village is well served by public transport and has a number of services and facilities that are in close proximity to the site.	Yes. The site is available for development.	The site is within an attractive residential location. Contamination issues are not known at this site. Connection cost for infrastructure and services are likely to be in line with expectations for a site of this size; as would any developer contributions for the site. A site of this size is likely to be brought forward by a medium sized developer.	*			
ING	G101B	Land Adjacent to Ingatestone by Pass, Ingatestone, (part bounded by Roman Road on two sides, to south of flyover)	1.38	Low	41	R Gaymer, P Gaymer and J Gaymer	Scrubland	Yes. The site comprises overgrown scrubland. This site would be suitable for development as it is located on the edge of the settlement. There are already residential properties adjacent to the site. A buffer from the A12 would need to be considered.	Yes. This site is available for development.	Yes. The site is within an attractive residential location. Contamination issues are not known at this site. Connection cost for infrastructure and services are likely to be in line with expectations for a site of this size; as would any developer contributions. A site of this size is likely to be brought forward by a medium sized developer.	*			

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Density Typology	Dwelling Capacity (Net)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable	Development Timescale			
											1-5	5-10	10-15	15 Years
WAR	G034	Site Adjacent to Carmel, Mascalls Lane, Warley	1.0	Low	30	Chaplin Trustees	Scrubland	Yes. The site comprises overgrown scrubland. The site would be suitable for residential development and would represent acceptable infill development. The development of this site could be combined with the redevelopment of the hospital site adjacent.	Yes. The site is available for development.	Yes, The site is within an attractive area and there is the possibility to tie this development in with adjacent land, which may add to the achievability of the site. Contamination issues at the site are unknown at present. The cost associated with connecting the site to local infrastructure and services is expected to be in line with expectations for a site of this size, as will any developer contributions for the site. The site is likely to be brought forward by a medium size developer.	*			
WH	G019	Thorndon Avenue and West of Tilbury Road, West Horndon	10.0	Medium	300	West Horndon Development Consortium	Grade 3 Agricultural Land	Yes. This parcel of land as put forward comprises agricultural land and is located between the A127 and West Horndon village. There is existing vehicular access to the land. Development of the whole of the 75 hectares put forward would be wholly unacceptable. Any development that provides for more than the local needs of West Horndon would need to be based on an agreed change in the role of West Horndon village, conformity with a spatial strategy based on Transport corridors and major infrastructure and service improvements for the village. An indicative maximum of 10 hectares has been used for this purpose, located adjacent to the existing village boundary, but the extent of development of this area would also be considered along with Site G018	Yes. The site is available for development.	Yes. Residential development on the site would be achievable providing, landscape and visual impacts and existing trees/hedgerows can be adequately dealt with. The land is flat and open and there is potential flood risk issue. All of these factors could reduce the viability of the site. Contamination of the site is currently unknown. Costs associated with connection of this site to infrastructure and services are likely to be considerable due to its size, as would any developer contributions. This site would come forward through a national house builder.		* (200)	* (100)	



