Essential Reference Paper C

EAST HERTS EMPLOYMENT LAND REVIEW UPDATE 2013

PART TWO: INDIVIDUAL SITE REPORTS*

*(This version does not contain site plans) EAST HERTS EMPLOYMENT LAND REVIEW UPDATE 2013

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Goodliffe Park, Bishop's Stortford

Owner: Local Authorities Mutual Investment Trust

Managing Agent: N/K

EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas "In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 General Industrial Uses and, where well related to the transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses". Raynham Road/Dunmow Road Industrial Estate. Haslemere Industrial Estate, Pig Lane. Twyford Road/Twyford Road Business Centre. **Stansted Road.** Woodside Industrial Estate, off Dunmow Road.

| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC | 2012 Commen | nts and |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| The cluster of estates and properties comprising of Goodliffe Park, Sto | and Rating | Rating: | | |
| Birchanger Industrial Estate is found on the northern edge of Bishop's S | The Four g | good quality unit | s let to prime | |
| area scores highly based on the general quality of its stock. While there | are some older units, | here has tenan | ts. No parking/ad | ccess issues. |
| been some recent development activity with some larger units available | . Its position directly or | Stansted | | |
| Road just off the A120 means that it scores highly in terms of visibility. T | The cluster has high oc | cupancy Asses | ssment: Green | |
| rates and good parking provision with no major conflicts with adjacent | | | | |
| land uses. It is recommended that it is safeguarded | | | | |
| Assessment: Green | | See A | ppraisal Criteri | ia below |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: 3/12/0283 Unit 1 – External alteration | ons to facilitate subdivis | ion of the existing | retail unit includi | ing new |
| shopfront and associated works. Alterations to car park and erection of a | 3M palisade fencing | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Unit 1. Wicks | Dairycrest |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Unit 2.Homebase | Unit 1b Elms BMW servicing |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Yes | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Yes | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Yes | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | Yes |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

Part 1. Summary

| Estate: Stort Valley Industrial Estate, Stansted Road, Bishop's Stortford | |
|--|---|
| Owner: N/K | |
| Managing Agent: Jones Lang LaSalle 020 7493 4933 | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites an | e defined as Employment Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 General Industry | ial Uses and, where well related to the |
| transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses.: IV Stansted Road | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: The cluster of estates and properties comprising Goodliffe | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: |
| Park, Stort Valley Industrial Estate and Birchanger Industrial Estate is found on the northern edge of | Halcrow 2008 comments still apply |
| Bishops Stortford urban area. The area scores highly based on the general quality of its stock. While | |
| there are some older units, there has been some recent development activity with some larger units | |
| available. Its position on Stansted Road just off the A120 means that it scores high in terms of | Assessment: Green |
| visibility. The cluster has high occupancy rates and good parking provision with no major conflicts | |
| with adjoining land uses. It is recommended that it is safeguarded for employment use. | |
| Assessment: Green | See Appraisal Criteria below |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Magnet Joinery B8 | 2. Elms Mini Car sales SG |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 3. Skillnet B1 | 4. To let |
| 5. John Whalley Garage B2 | 6. Clearwater Group B1 |
| 7. Screen Direct (paying £7.50 ftsq) B2 | 8.Clement Jocelyn B8 |
| 9. as 8 | 10. Sewell Accident Repair Centre B8 |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Good | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | | | |
| parking provision | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Birchanger Industrial Estate, Bishop's Stortford

Owner: REM Properties,C7, Harlow Business Centre, Lovet Road, Harlow

Managing Agent: Derrick Wade and Waters – Simon Beeton – 0844 828 0574

EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas "In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 General Industrial Uses and, where well related to the transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses". Raynham Road/Dunmow Road Industrial Estate. Haslemere Industrial Estate, Pig Lane. Twyford Road/Twyford Road Business Centre. **Stansted Road.** Woodside Industrial Estate, off Dunmow Road.

| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC 2012 | Comments and Ra | ting: |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| The cluster of estates and properties comprising of Goodliffe Park, | | Good location | n and visibility. Evid | ence of recent |
| Stort Valley Industrial Park and Birchanger Industrial Estate is | | improvement | /remodelling. Plot ra | atio above |
| found on the northern edge of Bishop's Stortford's urban area. The | | current stand | ards resulting in co | nstricted layout |
| area scores highly based on the general quality of its stock. While | | and parking i | ssues (particularly li | inked to car |
| there are some older units, there has been some recent | | repair uses) a | and some lower qua | ality space. |
| development activity with some larger units available. Its position | | Generally go | od occupancy and h | nigh demand. |
| directly on Stansted Road just off the A120 means that it scores | | | | |
| highly in terms of visibility. The cluster has high occupancy rates | | Assessment | : Green | |
| and good parking provision with no major conflicts with adjacent | | See Apprais | al Criteria below | |
| land uses. It is recommended that it is safeguarded for | | | | |
| employment use. | | | | |
| Assessment: Green | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: Unit 4A - 3/12/1421/FP = C/o/u fro | m B1, B2, B8 to pla | ant hire depot with t | rade counter, Appro | oved |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |
| | | | | |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Topps Tiles/Plumb City – ground fl - Enterprise car hire/RCA structures – 1 st fl | 9 |
|---|---|
| 2 City Plumbing | 10 |
| 3. Home interiors | 11 Touch Creative Design – Graphic Design |
| 4a/b to let – circa 4000ftsq @ £23,640pa = £5.90ftsq | 12 Concept digital/John Scrivener Images |
| 5? | 13. Elms Mini Garage |
| 6 Hancock Builders Merchants | |
| 7a Kris Aromatics | |
| 8Solus Coachworks | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Good | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average-good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Generally yes | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Generally yes | | | |
| parking provision | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | |

Part 1. Summary

| Estate: Millside Industrial Estate, Bishop's Stortford | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Owner: N/K | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: None | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Cor | nments and Rating | | |
| This estate has no vacant units indicating strong demand. Its central location and its reasonable quality and accessibility enhance its marketability. Given the strong demand and lack of supply for employment land in Bishop's Stortford it is recommended that it remains in employment use | turning/parking b indicates strong | | vironment. But high of unit. In longer te | occupancy rate rm, could be |
| Assessment: Green | See Appraisal C | Criteria below | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Alan Beere Catering B1 | 6. Express Picture Framing B1 |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 2. To let 01920 438717 | 7. SRP Engineering B2 |
| 3. Mainline Graphics Graphic Design B1 | 8. SRP Engineering B2 |
| 4. Nexus Computer Supplies B8 | 9. SRP Engineering B2 |
| 5. Soul Studios Recording Studios SG | 10. Walton Lodge Vets Group SG |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancy indicates good demand |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Reasonable | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Adequate |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |

| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|----|
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Poorly located for strategic road network but close to BS town centre. | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Νο |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | No | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Market sees this estate as of poor quality | | |