## Appendix 7:

# Greenfield Sites Assessed & Discounted for Residential Development

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
WAR	G106	Land to the Rear of 21-23 Hartswood Road, Warley	0.05	Private	Garden Land	Yes. The development of this site would leave adequate size gardens for both the existing and future residents. The site is considered to be suitable for residential development.	No. The site comprises the rear garden to a residential property. The site is not up for sale nor is it available.	Yes. The development of the site is considered to be achievable, although the site is not available at present.
WAR	G088	Land to the Rear of Arbour Close, Off Woodman Road, Warley	1.86	Private	Amenity Woodland	No. The site provides an important landscape break within the locality and contains a number of mature trees. This site is also designated as Protected Urban Open Space. It is considered that the loss of this woodland would be detrimental to the character of the area.	No. The site is in Private ownership.	Yes. Development of the site could be achieved. It is not anticipated that there are any contamination issues or requirements for additional infrastructure.
WH	G097	Land east of West Horndon Industrial Estate, West Horndon	1.02	Private	Scrubland	No. The site is designated as Protected Open Space and is therefore not considered to be appropriate for development.	Yes. At the time of survey the site appeared to be vacant.	Yes. The site is on the edge of a residential development and is currently un-used. The site is considered achievable for residential development although consideration is needed to any potential contamination. Due to adjacent industrial uses a landscape buffer would be required to protect residential amenities. Connection to infrastructure and services should be relatively low cost due to the existing residential uses nearby.
WH	G104	Land to the Rear of 144-152 Thornden Avenue, West Horndon	0.4	BBC	Public Open Space	Yes. The site is allocated for residential purposes, although currently used for open space purposes, which would need to be replaced.	No. The site contains an area of public open space attached to a playground and other facilities currently in use.	Yes. Development of the site could be achieved. It is not anticipated that there are any contamination issues or requirements for additional infrastructure. Access to the site is considered to be a constraint.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	G152	10 - 32 Running Waters, Brentwood	0.17	Private	Incidental Open Space	No. The site comprises incidental open space, the site is relatively constrained by space and it is considered that development would be detrimental to residential amenity.	No. The site is not considered to be available given its current use as public open space.	Yes. It is not anticipated that there would be any contamination issues or requirements for additional infrastructure.
BWD	G156	15 & 16 Bardeswell Close, Brentwood	0.24	Private & Multiple	Garage and Gardens	No. Development would have a detrimental impact upon the residents of numbers 15 and 16 and is therefore considered unsuitable for additional residential development.	No. The site is currently in use and comprises the garage, garden and driveways to numbers 15 and 16.	No. Development would be detrimental to residential amenity.
BWD	G094	Land Adjacent to the Chough Public House, East Ham Crescent, Brentwood	0.3	LB Newham	Public amenity space	No. The site comprises incidental open space, it is considered that development would be detrimental to residential amenity. The site is also Protected Urban Open Space.	No. The site is not considered to be available given its current use as public open space.	Yes. It is not anticipated that there would be any contamination issues or requirements for additional infrastructure.
BWD	G078	Allotment Gardens South of River Road, South Weald	0.4	BBC	Allotments	No. Development of this site would lead to the loss of allotment gardens.	No. The site comprises allotments which appear to be in regular use. The loss of the allotments would be contrary to PPG17 unless it could be shown that there is no proven need for them	Yes. In order to develop the allotments it would need to be concluded either that there was no need for them or that they could be replaced in an appropriate alternative location. There could be minor contamination issues associated with this. It is not considered that additional major infrastructure would be required to deliver this development.
BWD	G080	Adjacent to 1 Capon Close, Brentwood	0.1	BBC	Playground	No. It is considered that this site is not suitable for residential development as it represents a valuable community facility.	No. The site is currently in use as a playground.	Yes. It would need to be demonstrated that there is no need for this facility or that the facility could be relocated in an appropriate alternative location. It is not considered that additional major infrastructure would be required to deliver this development.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	G077	Playground North of River Road, South Weald	0.4	BBC	Playground and Pitch	No. It is considered that this site is not suitable for residential development as it represents a valuable community facility.	No. The site is currently in use as a playground.	Yes. It would need to be demonstrated that there is no need for this facility or that the facility could be relocated in an appropriate alternative location. It is not considered that additional major infrastructure would be required.
BWD	G162	Between 38 and 50 Crescent Road, Brentwood	0.17	ECC	School Playing Field	Yes. The site would be suitable given the size of the plot, location and surrounding residential development. However, the site is Protected Urban Open Space.	No. The site is currently in use as a school/nursery playing field.	Yes. It would need to be demonstrated that there is no need for this facility or that the facility could be relocated in an appropriate alternative location. It is not considered that additional major infrastructure would be required.
BWD	G016	Land to the West of Ongar Road, Sandpit Lane and Crow Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.13	Private/Highways	Green area in front of existing bungalow dwellings	Yes. This site is considered suitable for residential development although it has a number of trees and telegraph poles within it.	No. The site provides a valuable amenity green and is not considered to be available for development.	Yes. Development is considered achievable given its residential location.
BWD	G098	La Plata Grove, Brentwood	2.31	Private	Mature Woodland	No. The site is Protected Urban Open Space and a valuable local amenity and important woodland.	No. The site is not considered available given its current significant natural and landscape value.	Yes. Development could be delivered on this site. It is not anticipated that there would be a requirement for major infrastructure improvements.
BWD	G066	Adjacent to 5 Orchard Avenue, Brentwood	0.08	BBC	Incidental Green Space	No. The site is designated as Protected Urban Open Space. However, the site does not appear to have any formal use or recreational value at present. Development could rationalise the space and create a more usable play area as a result.	No. The site would be available if not required as open space.	Yes. There are some mature trees which would need removing in order to develop this site which is in an established residential area. Major infrastructure is not considered to be necessary.
BWD	G131	Land at the Junction of Cherry Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue, Brentwood	0.06	BBC	Incidental Green Space	No. The site is designated as Protected Urban Open Space. The site comprises incidental open space, which does not appear to have any formal use or recreational value at present. Development could rationalise the space and create a more usable play space as a result. The site could also be developed with site 121 above.	No. The site would be available if not required as open space.	Yes. There are some mature trees which would need removing in order to develop this site which is in an established residential area. Major infrastructure is not considered to be necessary.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	G096	Opposite 1-7 and 2 - 12 Pond Field, Brentwood	0.14	LB Newham	Incidental Open Space	No. The site comprises Protected Open Space and is therefore not suitable for development, although it does not appear to have any formal use or recreational value at present.	No. The site would be available if not required as open space.	Yes. There are some mature trees which would need removing in order to develop this site which is in an established residential area. There are unlikely to be any contamination issues at the site. Connection costs to infrastructure and services are likely to be low due to the surrounding residential uses.
BWD	G076	Opposite 18-28 Hornbeam Close, Brentwood	0.2	LB Newham	Incidental Green Space	No. The site is Protected Urban Open Space. The site comprises a triangular area of incidental green space, bounded on two sides by housing, with a public right of way on the third side. This right of way and a hedge separate the land from agricultural land to the south-east. The grassed open space features three mature trees and some poor quality play equipment.	Yes. The majority of the site could be brought forward, if the policy restrictions could be removed.	Yes. Although a new location would need to be found for the play area and the existing mature trees would require removal. Major infrastructure is not considered to be necessary.
BWD	G107	Rear of 11 West Way and Rear of 6 Manor Road	0.05	Private/Multiple	Residential Gardens	No. There is no access to the rear of the existing properties, at least one dwelling would need to be demolished in order to gain access into the site.	No. The site comprises part of two residential rear gardens in separate ownership.	No. Development of this site would be detrimental to the existing residents and would require the demolition of the existing property .
BWD	G108	Land Rear Of 4 - 16 Worrin Road, Brentwood	0.35	Private	Gardens	Yes. The site is considered to be suitable for residential development. The site lies within an existing residential area and development is not considered to be detrimental to existing residents.	No. The site comprises a number of gardens that are in use and in multiple ownership.	No. Not considered achievable due to multiple ownerships.
BWD	G109	Land between 31 and 40 Pennyfields, Brentwood	0.12	Private	Vacant land (Garden?)	No. There is a substantial level change between the site and Pennyfolds, which is where the access would be derived.	No. The site is land locked between existing garden areas.	No. The site's physical characteristics prohibit the development. The lack of access and removal of ground and remodelling of the land could make this a costly development.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	G110	5-13 Weald Road, Brentwood	0.4	Private and Multiple	Residential Gardens and unused land	Yes. The land to the rear and the existing gardens is suitable for residential development.	No. The site comprises a number of gardens and is in multiple ownership, there are likely to be issues with site assembly,	Yes. There is no access into the site, at least one dwelling would need to be demolished to access the land.
BWD	G111	R/O 42 - 50 Spital Lane, South Weald	0.12	Private	Multiple Gardens	Yes. The site is suitable for residential development and could be developed alongside site G141. Access to the site is somewhat restricted and Spital Lane is narrow and would need widening to support development.	No. The site is not available.	No. The site lies in multiple ownership.
BWD	G112	R/O Broomwood to Gatehouse, Upper Cornsland, Brentwood	0.38	Private and Multiple	Rear gardens	Yes. This site is currently existing residential gardens and suitable for residential development.	No. The site comprises part of several rear gardens and is not considered available.	No. Due to access constraints and multiple ownerships, development in this location is not considered to be achievable.
BWD	G113	Land adjacent to South Weald Parish Hall, Brentwood	0.24	Private and Multiple	Gardens	No, the site is in multiple ownership and comprises the rear gardens of a number of dwellings. Access to the site could be derived from the Parish Hall. However the access would need upgrading.	No. The site comprises part of several rear gardens and is not considered available.	No. Development on this site is not considered to be achievable given the multiple ownership issues relating to the site. The Site also lies within Flood Zone 2 and whilst this may not constrain development it may detract from the viability of the development.
BWD	G099	R/O 171e High Street, Brentwood	0.06	Private	Garden	Yes. There is existing residential development on four sides of the site. However, this part of the garden is well treed and of amenity value.	No. The site comprises part of the rear gardens and is not considered available.	No. Access to the site may be problematic.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
HER	G100	Land Adjacent to St Andrews Methodist Church, Herongate	0.26	BBC	Allotments	Yes. If an alternative location was found for the allotments then they would be suitable for residential development given the nature of the surrounding land uses.	No. The site comprises allotments which appear to be in regular use. The loss of the allotments would be contrary to PPG17 unless it could be shown that there is no proven need for them	No. If it could be shown that there were no requirement for the allotments or that they could be moved to an alternative location, development could be achievable on the site. There maybe issues of contamination. However, due to the location, it is not anticipated that there would be a requirement for major infrastructure.
HER	G114	Land to the Rear of 170 Brentwood Road, Herongate	0.06	Private	Garden	Yes. The site would be suitable for residential development if it was to become available. The site would be suitable for development given the surrounding land uses and the size of the plot/relationship with neighbours.	No. The site comprises the rear garden of a substantial dwelling house which is characteristic of the surrounding area. The development of the site would result in the loss of that garden land which appears to be well tended. The site is not up for sale and it is considered that the site is not available.	Yes. If the site becomes available.
PH	G079	Allotment Gardens to the Rear of 5-27 Bishops Hall Road & 68-80 Elizabeth Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.22	Brentwood Horticultural Society	Allotments	Yes. If an alternative location was found for the allotments then they would be suitable for residential development given the nature of the surrounding land uses.	No. The site comprises allotments which appear to be in regular use. The loss of the allotments would be contrary to PPG17 unless it could be shown that there is no proven need for them	No. If it could be shown that there were no requirement for the allotments or that they could be moved to an alternative location, development could be achievable on the site. There maybe issues of contamination. However, due to the location, it is not anticipated that there would be a requirement for major infrastructure.
PH	G115	Land to the Rear of 182-206 Hatch Road, Pilgrims Hatch	0.4	Private	Rear Gardens	Yes. The site would be suitable for residential development.	No. The site comprises a number of privately owned rear gardens in multiple ownership.	Yes. Given the size of the plot - development could occur in this location without having a detrimental impact upon the existing properties/residents. The site lies within an existing residential area and it is considered that major infrastructure would not be required to deliver the development.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
IGR	G103	Allotment Gardens Adjacent to St Nicholas Church, Ingrave	0.54	Private	Allotments	Yes. Given the size of the plot - development could occur in this location without having a detrimental impact upon the existing properties/residents. However an alternative location would be required for the allotments.	No. The site comprises allotments which appear to be in regular use. The loss of the allotments would be contrary to PPG17 unless it could be shown that there is no proven need for them	No. If it could be shown that there were no requirement for the allotments or that they could be moved to an alternative location, development could be achievable on the site. There maybe issues of contamination. However, due to the location, it is not anticipated that there would be a requirement for major infrastructure.
ING	G101	Land South of Bell Mead, Ingatestone	0.42	BBC	Scrub/Woodland	No. The site is not considered suitable for residential development as it contains a number of mature trees and dense vegetation.	No. The land in question is unavailable for residential development.	Yes. The site lies within an established residential area and it is considered that major infrastructure would not be required in order to deliver the development. The site contains established vegetation that would need to be cleared and access would need to be improved.
ING	G155	Land R/O 93-119 Heybridge Road, Ingatestone	0.5	BBC	Amenity Space	No. The site lies within an area of Flood Risk and it is therefore considered not suitable for residential development.	Yes. The Site is owned by the BBC and is considered to be available for development.	Yes. The site is in the ownership of BBC and development could be achievable if issues regarding flood risk can be overcome.
HUT	G116	R/O 120 - 134 'Fielding Way' Rayleigh Road, Hutton	0.17	Private & Multiple	Garages & Allotments	No. The site is unsuitable for residential development as the removal of the garages would result in the increase in vehicles parked on the street and therefore considered detrimental to local amenities and highway safety. Alternative allotment provision would also be required.	No. The site is in multiple ownership/use as garages and an allotment patch and therefore is considered unavailable for residential development. Part of the site comprises allotments which appear to be in regular use. The loss of the allotments would be contrary to PPG17 unless it could be shown that there is no proven need for them	Yes. The site is in an established residential area and it is anticipated that there would be no major infrastructure requirements.
HUT	G148A	R/O 83 - 87 Rayleigh Road, Hutton	0.06	Private & Multiple	Rear Gardens to Multiple Residential Properties	Yes. Rear gardens in an established residential location.	No. The site comprises the rear gardens to multiple residential properties.	No. The site is within an established residential area, it is anticipated that there would be no requirement for major infrastructure in this location. However, multiple land acquisitions to be achieved.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
HUT	G148B	R/O 75 - 81 Rayleigh Road, Hutton	0.06	Private and Multiple	Rear Gardens to Multiple Residential Properties	Yes. Rear Gardens in an established residential location.	No the site comprises the rear gardens to a number of residential properties.	No. The site is within an established residential area, it is anticipated that there would be no requirement for major infrastructure in this location. However, multiple land acquisitions to be achieved.
HUT	G118	R/O 113 - 115 Hanging Hill Lane, Hutton	0.2	Private & Multiple	Gardens to two Residential Properties	Yes. Rear gardens in an established residential location.	No. The site is not considered to be available for development due to multiple ownerships and current use.	No. The site is within an established residential area, it is anticipated that there would be no requirement for major infrastructure in this location. However, multiple land acquisitions to be achieved.
HUT	G119	50 & 52 Park Avenue, Hutton	0.34	Private & Multiple	Residential Properties	Yes. The existing dwellings occupy large plots with scope for intensification.	No. The site is not considered to be available for development.	Yes. Subject to acquisition of the two plots. It is considered that no additional infrastructure would be required to support the development. This is an attractive area and development in this location is achievable.
HUT	G120	Adjacent to Senga, Herington Grove, Hutton.	0.05	Private	Side Garden	No. The site is unsuitable for residential development as the existing properties are large, detached houses with large plots in private ownership. The site would be relatively small in comparison and out of character and there is the possibility of a TPO on the large plot	No. The site is not considered to be available for residential development as it is a side garden to a residential property and in use.	Yes. The site is within a sought after residential area, but small relative to other existing properties.
HUT	G121	Adjacent Lofthus & Little Mallards, Mallard Way, Hutton	0.05	Private	Part of large rear garden	Yes. The site is suitable for residential development as it is located within an established residential location with large, detached houses within large plots.	No. The site is considered to be unavailable for residential development as it is part of a rear garden to a residential property and in use.	Yes. The site is within a sought after residential area. It is not anticipated that there would be any requirement for major infrastructure to support this development.
HUT	G122	Adjacent to Cromarty, Heronway, Hutton.	0.12	Private	Side Garden	No. The site is unsuitable for residential development as the existing properties are large, detached houses with large plots in private ownership. The site would be relatively small in comparison and out of character.	No. The site is considered to be unavailable for residential development as it is the side garden to a residential property and in use.	Yes. The site is within a sought after residential area but small relative to other existing properties. It is not anticipated that there would be any requirement for major infrastructure to support this development.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
HUT	G123	Adjacent to the Lyches, Greenway, Hutton	0.12	Private	Side Garden	Yes. This is a substantial plot in an established residential location. The site may contain a number of TPOs.	No. The site is considered to be unavailable for residential development as it is the side garden to a residential property and in use.	Yes. The site is within a sought after residential area. It is not anticipated that there would be any requirement for major infrastructure to support this development.
HUT	G124	Rear Of Trevone and Thistledown, Mount Avenue, Hutton	0.12	Private and Multiple	Rear Gardens	No. The site comprises the rear gardens to two residential properties. Development would have a detrimental impact upon the existing residents.	No. The site is considered to be unavailable for residential development as it is the rear gardens to residential properties and in use.	Yes. Access would need to be taken through Hillwood Grove. It is not anticipated that major infrastructure would be required to deliver development on this site.