Part 1. Summary

|--|

| Owner: N/K | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Managing Agent: January's, York House, 7, Dukes | S Court, 54-62 Newmarket Road, Cambridge, CXB5 8DZ – 01223 326824 | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: No Allocation. Written Statem | ent: Para. 11.12.8 It is important that space is available for a variety of firms at different | | |
| stages of their development, including new business | ses. A number of smaller areas and sites exist in Bishop's Stortford, which have not been | | |
| identified as Employment Areas, but which are suita | able for the continued use for diverse employment purposes. | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | |
| Southmill Trading Centre has no vacant units Good quality units of 1500-1800 ftsg. Good location and access. Low plot ratio providing | | | |
| indicating strong demand. It benefits from its good parking/servicing. Fifteen units, one vacant. Only drawback is that it is on the | | | |
| location in Bishops Stortford and does not appear 'wrong' side of BS for M11/Airport. No change from Halcrow 2008 | | | |
| to suffer from and major qualitative constraints. Assessment: Green | | | |
| Assessment: Green | See Appraisal Criteria below | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | |
| | | | |

| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Proposal: None | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Senate Electrical – B8 | 2. Senate Electrical – B8 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Copyzone Printing B2 | 4. To let Coke Gearing |
| 5. Electrocomponents Ltd B8 | 6. South Woodford Electronics B1/B8 |
| 7. RP Print – B2 | 8. Forefront Signs B2 |
| 9. Nightingale Cleaning B2 | 10. Track Fitness SG |
| 11. Bakers Bikes A1/B1 | 12. as 6 |
| 13. as 6 | 14. Conscious Image Interiors B1 |
| 15. Computer Systems UK B1 | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Good/low vacancy |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|--------------------------|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | OK – but 'wrong' side of |
| | | | BS |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Part 1. Summary Estate: Stortford Hall Industrial Estate, Stansted Road, Bishop's Stortford | |
|--|--|
| Owner: N/K | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy EDE1 the | following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B | |
| transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses: Raynham Road/Dunmow Ro | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: The cluster made up of Stortford Hall | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: |
| Industrial Park, the Links Business Centre and surrounding Industrial Premises is | Halcrow 2008 comments still apply |
| well established and dominated by smaller industrial/warehouse units. It benefits | |
| from its location in Bishops Stortford and relative proximity to the M11 and high | |
| occupancy rates indicate strong demand | Assessment: Green |
| Assessment: Green | See Appraisal Criteria below |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Howden Joinery B8 | 2. Howden Joinery B8 |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 3. Independent Living Centre B1 | 4. DAB Pumps B8 |
| 5. DAB Pumps B8 | 6. Volvo Dealership |
| 7. Lookers Land Rover Dealership | 8. Armour Home |
| 9. Pioneer Europe (Balloons) | 10. Sewell Accident Repair Centre B8 |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|------|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Good | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |

| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | |
|---|-----|--|
| parking provision | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| Estate: The Links Business Centre, Raynham Road, Bishop's Stortford | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | |
| Managing Agent: 01920 438717 | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites | are defined as Employmer | nt Areas on the I | Proposals Map | |
| and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 | General Industrial Uses an | d, where well re | lated to the | |
| transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses. Raynham Road, | 'Dunmow Road Industrial E | state. | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | omments and Ra | tina | |
| Stortford Hall Industrial Park & The Links Business Centre | | As for Halcrow. M | | |
| The cluster made up of Stortford Hall Industrial Park, The Links | | gh vacancy (33%) | | |
| Business Centre and surrounding industrial premises is well | | previous occupier | | |
| established and dominated by smaller industrial/warehouse units. | | nere on Raynham | | |
| It benefits from its location in Bishop's Stortford and relative | • | om Cook Gearing) | | |
| proximity to the M11 and high occupancy rates indicate strong | | 5, | | |
| demand. | Assessment: | Green | | |
| Assessment: Green | Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Several occupiers cite signage as in need o | improvement. Contact Genma | ar below. Improver | nent of signage | |
| and access to the Rainham Road Area has been raised by Commercial Agents | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| Proposal: Partne | ers Costs | Timeframe | Priority | |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Cable TV Services B1 | 9. Alpha Marketing B1 |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2. Dive Centre B8 | 10. To let |
| 3. DMS International Air Freight B1 | 11. appears vacant |
| 4. To let 01920 438717 | 12. Genmar IT solutions B1 |
| 5. To let | 13. Computer Shop B1 |
| 6. To let | 14. HR Photography B1 |

| 7. Fairweather Windows B2 | | 15. FH Howard Tools and Fittings B8 | |
|---|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 8. To let | | 16. FH Howard Tools and Fittings B8 | |
| Part 3– Appraisal Criteria | | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | High but see above |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes- but accessibility from Dunmow Rd could be improved. |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | See 4 above | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|---|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes – but see comments on signage above | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Estate: Woodside, Dunmow Road, Bishop's Stortfor | d | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Owner: M+D Developments | | | | |
| Managing Agent: Savilles Commercial, 020 7499 8644 | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas | | | | |
| In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are of | | | | |
| comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 General Industrial | | transport network | k, B8 Storage and I | Distribution |
| Uses. Woodside Industrial Estate, off Dunmow Road | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHD | C 2012 Comment | ts and Rating: |
| Woodside is an industrial estate on the edge of Bishop's | Stortford's urban boundary and the | e closest The | 2008 comments st | till apply. The |
| estate to the M11junction to the north east of the town. I | | | detraction is the p | resence of the |
| key asset providing it with a high score in terms of visibi | | | C recycling depot. | |
| the quality of its stock is relatively high with some recen | | | | |
| larger occupiers than seen elsewhere in the District, pro | v | | | |
| perception. This is reflected in its tenant profile; occupie Diageo and Travis Perkins. Overall it is a key strategic e | | | | |
| for employment use. | inployment site that should be sale | guardeu | | |
| Assessment: Green | | Δες | essment: Green | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | A33 | | |
| Erection of 5,324 sq m of B1 Business Units on former I | Park and Ride site. Expected to star | t on site early 201 | 3 | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | - | |
| •• | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Inflight Engineering Services | Cornelius |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Mack Bananas | St. James Training Centre |
| Travis Perkins | Fister Biosciences |
| Diago | Federal Express |
| Fresca | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Good no vacancies |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

RAYNHAM ROAD, BISHOP'S STORTFORD

Halcrow treated the Raynham Road Estate as one area apart from the Links Business Centre (above). For the purpose of this update, it is split into three areas:

- 1. Raynham Road East between The Links Business Centre and Raynham Close/Myson Way
- 2. Raynham Road/Myson Way
- 3. Raynham Road West

All areas, including The Links Business Centre and the adjoining Brake Brothers Cold Store share the same problems of access and signage, considered further in para.5.7 of the main report.