HUT	G125	R/O Broad Oaks, Knowle, Trinity Gables, Brockley Grove, Hutton	0.3	Private	Rear Gardens	No. The site comprises rear gardens to three properties, the gardens appear to comprise dense woodland which adds to the leafy character of the area. The site could be accessed from Silver Birches.	No. The site is considered to be unavailable for residential development as it is the rear gardens to residential properties and in use.	No. Accesses could be derived from Silver Birches however this would be detrimental to the character of the street.
HUT	G126	R/O 53-57 Rayleigh Road, Hutton	0.05	Private	Rear Gardens	Yes. The site is in an established residential area and considered suitable.	No. The site is in multiple ownership and comprises the rear gardens to 3 residential dwellings. The site is therefore not considered to be available for residential development.	No. The site lies in an established residential area, it is not considered that development in this location would require major infrastructure investment, but land assembly may be problematic.
SHN	G127	Land to the Rear of 38-42 Crossways, Shenfield	0.06	Private	Gardens	No. The site comprises part of the gardens to 4 properties, the loss of which may be unacceptable and have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of the existing properties.	No. Given the multiple ownerships the site is not available.	No. Although situated in a desirable area, the site is unlikely to be achievable due to the multiple ownerships and impact on amenities.
SHN	G132	R/O 49b to 57 Priests Lane, Shenfield	0.32	Private	Rear Gardens	Yes. The site comprises a number of rear gardens in an established residential location.	No. The site is not considered to be available due to ownership constraints and issues of access.	Yes. However, land acquisition could be problematic given the multiple ownership and access to the site may require the demolition of one property.
SHN	G129	16 & 17 Worrin Close, Shenfield	0.25	Private	Rear Garden Land	Yes. However, development of the site may be difficult given the layout of existing development.	No. The site comprises the rear gardens of two private dwelling houses and is not available for development.	No. Development may require the demolition of an existing property but still be difficult given the layout of existing properties.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
SHN	G159	Land to the Rear of 10-14 Kilworth Avenue, Shenfield	0.05	Private	Rear Garden Land	Yes. The site would be suitable as the plot is considered to be large enough without causing detriment to the existing residents.	No. The site comprises the rear gardens of large private dwelling houses and therefore is not available.	Yes. However, land acquisition could be problematic given the multiple ownership.
SHN	G157	Land to the Rear of 68-74 Worrin Road, Shenfield	0.06	Private	Rear Garden Land	Yes. The site would be suitable for development given the size of the plot and the surrounding uses.	No. The site comprises the rear gardens of large private dwelling houses and therefore is not available.	Yes. However, land acquisition could be problematic given the multiple ownership.
SHN	G033	Adjacent to 67 Priests Lane, Shenfield	0.08	Private	Side Garden	Yes. If the site were to become available it is considered that it would be suitable for one residential dwelling with access provided off Priests Lane.	No. The site comprises a side garden to a large residential property on Priests Lane, the garden is well tended and therefore considered not available for residential development.	Yes. The site lies within an established residential area and it is not anticipated that major infrastructure would be required to support the development.
SHN	G133	Ashdown House and grounds, Hallwood Crescent, Shenfield	0.56	Private	Rear Garden Land	Yes. This site comprises a large single private dwelling and extensive private gardens in an established residential area. The site is accessed via Hallwood Crescent.	No. Neither Ashdown House nor its grounds are currently for sale and it is unlikely that they would become available for additional residential development.	Yes. The site lies within an attractive residential area and it is considered that major infrastructure would not be required in order to support the development. The site is large enough to support additional development.
SHN	G134	Land to the Rear of 94 Worrin Road, Shenfield	1.27	Private	Rear Garden Land	Yes. The site would be suitable for development if it were to be available. Given the size of the plot, development would not have a detrimental impact upon the existing residents.	No. The site provides garden land to the rear of the property and does not appear to be available for development.	Yes. The site lies within an attractive residential area and it is considered that major infrastructure would not be required in order to support the development. The site is large enough to support an additional dwelling and access could be derived without the need for demolition.
SHN	G135	Land Adjacent to Alouette, Mill Hill, Shenfield	0.22	Private	Garden	Yes. If the site were to become available, it may be suitable for one additional residential dwelling given the size of the plot.	No. The site comprises the garden of a substantial dwelling in private ownership. The site is not up for sale. It is therefore considered that the site is not available for residential development.	Yes. The site lies within an attractive residential area and it is considered that major infrastructure would not be required in order to support the development. The site is large enough to support an additional dwelling and access could be derived without the need for demolition.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
SHN	G136	Land Adjacent to Higher Barton, Hallwood Crescent, Shenfield	0.09	Private	Garden	No. The site comprises the garden of a large property in substantial grounds. The development of the garden would result in the loss of a large number of significant trees (with TPOs). The site is therefore not considered to be suitable.	No. The site is in private ownership and is not considered to be available for development.	No. Development is likely to require demolition of the existing dwelling. The site is situated within an attractive area and it is not considered that major infrastructure would be required.
SHN	G137	Land Adjacent to 8 Crescent Drive, Shenfield	0.06	Private	Side Garden Land	Yes. The site is in an established residential area. An additional dwelling could potentially be constructed on this site.	No. The site comprises the side/rear garden of a large property which is in use.	Yes. Development on the site would be achievable, Access could easily be achieved. The site lies within an established residential area. It is considered that major infrastructure would not be required to deliver this development.
SHN	G025	Land Adjacent to 3 Bishops Walk, Shenfield	0.9	Private	Scrub Land	No. The site is designated as Protected Urban Open Space and is therefore not considered suitable for development unless this policy restriction was removed.	Yes. The site is a vacant site which is currently overgrown scrub land. The site is not in use and therefore appears to be available.	Yes. Development of the site would be achievable with access taken from an existing gated access off Bishops Walk. The site lies within an existing residential area and it is not anticipated that there would be a requirement for major infrastructure.
BLM	G138	R/O Greenleas, Chantelle and Cranwood, Blackmore Road, Doddinghurst	0.08	Private	Rear Gardens	Yes. The site is within the village envelope and it is considered that the site could be developed without harm to existing residential amenities.	No. The site comprises residential gardens and is therefore considered to be unavailable.	No. Development on this land would require a shared access through third party land, which could exacerbate the costs and achievability of the development.
KH	G139	Adjacent to Trees, Blackmore Road, Kelvedon Hatch	0.05	Private	Side Garden	Yes. The site is within the village envelope and in use as a side garden for a private dwelling. There is adequate space for one additional dwelling. Development would need to consider the relationship to the existing dwellings as not to have a detrimental effect.	No. The site comprises the side garden to a large residential property and it is therefore considered that the site is unavailable for residential development.	Yes. An additional dwelling could be achieved, access could also be easily achieved. The site lies within an existing residential area and it is not anticipated that major infrastructure would be required to deliver a development.
DOD	G102	Site of Roseacre, Heronhurst and Sunnyview, Apple Tree Lane, Doddinghurst	0.72	Private	Paddock	No, the road into the site is extremely narrow and existing houses run across a prominent ridgeline. Residential development would spill over this.	No the site is not available and is in use as a paddock.	Development would be achievable although a new access would be required.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
WAR	G063	Coombe Woods, Beredens Lane, Warley	7.97	Mr J Williams	Wooded - Tree nursery	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is located in an unsustainable location. It is detached from any urban settlement, remote from services/facilities, and would result in intrusion into the open countryside. In addition the woodland currently offers amenity value in its current form.	Yes. The site is currently a Tree Nursery.	Yes. Although the rural location of the site and the potential for a significant number of dwellings if the whole site were to be developed is likely to require additional infrastructure investment.
WAR	G149	Little Warley Hall Farm, Little Warley Hall Lane, Little Warley,	6	Dr M & Z Sahirad	Pasture	No. The site is not considered suitable for residential development due to the site's unsustainable location and its poor accessibility to services, facilities and public transport links.	Yes. The site is currently pasture.	No. There could be access issues associated with the site and the unsustainable location is likely to require significant infrastructure investment.
WAR	G026	Land on the north side of Church Lane, Warley Street	0.03	John Gemmill	Agricultural	No. The site is not considered suitable for residential development due to the site's unsustainable location and its poor accessibility to services, facilities and public transport links.	Yes. The site is currently in agricultural use.	Yes. Development of the site would be achievable.
WAR	G031	Land adjacent to Hill Cottage, Warley Road and fronting Mascalls Lane, Adjacent to Mill House, Warley	5	Chaplin Trustees	Open land	No. Mascalls Lane currently forms the physical boundary to Warley and the proposed development would form an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. Development would have a negative impact upon the Special Landscape Area.	Yes. The site is open fields.	Yes. Development of this site is considered to be achievable. Additional infrastructure and services may be required to support development of this size.
SM	G069	Land North West Side of Blackmore Road, Stondon Massey	2.07	Victor Smith	Open field - grazing	No. The site lies beyond the urban boundary and bears no relationship to the existing settlement. None of the site is suitable for development as it lies beyond the urban boundary, the site is not surrounded by development and therefore would constitute intrusion into the countryside. If developed it may lead to further development and lead to settlement coalescence.	Yes. The site comprises open fields used for grazing.	Yes. Given the site size and the number of dwellings that could be delivered, the development of this site is considered to be achievable.
SM	G047	Land to East of Nine Ashes Road, Stondon Massey	0.4	James Gann, David Lee, Sarah Wright	Agricultural	No. The site comprises agricultural fields. It is located on Nine Ashes Road on the approach into Stondon Massey. The site is not considered suitable for residential development as it would represent an unnecessary intrusion into the open countryside and constitute ribbon development.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Development on the site is achievable.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
SM	G049	Land to North of Blackmore Road, Stondon Massey,	0.47	James Gann, David Lee, Sarah Wright	Agricultural	No. The site comprises agricultural fields. The site is not considered suitable for residential development as it would constitute ribbon development, unrelated to the existing village envelope.	Yes. The site is available for residential development	Yes. Development on this site is achievable. It is not considered that there are contamination issues on the site.
SM	G067	Land Adjoining "Crescent Cottage" Nines Ashes Road, Stondon Massey	0.26	Mr S Saunders	Scrub land	No. The site is not suitable for residential development. The location is not considered to be sustainable and new development in this location would extend the existing ribbon development, unrelated to the existing village envelope.	Yes. The site is available	Yes. Development on this site is achievable. It is not considered that there are contamination issues on the site.
SM	G011	Four Oaks & Land Adjoining Four Oaks, Clapgate, Chivers Road, Stondon Massey, Brentwood, Essex. CM15 0LH	8.1	Cawson Ltd (single site); others listed for composite site	Agricultural land / storage with some agricultural buildings, 5 residential properties	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is located in an unsustainable location as it is detached from existing settlements with no services /amenities. Its development would result in unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land, storage buildings and 5 residential properties.	Yes. However, due to the unsustainable location of the site additional development may require significant infrastructure and services.
SM	G048	Land to North of Reeves Close, Stondon Massey	1.72	James Gann	Agricultural	No. None of the site is suitable for development as it lies beyond the existing boundary of Stondon Massey. Its development would constitute an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. It is considered that the development of this site would be achievable.
SM	G050	Land at the West of Ongar Road, Stondon Massey, Brentwood, Essex	0.2	James Gann, David Lee, Sarah Wright	Agricultural / Scrub	No. This site is not suitable for development as it lies beyond the existing boundary of Stondon Massey and would constitute unacceptable intrusion into the countryside. The site is not contained by development and could lead to further pressure for ribbon development and settlement coalescence with Doddinghurst.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural/scrubland.	Yes. It is considered that the development of this site would be achievable.
SM	G051	Land to South of Blackmore Road, Doddinghurst,	0.79	James Gann, David Lee, Sarah Wright	Agricultural	No. This site is not suitable for development. Although it abuts the current village envelope, Blackmore Road acts as a strong physical boundary and this site would constitute an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside and unrelated to the existing settlement form.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural/scrubland.	Yes. It is not envisaged that the site is contaminated. The development of the site is considered to be achievable.
WG	G073	Old Mill Site, Hay Green Lane, Wyatts Green	0.15	R. Lunnon	Scrub land (potentially used for fly tipping)	No. This site is not suitable for development as it would constitute an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside and it would extend Wyatt's Green beyond the existing physical boundary formed by Hay Green Lane. May set precedent for further development leading to coalescence with Hook's End.	Yes. The site comprises vacant scrubland land.	Yes. However, there may be some contamination on the site which would need to be mitigated as part of any redevelopment.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
WG	G074	North of Hay Green Lane, Wyatts Green	3.45	R. Lunnon	Agricultural	No. This site is not suitable for development as it would constitute intrusion into the countryside and it would extend Wyatt's Green beyond the existing physical boundary of the settlement formed by Hay Green Lane. May set precedent for further development leading to coalescence with Hook End Lane.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. It is not envisaged that the site is contaminated. Additional infrastructure and services would be required to support the development.
WG	G037	Land to North West of Lowes Farm, Wyatts Green Road, Wyatts Green	1.75	Mr R Rewwick / Renwick	Paddock / Grazing land	No. This site is not suitable for development as it would extend development along Wyatts Green Road and is considered to represent an un-necessary intrusion into the countryside. The site is not surrounded by development and is divorced from the existing settlement.	Yes. The site comprises a paddock and grazing land.	Yes. The development of this site is considered to be achievable. It is not envisaged that the site is contaminated.
SHN	G012	Priests Lane Playing Field, Shenfield	4.45	The JTS Partnership LLP	Playing Field	No. The site comprises a disused private school playing field and is designated as Protected Urban Open Space. If the site was not required for open space, residential development would be suitable in this location. However, the Council's open space audit values the site's contribution to open space provision within the area.	Yes. It is understood that the site is surplus for school playing field purposes and is therefore available.	Yes. The site is considered to be achievable if the policy issues can be overcome and access can be derived from Priest's Lane.
SHN	G085	Land East of Hall Lane, Shenfield	12	Mr C H Courage	Agricultural / Wooded	No. This site is not considered suitable for development. Access to the site may be a problem as Hall Lane is very narrow and not suitable for a development of this size. Development of the site would not relate well to the existing urban area and would form an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land with pockets of woodland.	Yes. Development of the site is considered to be achievable. However significant infrastructure improvements would be required to secure access.
BWD	G010	Land Off The Chase, Brentwood	0.19	Ursuline Sisters Brentwood Trustees	Open Space	No. The site is designated as Protected Urban Open Space. If it was no longer required for open space purposes then residential would be suitable.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Development of the site would be achievable if the policy restriction were to be removed.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	G100A	Land SW of Junction 28 of M25, off Brook Street, Brentwood	13.68	Messers Kingston	Agricultural	No . This site is not suitable for residential development as it forms part of the important strategic green wedge between Brentwood and the built up area of the London Borough of Havering. It is also disjointed from other residential areas - with the M25 acting as barrier between the site and Brentwood. Development of this site would also encourage settlement coalescence with London.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. The development of this site is considered to be achievable.
BWD	G105	Land east of West Horndon Village, north of Station Road	13	J H Ford	Agricultural	No . Development of the whole site would extend the village into the surrounding countryside. Either more modest development to serve local needs on Station Road frontage, or a significant development associated with sites G018 and G019 would be suitable.	Yes. The site comprises an agricultural field.	Yes. It is not considered that there would be significant contamination on the site. However development in this location would require significant investment in infrastructure and services.
BWD	G015	Heron Hall, Herongate, Brentwood	235.0	Wallasea Farms Ltd	Predominantly Agriculture	No. The site forms an extensive area of land to the east of Ingrave and Herongate Villages. Development would be a wholly unacceptable loss of this part of Brentwood Borough's countryside. Part of the northern area of the Site falls within Flood Zone 3 which is not compatible with residential uses.	Yes. The site is a large area of agricultural land surrounding Heron Hall which is not part of the parcel of land put forward, but does however have a SAM status within it.	Yes. Development of the site in full is likely to require additional major infrastructure and services.
BWD	G150	Collins Farm, Goodwood Ave, Hutton	25	Nicholas Chaplin, Jonathan Chaplin and Maryland's Green Estates	Site is currently in agricultural use, the farmhouse on the site is not occupied.	No. The site represents a large extension of the urban area into the open countryside.	Yes. The site is a large area of agricultural land.	Yes. Development of the site in full is likely to require additional major infrastructure and services.
BWD	G035	Rear of 1 Hogarth Avenue/Ingrave Road, Brentwood	0.14	Mr and Mrs Nowell	Parcel of land to rear of residential properties	No. The site is constrained by its size and development in this location is likely to have a detrimental impact upon the existing residents which neighbour the site on all four boundaries.	Yes. The site is part of the rear garden of a residential property.	No. This site is not considered to be achievable as there is currently no means of access to the site and there is a covenant regarding no buildings.
BWD	G100B	Land at Brook Street, East of Junction 28 of M25, Brook Street, Brentwood	13.6	Messrs Kingston	Agricultural fields	No. The site is not suitable for development. the site represents an important strategic gap between Brentwood and the London Borough of Havering.	Yes. The site is available for residential development.	Yes. The site is considered to be achievable.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
BWD	G056	Land and building on the West of Church Lane, Hutton	2.72	Mr Thacker	Stable and Grazing	No. The site is divorced from the built up area of Hutton. Residential development would form an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside which would have a high visual and landscape impact. The site also lies within the Hutton Village conservation area.	Yes. In use for grazing and stabling.	Yes. The development of the site is considered to be achievable. There are no known contamination issues on the site.
PH	G082	Greenacres Riding Stables & Land on the opposite, Beads Hall Lane, Pilgrims Hatch	5.5	Charter Holdings and William Eastwood	Livery and Pasture (5.125 ha), Gypsy site (0.375 ha)	No. This site is not suitable for development. The main part of the site is detached from the rest of the built up area and would constitute an unacceptable encroachment into the countryside. There may be potential access problems with a development of this size as the site fronts on to a narrow lane.	Yes. The site comprises a livery and pasture land, although part is currently used as a Gypsy site.	No. Access issues would also need to be overcome. There could also be some contamination on this site due to the previous uses.