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Raynham Road (East) Bishop's Stortford (comprises business premises lying between The Links Business Centre and Myson Way)

Owner: various

Managing Agent: N/K

EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 General Industrial Uses and, where well related to the transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses. **Raynham Road/Dunmow Road Industrial Estate.**

| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDO | 2012 Comme | ents and Rating: | | |
|---|----------|--|-----------------|---|------------------|--|
| Raynham Road / Dunmow Road Industrial Estate (all areas) | | Assessment: | | | | |
| The cluster's occupancy rate is relatively low with several vacant | | This part of Raynham Road comprises Capital House, | | | | |
| units at the time of the survey. The overall qualitative | | a moo | lern two storey | v office building, indu | ustrial premises | |
| characteristics of the cluster are mostly average indicating there is | | to the | rear occupied | by Hilton coachwor | ks, modern | |
| room for improvements. There are currently a number of B2 uses | | indust | rial premises o | occupied by Taylor (| Goodman | |
| on the site which if the decline in B2 demand continues (as | | Group | and Fyfe Wils | son and a modern tv | vo storey office | |
| indicated by the employment forecasts) should be considered for | | buildir | ng occupied by | Chip and Pin Solut | ions. All but | |
| B1 redevelopment. If that is not deemed possible, the cluster | | Hilton | coachworks fu | unction well – here h | nigh plot ratio | |
| should be re-assessed as a possible "Red" | | | | of the use results in parking overflows or | | |
| Assessment: Amber | | Road | - | - | - | |
| | | Asse | ssment: Ambe | er | | |
| | | See A | ppraisal Crite | eria below | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Access and signage | | | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | | Costs | Timeframe | Priority | |
| | | | | | | |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Capital House – CF Group finance and leasing B1 | Hilton Coachworks – vehicle repairs, leasing, tyre fitting B2 |
|---|--|
| Taylor Goodman Group – Electrical plant and machinery repairs B2 | Fyfe Wilson – as Taylor Goodman plus supply/repair of electrical |
| | motors, pumps, control gear B2 |
| Chip and Pin Solutions – card processing machines and services B1 | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | No vacancies |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | No |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Only in terms of overflow parking |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | No | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|---------|---|----------------|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | Parking/access |
| Is the market perception positive? | Average | | |

| Part 1. Summary | |
|--|--|
| Estate: Raynham Road, Bishop's Stortford (West) | |
| Owner: Howard Property Investments | |
| Managing Agent: Howard Property Services 01223 312910 | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: In accordance with Policy ED1 the following sites are define | d as employment areas on the proposals map and will be |
| reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 General Industrial Uses | and, where well related to the transport network, B8 storage |
| and distribution uses: Raynham Road/Dunmow Road Industrial Estate | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: |
| Raynham Road/Dunmow Road Industrial Estate (all areas) The cluster's | This area lies at the extreme western end of Raynham |
| occupancy rate is relatively low with several vacant units at the time of survey. | Road and comprises a mix of modern B1, B2 and B8 |
| The overall qualitative characteristics of the cluster are mostly average indicating | buildings together with some older single storey |
| there is room for improvements. There are currently a number of B2 uses on the | brick/asbestos units. Owners Howard Property Trust is |
| site, which, if the decline in B2 demand continues (as indicated by the | progressively redeveloping the older stock. In March 2011, |
| employment forecasts) should be considered for B1 redevelopment. If that is not | Units 4 & 5 (redeveloped 2011) and let to Profile Lighting |
| deemed possible, the cluster should be re-assessed as a possible "Red". | for £9.25 ftsq. |
| Assessment: Amber | Assessment: Green |
| | See Appraisal Criteria below |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | |
| | |

| Opportunities for Enhancement: Improvement to access/signage from Dunmow Road | | | | |
|---|----------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Unit 1. Edmundson Electrical B8 | 21. To let | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| 2. To let | 22. To let | |
| 3. To let | 23. To let | |
| 4. Profile Lighting B1, B2 | 24. Globe Leisure Products B1, B2 | |
| 5. Profile Lighting | 25. Globe Leisure Products | |
| 6. Profile Lighting | 26. BTL Precision – Engineering B2 | |
| 7 | 27. BTL Precision | |
| 8 | 28. Ceramic and Stone supplies | |

| 9 | 29. Indifit Ltd B8 |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 10 | 30. Dr. Blooms Hydroponic- supply of components for indoor plant |
| | growing B8 |
| 11. Rye Street Group (coachworks) B2 | 31. vacant |
| 12. Rye Street | 32. |
| 13. Rye Street | 33. Saffron Engineering Precision Engineers B2 |
| 14. Rye Street | 34. Pot Shop Catering B2 |
| 15. To let | 35. Pot Shop Catering |
| 16. To let | 36. to let |
| 17. Virgin Media B1 | 37. To let |
| 18.Virgin Media | 38. P3 Aviation Aviation Services B2 |
| 19. Virgin Media | 39. Ensinger Ltd Engineering Plastics B8 |
| 20. To let | 40. Avio-Diepen BV Aviation Industry Supplies B8 |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | e | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancy |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average to good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | no |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability

| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

Part 1. Summary

| Estate: Raynham Road Bishop's Stortford (Raynham Clos | e/Myson Way) | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Owner: University's Superannuation Fund | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: Jones Lang LaSalle 020 7493 2933 | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas: In accordance | with Policy EDE1 the f | ollowing | sites are define | ed as Employment / | Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Cla | asses B1 Business, B2 | General | Industrial Use | s and, where well re | elated to the |
| transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses. Raynhar | n Road/Dunmow Roa | d Indust | rial Estate. | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC | 2012 Comm | ents and Rating: | |
| Raynham Road / Dunmow Road Industrial Estate (all areas | s) | Asses | sment: | _ | |
| The cluster's occupancy rate is relatively low with several vacant units at the time of the survey. The overall qualitative | | This part of Raynham Road comprises Raynham Close, relatively modern single storey/mezzanine | | | |
| | | | | | |
| room for improvements. There are currently a number of B2 us | ses | | | | |
| on the site which if the decline in B2 demand continues (as | | good | ayout, access | and servicing. | |
| indicated by the employment forecasts) should be considered | for | | | | |
| B1 redevelopment. If that is not deemed possible, the cluster | | Assessment Green See Appraisal Criteria below | | | |
| should be re-assessed as a possible "Red" | | | | | |
| Assessment: Amber | | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Access and Signage | | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |
| | | | | | |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Raynham Close | Unit 11. Motor Parts Direct | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Unit 1: First signs and labels | Unit 12. City Electrical Factors | |
| Unit 2. | Unit 13. Partco Auto parts | |
| Unit 3. Plumb Centre | Unit 14. Partco Auto parts | |

| Unit 4. Anglia Maintenance/South Anglia Housing | Unit 15. M+J Hire Centre | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| Unit 5 Barley McNaughton | Myson Close | |
| Unit 6. SEV | Unit 1. Stortford Performance Tyres | |
| Unit 7. Stortford Performance Tyres | Unit 2. | |
| Unit 8. Stortford Performance Tyres | Unit 3. Thyssenkrupp Elevators | |
| Unit 9. Ian Douglas Design and Print | Unit 4. Galaxy Components | |
| Unit 10. Sally Salon Services | Unit 5. Minitram Ltd | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|--|----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Few vacancies |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | no |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes but shares | | |
| parking provision | wider access | | |
| | problems | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | yes | Is the estate in a good position? | yes | |
| Is the estate visible | yes | Is the estate flexible? | yes | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | no | |
| Is the market perception positive? | yes | | | |

Estate: Twyford Road, Bishop's Stortford Owner: N/K Managing Agent: Derrick Wade and Waters EH 2007 Local Plan: Identified as an employment location EDE1/ EDE2. B1S9: In accordance with Policy EDE1, the following sites are defined as employment areas on the proposals map and will be reserved for industry comprising classes B1 Business, B2 General Industrial Uses and, where well related to the transport network, B8 storage and distribution uses. III Twyford Road and Twyford Business Centre Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: Twyford Road in the south of Bishops Stortford benefits from its location Comprises two areas – Twyford Industrial Estate, older buildings and relative proximity to the M11 compared to other estates in other parts of at the northern end of the site to the east and west of Twyford Rd the district. However its direct access to the M11 is heavily constrained as it and the more modern Twyford Business Centre (circa 1985) to is located to the south of the town. Access into the estate is also the west. The 2008 comments still apply. Overall, plot ratio/site cover is high at between 70% and 80% giving rise to servicing constrained with some recent new build residential development as you enter the site. This combined with the fact that the general quality of the and parking problems and making estate management stock is not particularly high, with small units appealing to local occupiers problematic. Units available at between £6 and £7 ftsg. Twyford Industrial estate could be released for redevelopment if means that in terms of market perception, it scores poorly. Local agents gave it the lowest rating in Bishops Stortford. Its assessment should be alternative provision is made elsewhere in the town. regularly reviewed to reflect market trends and redevelopment Assessment Amber opportunities. **Assessment: Amber Outstanding Planning Consents:** Change of use from B2 to D2 (sports hall) renewed for a further 5 years, expiring 20/07/16. Office building adjoining new Baptist Church **Opportunities for Enhancement: Proposal: Partners** Costs Timeframe **Priority** Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Twyford Industrial Estate: East of Twyford Rd. | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Medisafe Knowledge Centre | PFS Plumbing Supplies |
| Bathroom Showroom | BS Baptist Church |
| | |
| Twyford Industrial Estate: West of Twyford Rd | |

| 1/2. Medisafe – design/production of medical equipment | 3. Valdez Gymnastics club |
|--|---|
| 3a. D+D Roofing | 4. Medisafe |
| 5. Medisafe | 6. Colmans Paints/Home Interiors |
| 7. Central Tyre | |
| | |
| Twyford Business Centre | |
| 1. Stortford Interiors – commercial interiors contractors | 1a. 3e Security – lock mnfrs |
| 2. George Buxton Electrical Contractor | 3. DC Butler Motorcycles |
| 4. Starc Engineering – sheet metal work | 5. Wholesale lighting and electrical |
| 6. A.J.Denman Garage Services | 7. as 6 |
| 8. OMS Optical/Pheobus Engineering – optical measuring syst. | 9. Raybold Metal Re-cyclers |
| 10. Absolute Signs Printers | 11. as 8 |
| 12. Vacant | 13. Nesor Equipment – dental equipment mnfrs |
| 14. Palmer & Martin Vehicle Hire | 15. Newducts Ltd – ducting mnfrs |
| 16. PHF Electrical Contractors | 17. Tant Labs – optical design/supply |
| 18. AK Rubber | 19. Totally Tropical – aquarium & pond supplies |
| 20/21. Hadham Engineering Steel Fabricators | 20/21. Krypton Health Construction Ltd – building services |
| 20//21. KH Medical Ltd – medical gas supplies | 22. as 4 and Custom Hardware Sheet metal work |
| 23. Leuco – saw blade sharpening | 24. Sommerville Services vehicle servicing |
| 25. Raybold Recycling/CMC metal trading | 26. Safe Security Solutions????? |
| 27. | 28. The Wright Buy – kitchen appliance sales |
| 29. Allklass Autos – vehicle services/repair | 30. Boardman Office Solutions/Hydrex |
| 31. PSR Automotive – vehicle services | 32 a. vacant |
| 32c. Fight Outlet boxing/fightwear suppliers | 33b Stansted Cars – vehicle sales/services |
| 24. East Chair & Sofa Company – showroom and sales | Thomas Tredgold House/Stortford House – part vacant/part Little |
| | Gym – children's gym |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | e | | |
|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Some vacancies on |
| | | | Twyford Bus. Centre |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Restricted access |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Restricted | | |
| parking provision | accessibility | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| Is the estate marketable? | Not a favoured location | Is the estate in a good position? | No – 'wrong side' of BS |
| Is the estate visible | | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | Yes – residential uses in Twyford Road |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Haslemere Estate, Pig Lane, Bishop's Stortford