PH	G038	Land to the North of Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch	3.49	Julia Shayler	Agricultural land	No. It is considered that the development would result in an unacceptable extension of Pilgrims Hatch into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land to the rear and scrub land to the frontage with Ongar Road.	Yes. The development of this site is considered to be achievable.
PH	G057	Land off Crow Green Lane, Crow Green Lane, Pilgrims Hatch	2.8	Wiggins Gee Home	Open fields / grazing land	No. This site is not suitable for development as it would constitute an unacceptable encroachment into the countryside, poorly related to the existing built up area.	Yes. The site comprises open fields and grazing land.	Yes. The development is considered to be achievable.
PH	G039	Land to South-east of Doddington Road, Pilgrim Hatch	5.68	Mrs D Bennett	Agricultural land	No. This site is not suitable for development as it detached from the rest of the built up area in an unsustainable location poorly related to existing services/facilities. Given the site's location divorced from the main urban area, there would be significant and unacceptable encroachment into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. Development in this location is considered to be achievable, however additional infrastructure and services may be required to support a development of this size.
MTN	G075	Applegrove, Swallow Cross Road, Mountnessing	1.0	Rachel Milton	Grazing land	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is located in an unsustainable location away from services and facilities. It is detached from any urban area and would therefore result in an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises grazing land.	Yes. Development in this location is considered to be achievable.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
MTN	G083	Between residential dwellings at 375 & 361 Roman Road, Mountnessing	0.2	Mr O'Connor	Wooded area	No. This site is not suitable for development as it would constitute ribbon development some distance outside the existing Mountnessing Village envelope, adding to the coalescence of the village with the town of Brentwood	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Residential development on the site would be achievable. Access could be provided from Roman Road and there do not appear to be any environmental constraints.
KH	G006	Pettits, Frog Street, Kelvedon Hatch, Brentwood, Essex. CM15 0JL	0.5	Mr and Mrs Morrison	Grassed area to rear of residential garden	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is located in an unsustainable location, well outside the village of Kelvedon Hatch and poorly related, therefore, to existing services and facilities. It would constitute an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises a grassed area to the rear of a residential garden.	Yes. Development would be achievable, the land is available and contamination is unlikely.
KH	G084	Eagle Field, Kelvedon Hatch	2.25	Lord Rodney	Recreation ground	No. This site is not suitable for development due to the amenity value it provides to the local community in its current use as a recreation ground.	Yes. The site comprises a recreation ground.	No. A replacement open space facility would need to be provided or it would need to be proven that the recreation facility was not require. Whilst the promoter of the site has confirmed that the loss of recreational land could be replaced by the woodland at Furzy Bit Wood (County Wildlife Site), this would not provide the same typology of open space facility currently available.
KH	G071	7 Church Road, Kelvedon, Hatch, Brentwood, Essex. CM14 5TJ	0.54	Lynn and John Sanders	Residential Property with Small Holding	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is well beyond the existing village envelope, detached from services and facilities. Given its setting, it is considered that it would constitute an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises a small holding that contains a residential property.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable.
KH	G036	Birchwood, School Road, Kelvedon Hatch	1.75	Mr and Mrs Bremner	Pasture	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is poorly located to the existing village of Kelvedon Hatch. It is just outside but detached from the defined village envelope. Additionally, the elongated shape of the site would lead to ribbon development along the road to Doddinghurst and form an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises pasture land.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable.
KH	G045	Land to North of Blackmore Road, Blackmore Road, Kelvedon Hatch	5.76	H Clarke Farmers Limited	Agricultural	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is detached from the existing village envelope by a small parcel of land and would form an unacceptable extension of the village into the open countryside potential leading to coalescence with Doddinghurst.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable. However, development may require additional infrastructure and services to support it.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
KH	G055	Chivers, Chivers Road, Kelvedon Hatch	4.7	J A Parrish and Sons	Agricultural	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is poorly located to the existing settlement of Kelvedon Hatch. It is just outside but detached from the defined village envelope. Development would form an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable. However, development may require additional infrastructure and services to support it.
KH	G003	Gardeners, Ongar Road, Kelvedon Hatch, Brentwood, Essex. CM15 0JX	3.25	Ordnance Land (Holdings) Ltd	Residential property with extensive land	No. This site is not suitable for development as it is located in an unsustainable location some distance from the existing defined village envelope of Kelvedon Hatch and its services and facilities. development would result in an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.	Yes. Garden land.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable. However, development may require additional infrastructure and services to support it.
KH	G053	11-12 Church Road, Kelvedon Hatch, Brentwood, Essex.	1.1	J A Parrish and Sons	Agricultural	No. this site is not considered suitable for development as it is located well beyond the existing village envelope and would add to the existing ribbon development and/or form an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable.
KH	G043	Land to West of Place Farm Lane, Kelvedon Hatch	9.34	H Clarke Farmers Limited	Agricultural	No. The development of this site would represent an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside and could lead to settlement coalescence with Dodinghurst.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. This site is considered to be achievable. However, it may need substantial infrastructure improvements to accommodate a site of this size in this location.
KH	G027	Brizes Corner Field, Blackmore Road, Kelvedon Hatch	1.2	W.H. Norris and Sons	Agricultural	No. The site comprises agricultural land. The development of this site is not suitable for as it is considered that it would constitute an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside .	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. The site is located adjacent to the existing village residential envelope with cost of connection to infrastructure and services likely to be in line with expectations for a site of this size.
BLM	G041	Land to the East of Ingatestone Road. Blackmore	5.76	Copy farm (Blackmore) Ltd	Agricultural	No. None of the site is suitable for development as it is poorly related to the existing village envelope, detached from it by the Chelmsford Road and would form an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside, leading to coalescence with the existing ribbon development in Chelmsford Road.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable. However, development may require additional infrastructure and services to support it.
BLM	G044	Land to the West of Blackmore, east and west of Blackmore Road	28.54	Copy farm (Blackmore) Ltd	Agricultural	No. None of the site is suitable for development as it is poorly related to the existing village envelope, and would form an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside on the western side of Blackmore Road and lies partly within the Conservation Area on the eastern side of Blackmore Road.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable. However, development is likely to require additional infrastructure and services to support it.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
IST	G042	Land to South of Fryerning Lane, Ingatestone	2.1	R Gaymer, P Gaymer and J Gaymer	Agricultural	No. The site is not suitable for development as it is divorced from the existing village envelope on the opposite side of the A12 dual carriageway, which forms a strong physical boundary to the village. The site is located within a Special Landscape Area.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	Yes. Development in this location is achievable.
IST	G101A	Land Adjacent to Ingatestone bypass, Ingatestone (to west of bypass)	1.21	R Gaymer, P Gaymer and J Gaymer	Scrub	No. The site is not suitable for development as it is divorced from the existing village envelope on the opposite side of the A12 dual carriageway, and would result in an unacceptable living environment being bounded on all four sides by the dual carriageway, slip road and Roman Road and is raised up to overlook the carriageway. The site is located within a Special Landscape Area.	Yes. The site comprises scrub land.	No. It is considered that the environmental constraints make development on this site unachievable
IST	G101C	Land Adjacent to Ingatestone bypass, Ingatestone (to east of bypass and to north of flyover)	2.06	R Gaymer, P Gaymer and J Gaymer	Scrub	No. The site is not suitable for development as it is divorced from the existing village envelope on the opposite side of the A12 dual carriageway slip road, and would result in an unacceptable living environment being bounded on all four sides by the dual carriageway, slip road and Roman Road. The site is located within a Special Landscape Area.	Yes. The site comprises agricultural land.	No. It is considered that the environmental constraints make development on this site unachievable.
DOD	G001	Brooklands, Rectory Chase, Doddinghurst	1.62	Ian and Edna Churley	Residential property with land	No. This site is not suitable for further residential development. The open land to rear of the site forms part of the open gap which separates the two settlements of Doddinghurst and Wyatts Green and could result in settlement coalescence. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement.	Yes. The site comprises one residential property with a large garden land.	Yes. However, development may require additional major infrastructure and services.
DU	G060	Friern Manor Farm (Timmermans Nursery, Dunton Hills Farm) Lower Dunton Road, Dunton,	50.3	Barrie Stone	Turf Farm/ Plant Nursery/Farm and golf course	No. Only a small part of the site lies within Brentwood Borough, but is not considered suitable for residential development due to its unsustainable location, divorced from and unrelated to existing settlements in the Borough and their services and community infrastructure.	Yes. Various owners support proposals.	Yes. Development is likely to require additional major infrastructure and services.