Owner: SEGRO Ltd, 15 Regent Street, London, W1SY 4LR

Managing Agent: as above

EH 2007 Local Plan: BIS9 Employment Areas. In accordance with Policy ED1 the following sites are defined as employment areas on the proposals map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business, B2 General Industrial Uses and, where well related to the transport network, B8 storage and distribution uses: **Haslemere Industrial Estate**

| Halcrow 2008 Comments | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| and Rating: | Mid-1970s industrial estate, good layout park | Mid-1970s industrial estate, good layout parking and servicing. Buildings in need of upgrading but useable and | | | |
| Not assessed by Halcrow | flexible. Well signed from Pig Lane. But high | vacancy rate a | and buildings d | ifficult to let. Loca | I agents cite |
| 2008 | location on the wrong side of Bishops Stortfo | ord for the M11 | /Stansted, diffic | cult access from t | he north/east and |
| | lack of visibility from London Road. | | | | |
| | Assessment: Green | | | | |
| | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: PP for use of Unit 2 for a gym – 3/11/1592/FP | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Improved signage/visibility from London Road. | | | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Vacant | 2. To let Coke Gearing |
|--|---|
| 3. Construction Products Solutions B1/B8 | 4. MHC? Check back |
| 5. To let Coke Gearing | 6. K2 Plastic fabricators B2 |
| 7. K2 B2 | 8. K2 B2 |
| 9. Morrison Utility Services B8 | 10. To let Coke Gearing (no longer available) |
| 11. vacant? | 12. Mains B8 |
| 13. To let | 14. Leisure Plan? |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | low |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Good |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Difficult to market | Is the estate in a good position? | No |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Mill Site, Stonemasons Yard and former Sheppard's Garage, Dane Street, Bishops Stortford

Owner: Westmill Foods Ltd, Vindis Group, Days and Sons, Stone Masons

Managing Agent: N/A

EH 2007 Local Plan: Various: BH4 – Demolition in Conservation Areas; (No.8 Dane Street is a Grade 2 Listed Building) BH5 – Extensions/alterations to unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas: BH6 – New development in Conservation Areas: **BIS10 – Town Centre Sites for Redevelopment:** Within or adjacent to Bishop's Stortford town centre the following three potential development or re-development sites are defined on the proposals map: The Mill Site, Dane Street **BIS12 The Mill Site: 1.** The District Council identifies the Mill Site, Dane Street, as defined on the Proposals Map, as having redevelopment potential II. In the event of the site coming forward for redevelopment the following mix of uses may be appropriate, subject to the provision requirements of Policy BIS10: (a) residential development of around 100 dwellings, including up to 40% affordable housing in accordance with Policies HSG3 and HSG4, taking into account the amenity potential of the River frontage and the proximity of the town centre, and particularly opportunities to enhance pedestrian and cycle links between this site and the town centre; (b) small scale office development.

| BS 2020 Group: A vision for Bishops Sto | rd. Mill Site: Site Specific Develo | pment Brief Dece | mber 2010 | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | | |
| Not considered by Halcrow in 2008 Assessment: N/A | unctioning flour mill, stonemason's yard and reconservation area and partly within Flood Zone 2 rea of Archaeological significance No.114. Mill scommodated in an employment area closer to presents the main opportunity but the investme ck of alternative locations suggests that this site aking the aspirations expressed in the brief mo- portribute to the health of Bishops Stortford Tow cross the river. ssessment: Amber ae Appraisal Criteria below | 2. Contains one Gr site generates hea the strategic road ent already made b e may not become re difficult to delive | ade 2 listed build vy traffic which v network. This pa by the owners an available in the er. Whole site ha | ding. Within would be better art of the site nd the current shorter term as potential to | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | 1 | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority | |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Westmill Foods Ltd. | Day & Sons, Stone Masons |
|---------------------|--------------------------|

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | No | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Part vacant |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | No |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | No | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Heavy vehicle movements |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | No | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|-----------|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | No | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | See above | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | N/A | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Estate: Buntingford Business Park, Baldock Road, Buntingfor | ď | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: BUN4 - Existing and new employment areas | s. In accordance with pol | icy EDE1, the | former Sunnyside N | Nursery site and |
| the site adjoining the former Sunnyside Nursery site are reserved | for industry comprising | B1 Business and | B2 General Industri | ial Uses |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comment | ts and Rating: | | |
| Buntingford Business Park located directly on the A10 is a new | As for Halcrow. Modern B1, B2 and B8 development. Approximately 30% of | | | |
| development with large, high-quality units. It scores well in most | floor space (one building) currently vacant. (Paul Wallace currently | | | |
| qualitative areas and is a particularly attractive location for local | marketing 36,257ftsq fe | | | |
| occupiers based on the quality and range of its offering. It is | Particulars refer to 'inte | | | |
| recommended that it is safeguarded for employment use. | phase'. Permission for | a car park should | ease existing parki | ng problems. |
| Assessment: Green. | Assessment: Green | | | |
| | See Appraisal Criteria | a below | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: Consent for a car park | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: N/A | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Unit 1. John O'Connor/EHDC Ground Maintenance/EHDC Parking | Milton Park – Amwell Systems – washroom contractors/suppliers |
|--|---|
| Office/EHDC Recycling/Veolia | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Approx 30% vacant | | | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | | | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | |

| separation of the residential element from its employ c) improved or introduced landscaping features are Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: Park Farm Industrial Estate Park Farm Industrial Estate provides smaller, older of scores well in terms of general quality and its high of from local businesses. Assessment: Green Outstanding Planning Consents: No significant pe | expected on the northern edges of both parts of the site. units that cater for smaller businesses. It ccupancy rate indicates strong demand Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | lity to |
|---|---|---------|
| c) improved or introduced landscaping features are Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: Park Farm Industrial Estate Park Farm Industrial Estate provides smaller, older us scores well in terms of general quality and its high o from local businesses. | expected on the northern edges of both parts of the site. units that cater for smaller businesses. It ccupancy rate indicates strong demand EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating : No change from Halcrow. Good accessibil A10 Assessment: Green | lity to |
| c) improved or introduced landscaping features are Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: Park Farm Industrial Estate Park Farm Industrial Estate provides smaller, older us scores well in terms of general quality and its high o | expected on the northern edges of both parts of the site. EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: No change from Halcrow. Good accessibit A10 | lity to |
| c) improved or introduced landscaping features are Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: Park Farm Industrial Estate | expected on the northern edges of both parts of the site. EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: No change from Halcrow. Good accessibi | lity to |
| c) improved or introduced landscaping features are Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | expected on the northern edges of both parts of the site. EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | lity to |
| c) improved or introduced landscaping features are | expected on the northern edges of both parts of the site. | |
| | | |
| separation of the residential element from its employ | ment element on this site | |
| | | |
| | arise. A condition and/or planning obligation is likely to be required to prevent the | |
| b) The smaller area to the north-east, fronting Ermin | e Street, is reserved for live/work units. Careful planning and attention to detail is exp | ected |
| General industrial uses. | | |
| a) the larger area to the south and west is, in accord General Industrial uses. | ance with Policy EDE1, primarily reserved for industry comprising B1 Business and B | 2 |
| | | - |
| to the following guidance: | | |
| | as, as defined on the Proposals Map. Proposals for development are expected to conf | orm |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: BUN6 – Park Farm Industrial | | |
| Owner: Lapinag Industries Managing Agent: Jaggard Baker 01494 677755 – 0 | Sraham Atkinson | |
| | | |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. vacant | 26. ? |
|-----------|-------|
| 2. | 27.? |

| 3 | 28.Markey Coffee Communicator ? |
|---|--|
| 4. Idrums – sale of drum kits (main retail premises Chelmsford) | 29.Buntingford Gym SG |
| 5. ? | 30.Caron Engineering Services B2 |
| 6. Vacant | 31.vacant – Cook Gearing |
| 7. ? | 32. Buntingford Services – streetworks contractors B2 |
| 8. To let – 3190ftsq Atchison Raffety | 33.Premier Design and Print Printers B2 |
| 9? | 34.Ball Spinning Company Ltd – Metal spinning/fabrication B2 |
| 10. Evergood Associated Medical recruitment agency B1 | 35.PMC Polythene – polythene suppliers B8 |
| 11. S.J. Tokely Car Repairs B2 | 36. " " |
| 12. """" | 37. "" |
| 13. | 38. "" |
| 14. Sharp Print Printing Services B2 | 39.to let, , |
| 15. Scenic Design Printing Services B2 | 39a/b Evergood |
| 16.Thomas Electrical Electrical contractor B2 | 39c GX blinds – blinds and canopies B2 |
| 17.Keri Systems door access systems sales office B1 | 39d to let |
| 18. Specialised Security Products – security systems supply/mnfr B2 | 40.BV tools Storage and distribution B8 |
| 19. " " " | 41.First Class Business Solutions B1 |
| 20. " " " | 42.LBT computer services B1 |
| 21. " " " | 43.as 41 B1 |
| 22.Buntingford Mowers B2 | 44.as 41 B1 |
| 23.Buntingford Engine Services B2 | 45.as 41 B1 |
| 24.Herts Air Ambulance – B1 | |
| 25 | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | 9 units vacant (25%) |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|--|
| Estate: Sainsbury's Depot, London Road, Buntingford, SG9 | 9JR | | | | |
| Owner: Sainsbury's Supermarkets, 33, Holborn, EC1 2HT | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/A | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: Policy EDE1 – Employment Areas: BUN5 | The Former Sainsbury D | Distribution Depot Ir | n accordance with P | olicy EDE1, the | |
| Former Sainsbury Distribution Depot is primarily reserved for B8 | Storage and Distribution | Uses. Proposals for | or the alternative use | e and/or | |
| development of the site will be considered against the recommen | dations of the latest Emp | ployment Land Stud | dy for East Hertfords | shire. In the | |
| event that the retention of the whole or part of the site for B8 Stor | age and Distribution Use | e has been explore | d fully without succe | ess evidence | |
| must be supplied to the satisfaction of the District Council to dem | onstrate this. Any propos | sed alternative use | and/or developmen | t of the site will | |
| be expected to be subject to a Development Brief prepared or ap | proved by the District Co | ouncil. | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | |
| Sainsbury's Distribution depot | | No Change. Current (1/1/13) application from | | | |
| This site scores well across most qualitative criteria and benefits | | Prologis for demolition and redevelopment with | | | |
| from its good location and visibility. It is recommended that it is | | a new storag | a new storage and distribution depot (B8) | | |
| safeguarded for employment use. | | Assessmen | Assessment: Green | | |
| Assessment: Green | | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: N/a | | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority | |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Vacant | |
|--------|--|
| | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | n/a |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Along northern boundary |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |
| | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Estate: Silkmead Industrial Estate, Buntingford | | | | |
| Owner: Lapinag, 35 Potter Street, Bishops Stortford | | | | |
| Managing Agent: Derrick Wade and Waters | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: OSV7 Employment Areas: In accordance with F | olicy EDE1 the fol | owing sites are define | d as Employment | Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes E | 1 Business and B2 | 2 General Industrial Us | ses, subject to sub | o-section (II) of |
| this policy; and, where well related to the transport network, B8 Storage | e and Distribution | Uses: Silkmead Farm | n, Hare Street. | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 | 2 Comments and Rat | ing: | |
| Silkmead Industrial Estate in Hare Street is an isolated small | No change | from Halcrow | | |
| estate in the north of the District and based on its isolation it | | | | |
| scores poorly in terms of marketability. Its isolation however | | | | |
| means that it achieves a good score in terms of competition as | Assessme | nt: Amber | | |
| there are no other employment sites in the locality. The estate is | | | | |
| made up of small wooden units further restricting its score in terms | | | | |
| of market perception and general quality of working environment. | See Appra | isal Criteria below | | |
| Assessment: Amber | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