Location	Site Ref No	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Ownership Information (If Known)	Current Use	Suitable	Available	Achievable
HUT	G092	Land to the East of Hutton Village, Hutton, Shenfield	3.2	Elizabeth Finn Trust	Open land	No. The site lies within the Hutton Village conservation area and development on this scale would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the conservation area. Development would also have a detrimental impact on the visual and landscape quality of the area.	Yes. The site is available.	Yes. Development is likely to require additional infrastructure.

## **Appendix 8:**

# **Summary of Stakeholder Workshop Comments**

- Density categories should overlap and there should not be gaps in the density ranges from one band to another.
- Within all of the density bands, need to allow some flexibility to go above/below them.
- Need to consider if people will actually want to live in dwellings at the densities we are proposing and if they will sell. Developers, at present, are finding it difficult to sell smaller dwellings and flats and easier to sell larger houses, therefore this is what they are building. Densities that are too high could risk nothing getting built as smaller dwellings are not saleable and larger properties could not be built within the higher density bands.
- Noted that SHMA states that the *need* within Brentwood is for smaller properties, predominantly one and two bedrooms.
- Suggested that the medium band could be wider, with the option for densities to go higher near public transport, services and employment areas.
- Suggested that within the low band, there could be exceptions that would go above/below and we need to consider these.
- A query was raised as to how unimplemented planning permissions are being considered and how we are assessing when these will come forward, if at all, given the current market conditions.
- Deliverability: as we don't need the supply for the next five years, need to think longer term about how we can get the right sites coming forward.
- It was commented that the site size threshold seemed quite low. Advised that given the large number of small sites coming forward in the Borough, it was reasonable to set it at this size.
- A query was raised as to if there was any conflict with any of the gypsy and traveller sites in the Borough.
- It was noted that we need to be working off up-to-date densities and that the UCS data is slightly dated now.
- A query was raised as to whether sites were being considered as a whole only, or whether they would be considered in part if one part of the site was considered suitable, available and achievable but another part of the site failed to meet these 3 criteria. It was agreed that this was the case.
- It was noted that in all developments consideration needed to be given to allow space for sustainable urban drainage etc.
- Comments were made regarding the lack of market for flats in the Borough and the need to provide more family dwellings which may push densities down. Larger dwellings and family homes have not been delivered over the past 20 years.
- Densities should be based on recent completions.