| 1d Vintage Paintworks car spraying B2 | 1-4 Silkmead Furniture – bespoke kitchens B2 |
|--|--|
| 7a Turnfast Components – Precision Engineers | 9a Silkmead Fabrications - Manufacturing B2 |
| 9b,c – Naturally Wood – handmade wood furniture B2 | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Some vacancies |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Poor | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|------------------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes for low rent | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| | tenants | | |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Poor | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| Estate: Watermill Estate, Buntingford | | | | | |
| Owner: Bernard Greenwood, 10 The Woods, Radlett | | | | | |
| Managing Agent | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: 16.7.3 In respect of the Watermill Indust and poor in alignment. It is therefore considered that it would b further significant expansion of the site without improvements I Employment Land Study 2004 confirmed this view. BUN7 Wat permission for significant traffic generating developments will b been carried out on Aspenden Road. | be detrimental to the sa having been made to t termill Industrial Estate | afety of pe his acces - Improve | ersons and veh s. The findings ement to Asper | icles using the road of the East Hertfor nden Road No furth | d to allow dshire ner planning |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC 2 | 012 Comment | s and Rating | |
| Watermill Industrial Estate benefits from its relative proximity to | o the | | | rained by poor acc | ess but a |
| A10 but the fact that it is located in the north of the District and | | recent agreement by EHDC to sell a small area of land at | | | |
| small, poor quality units meant that in terms of marketability it s | | the junction with Aspenden Road will enable to units | | | |
| vacant units indicate demand could be stronger. Refurbishmen | t of units would lead | referred to by Halcrow to be constructed. This site is | | | |
| to improved image and perception. An application for a total of | seven new B1 units | currently being marketed by Paul Wallace 01992 440744 | | | |
| has been recently approved by the Council. | | Assessment: Amber | | | |
| Assessment: Amber. | | See Ap | oraisal Criteria | a below | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: 3/08/0538/FP - Erection of | 5 B1 Units – 27.7.11. | Erection of | of 2 B1 office/w | orkshops 27.7.11 | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Improved access | | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

| 1. The Willows- Nicholas and Knight – marketing/advertising | Unit 1. The Firs Business Park - Pure Graphics |
|---|---|
| Unit 5A – Lewden Joinery | Unit 5b – Liberro – electronic smoking appliances |
| Suite 6, Unit P3 - Community Transport Training | HCC Household Waste Transfer Station |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Some vacancies |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average to poor | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | average |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | No | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Not a favoured | Is the estate in a good position? | No |
| | location | | |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | No | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Former GSK Laboratory, Bury Green Farm, Bury Green, SG11 2HE

Owner: Romehold Ltd, 3rd Floor, Sterling House, Langston Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 3TS

Managing Agent: None

EH 2007 Local Plan: GBC4 Major Developed Sites Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and Rural Area. 4.6.6 The following sites within the Green Belt are identified and delineated on the Proposals Map as Major Developed Sites: Former GlaxoSmithKline site, Bury Green

| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| The former GlaxoSmithKline site at Bury Green is a major developed site | PP granted in 2008 for redevelopment of the research | | | | |
| that was purpose built for GSK for their Research & Development activities. As a result, it scores poorly in terms of fitness for purpose and marketability. Based on its previous use the site's access is limited, further reducing its marketability score. In terms of sustainability the site also scores poorly due to its rural location meaning that its access to public transport and supporting facilities (shops etc) is non-existent. However, the site has recently been given planning approval for 2 data centre buildings, 2 external compounds and a substation building and is expected to be redeveloped in the near future. Assessment: Amber. | facility with 2 data centre buildings for GSK but so far not implemented. While an established employment location within the green belt, the nature of the new development – two large footplate buildings designed for a named occupier – limits the sites' flexibility in terms of possible alternative uses while the disadvantages of the rural location as noted by Halcrow still apply Assessment: Amber See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: 3/08/0593/FP Erection of 2 no. data c | centre buildings containing data handling computers, | | | | |
| associated plant areas, technical support services and ancillary office area. 2 no external compounds, substation building and | | | | | |
| associated site works. Approved with Conditions 10-Jul-2008 | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | | |

Proposal:

Partners Costs

Timeframe Priority

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

Vacant buildings and site

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | e | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Currently vacant | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | N/A |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Poor location/good parking |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | N/A | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Poor location but | | |
| parking provision | good parking | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|----------------|---|----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Limited demand | Is the estate in a good position? | No |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Former GSK Terlings Park, Gilston

Owner: Angle Property (Terlings Park) Ltd/PCDF Second (B) Nominees Ltd

Managing Agent: N/K

EH 2007 Local Plan: GBC4 Major Developed Sites Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and Rural Area

Merck Sharpe and Dohme, Terlings Park

| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------|----|--|--|--|
| Terlings Park in Gilston is one of the major developed sites in the greenbelt | : / rural area. Whi | е | | | | | |
| it scores poorly in terms of town location because of this classification, the fact that it is on the Permission granted (subject to | | | | | | | |
| Harlow boundary and in close proximity to Harlow train station, means that | residenti | al development of | site. Existing | | | | |
| terms of sustainability. Its attractiveness is also enhanced based on its prox | buildings | now being demoli | shed | | | | |
| road. It scores poorly based on its fitness for purpose however. The site wa | s used for | | | | | | |
| research and development activities and as a result its properties are suited | Assessr | Assessment: N/A | | | | | |
| research and development activities and as a result its properties are suited | a te el en gre | occupier for this use. Demand from occupiers of this nature is limited in East Herts therefore See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | | |
| | | See App | raisal Criteria bel | ow | | | |
| | st Herts therefore | See App | raisal Criteria bel | ow | | | |
| occupier for this use. Demand from occupiers of this nature is limited in East | st Herts therefore Harlow also | See App | raisal Criteria bel | ow | | | |
| occupier for this use. Demand from occupiers of this nature is limited in East the site is not meeting the District's current demand profile. Its proximity to I means that it competes directly with this market which has a greater 'years offices compared to East Herts as a whole (4.5 versus 3.9 years). It is likely | st Herts therefore Harlow also of supply' of r that if the site | See App | raisal Criteria bel | ow | | | |
| occupier for this use. Demand from occupiers of this nature is limited in East the site is not meeting the District's current demand profile. Its proximity to I means that it competes directly with this market which has a greater 'years | st Herts therefore Harlow also of supply' of r that if the site | See App | raisal Criteria bel | ow | | | |
| occupier for this use. Demand from occupiers of this nature is limited in East the site is not meeting the District's current demand profile. Its proximity to I means that it competes directly with this market which has a greater 'years offices compared to East Herts as a whole (4.5 versus 3.9 years). It is likely | st Herts therefore Harlow also of supply' of r that if the site | See App | raisal Criteria bel | ow | | | |
| occupier for this use. Demand from occupiers of this nature is limited in East the site is not meeting the District's current demand profile. Its proximity to I means that it competes directly with this market which has a greater 'years offices compared to East Herts as a whole (4.5 versus 3.9 years). It is likely was to be redeveloped to appeal to smaller scale occupiers it might perform | at Herts therefore Harlow also of supply' of that if the site h better. | | | | | | |
| occupier for this use. Demand from occupiers of this nature is limited in East the site is not meeting the District's current demand profile. Its proximity to I means that it competes directly with this market which has a greater 'years offices compared to East Herts as a whole (4.5 versus 3.9 years). It is likely was to be redeveloped to appeal to smaller scale occupiers it might perform Assessment: Amber. | at Herts therefore Harlow also of supply' of that if the site h better. | | | | | | |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