- The market can only really go one way from here as we come out of the recession and therefore the market will dictate the types and densities of development coming forwards.
- Comments were raised about sustainability appraisals and it was agreed that these should be a high level approach at present with a detailed approach being taken through the Site Allocations Document.
- It was questioned whether BBC would make time to review and update the SHLAA on a bi-annual basis.
- Comments were received regarding the difficulties in establishing a strict density rate as some sites would be able to comfortably accommodate high density development but others would be more suited to low density development. Densities should be considered based on the environment within which the site sits. A site adjoining low density development of detached houses should be developed in a similar manner. Sites should therefore be considered on their individual merits.
- The SHLAA should not be used as a Site Allocations Document by the back door.
- Sites in or adjoining small villages should be considered if they could bring about sustainability benefits to the villages through new population and services etc.
- Sites which are perceived to have constraints should be included if there is evidence that such constraints can be overcome.
- Some of the densities, particularly in the higher categories, may be too high.
- Consideration should be given to the need for sites for affordable houses particularly in rural locations such as Kelevdon Hatch.
- Consideration should also be given to the need to provide smaller houses in attractive locations allowing the older generations to down size whilst still remaining within the same community.
- Ensure that a logical Green Belt boundary is drawn so that scrubland/wasteland is considered rather than areas of special landscape character or green wedge etc.
- The range of densities within each typology provides good flexibility for the developer.
- Consider adopting low densities now given the state of the market and upping them over time to reflect a positive upturn at 5, 10 and 15 year intervals.
- Each site should be considered on its own merit taking into account the environmental, physical and social constraints and opportunities.
- The approach to density will surely depend on the Council's Preferred Approach towards the future growth options of the Borough, in that urban concentration would result in high densities around the urban area. If the Council adopt a dispersed option for growth then high density should be permitted in village centres also.

## **Appendix 9:**

# **Summary of BBC Councillor Discussions Session Comments**

- Need to ensure it is made very clear that this is just an assessment and that we are not allocating sites at this stage.
- The consideration of Green Belt land was raised: it was clarified that we have agreed that we will assess Green Belt sites at this stage and that it will be for later stages of the Core Strategy process to decide whether or not it is appropriate to release Green Belt sites.
- PPS 4: it was noted that PPS 4 states that there needs to be a focus on traditional town centre uses in town centres. This has been considered within the assessment, but there would still need to be a mix of housing and employment uses within a town centre, particularly on the areas surrounding the main High Street.
- Protection of views: the impact of tall buildings on the skyline was noted, particularly given the hilly nature of the Borough. It was suggested that we look into the possible protection of key views within the Core Strategy and develop policy in order to control where it is appropriate for taller buildings to go.
- Villages: it was noted that we need to consider some sites in the villages to enable them to continue to be viable. This could also help improve services and facilities in these locations.
- Infrastructure: we need to consider the impact of development on infrastructure and if any improvements to infrastructure will be delivered.
- Housing need: questioned where the need for extra houses comes from? Is it only to provide for the needs of the local population? Clarified that much of the need is due to people living longer and living on their own or in smaller households for longer. We will need to cater for a mix of needs.

## **Appendix 10:**

# **Sites Passed to ELR Team for Consideration for Employment/Mixed Use Development**

Site Reference Number	Site Description
B204	The Forge, Great Warley Street, Warley
B199	Crown Corner Country Store, Ongar Road, Kelvedon Hatch
G100b	Land at Brook Street, Brook Street, Brentwood
G100a	Land SW of Junction 28 of M25, off Colchester Road Street
G101a	Land Adjacent to Ingatestone by Pass, Ingatestone, (to west of bypass)
G101c	Land Adjacent to Ingatestone by Pass, Ingatestone, (to east of Bypass and to north of flyover)
B188/B189	West Horndon Industrial Estate
B218	Essex County Fire Brigade HQ, Rayleigh Road, Hutton

## **Appendix 11:**

# **Brentwood Borough Housing Trajectory**

**(Source: AMR 2009/2010)**

## Appendix 3

### Brentwood Borough Housing Trajectory 2010-2025: site details

Site name/address	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	Total Identified
<b>Extant Planning Permissions on Allocated Sites</b>																
Former British Gas Site, St James Road/Wharf Road, Brentwood	49															49
Phase 4A - British Gas Site, St James Road/Wharf Road, Brentwood	0	25	28													53
Former Warley Hospital, Warley Hill, Warley	60	60	60	50												230
William Hunter Way car park site, William Hunter Way, Brentwood			14													14
Highwood & Little Highwood Hospital, Geary Drive, Brentwood			50	50	50	53										203
	<b>109</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>549</b>								
<b>Extant Planning Permissions on Unallocated Large Sites</b>																
St Charles Youth Treatment Centre, Brentwood	50	23														73
Former Sam's Nightclub, Ongar Road, Brentwood	54	0														54
43-53 Ingrave Road, Brentwood		11														11
St Helens RC Infants School, Queens Road, Brentwood		40														40
Land rear of the Grange, 93 Queens Road, Brentwood		12														12
122-124 Station Road, West Horndon		11														11
Land rear of Sylvia Avenue/Brindles Close, Hutton		16	16													32
Willowbrook Primary School, Brookfield Close, Hutton			36													36
	<b>104</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>269</b>
<b>Extant Planning Permissions on Small Sites</b>																
	<b>44</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>159</b>									
<b>Residual Allocated Sites</b>																
Land north of Highwood Close, Brentwood							16									16
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>							
<b>Contingent Sites</b>																
Essex County Fire Brigade HQ, Rayleigh Road, Brentwood				20	21	0										41
Keys Hall						35										35
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>76</b>								
<b>Windfalls</b>																
Large UCS Sites							24	24	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	209
Small Site Windfalls						48	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	390
Large Site Windfalls							40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	360
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>959</b>						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>2,028</b>						

# ATKINS

Trent House  
RTC Business Park  
London Road  
Derby  
DE24 8UP  
England

Tel: +44 (0)1332 22 5701  
Fax: +44 (0)1332 22 5638