None

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | N/A | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | N/A |

| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | N/A | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | N/A |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | N/A | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | N/A |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | N/A | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | N/A | Is the estate in a good position? | N/A | | |
| Is the estate visible | N/A | Is the estate flexible? | N/A | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | N/A | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | N/A | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | N/A | | | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Dicker Mill, Hertford

Owner: Dicker Mill Investments, 15a Dicker Mill, Hertford, SH13 7AE - 01992 554456

Managing Agent: as above

EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 Business and B2 General Industrial use: Mead Lane (East of Marshgate Drive). Note – the Proposals Map includes the Dicker Mill area within the employment allocation covered by HE8 although the policy wording does not refer to the Dicker Mill area

| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| The estate benefits from its location which | The overall quality of the estate is poor to average but there are few vacant buildings. Parking | | | | | | |
| is relatively close to the town centre while | and servicing space is adequate but layout of parking/servicing areas is haphazard. Despite | | | | | | |
| being relatively isolated from residential | these shortcomings, the estate appea | ars to fulfil | l a useful local | function and, as r | noted by Halcrow, | | |
| areas therefore avoiding major conflicts | is well located and has no major conf | flicts. Long | g tern proposal | s to improve acce | ess to the Mead | | |
| with adjacent land uses. Its overall quality is | Lane area will improve access to the | eastern e | end of the site f | rom Marshgate Dr | rive, possibly | | |
| average but it serves the need of smaller | enabling the western access from Me | ead Lane t | to be closed th | ough this would re | equire the | | |
| occupiers in Hertford. | agreement of the owners. | | | - | | | |
| Assessment: Green | Assessment: Green | | | | | | |
| | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Improved access as part of improvements to Mead Lane | | | | | | | |
| Proposal: | Par | rtners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority | | |

| Starting from western end of Dicker Mill Complex: | |
|---|---|
| First unit after bridge – vacant, being decorated | 1. To let 1500ftsq Roger Richards |
| 2. vacant | 3. Harts Radiators |
| 4.? | 5. To let Roger Richards |
| 6,7, Burton Lane, Cabinet Maker | 8,9 Magic Car repairs |
| 10 Barbe & Bald Ltd Furniture repairs | 11. Gullpine Printers |
| 12. Mucky Pups dog grooming | 13. Hertford Horse Bits – equine supplies |

| 14. Vacant | 12. Vdub Shed, vw servicing/repairs |
|--|--|
| 14,16 Regarda Vehicle Services, Regarda Graphics | 17. Colin Gunning VW Repairs/servicing |
| 18. DM Tyre and MoT | 19. Quadrant Design and Print |
| 20. B.C Autos | 21,22. TG Commercials Commercial Vehicle Services |
| 23/24. Hertford Tyre Services | |
| Eastern End of site adjoining Marshgate Lane: | |
| 6,6(b), 7, 8 (b), (c) (d) (e) Ducting and Vent Ltd – Ducting Engineers | 8(f) (g) T. Hayden Welding Supplies |
| 8(a) Metal Morphics – car body repairs | |
| Building to rear of above | |
| 8f. NC Contract Furniture | Units 13, 14? |
| Detached building to west of Marshgate Drive | |
| 12. Glitter Monster Crafts | 13. C. Beach 13(b) HW Taylor (Companies linked to Dicker |
| | Mill Investments) |
| 15(c) Cadtech | 15. Westminster Forum events organisation (Specifically |
| | business/politics briefings). |
| 15(d) Pretty Cool | 15(a) Dicker Mill Investments |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|--|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancy |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Some issues |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Adequate | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|---------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

Part 1. Summary Estate: Foxholes Business Park, John Tate Road, Hertford

| Owner: Various | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Managing Agent: The Chase - Cushman and | d Wakefield – 0845 603 4450. Wa | termark Way - | - Jones Lang L | aSalle 0121 643 | 6440, Harforde |
| Court – Devonshire Developments 020 7722 | 1199. Remainder unknown. | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Area | as: In accordance with Policy ED | E1 the followin | g sites are defi | ned as Employme | ent Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved | for industry, comprising Classes | B1 Business a | nd B2 General | Industrial uses: F | oxholes West. |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Ra | ting: | | | |
| Foxholes Industrial Estate which is primarily | Foxholes is described by one loo | al agent as 'th | e only busines | s park in town'. M | ade up of |
| made up of B1 offices scores highly in terms of quality of offering with its larger, newer units and visibility based on its positioning directly off the A414. Based on the market perception of local agents, it is considered the top ranking location in Hertford. Assessment : Green | businesses in John Tate Road, quality units built circa 1990. Mo apart from congestion/overflow p which detracts from the attractive market perception of this part of currently vacant (at least 50%) it are now being resolved and not business units the majority of wh benefit from better signage from junction. Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | stly B1 but sor parking around eness of the es the estate. Wh is understood the quality of the nich are occupi | ne B2. Layout, the A414 junc state. Rents of nile a significan that this is due ne offer. Harfor ed. Agents sug | access and parki ion linked to the I £15ftsq at The Ch t proportion of this to management/ de Court also goo gest that the Fox | ng generally good Mercedes garage hase reflect the s development is lease issues that od quality holes estate could |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | • • | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Better sign | nage from A414. Opportunity to re | move vehicle | barrier betwee | n Foxholes /Caxto | on Hill. |
| Proposal: Vehicular Link to Caxton Hill? See | • • • • | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

| The Chase: (9 self-contained two storey detached/semi-detached campus- | John Tate Road: Lancaster Mercedes, |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| style office buildings. Head Lease held by Orange Holdings. Freehold | Azelis Personal Care, |
| currently for sale for £7.5M (LSH). | Vtesse Cirus Services, |
| Unit A Gnd FI. vacant, 1 st FI. Apollo Learning & Development | Jewsons |

| Unit B Gnd. Fl. Vacant, 1 st fl. Clydesdale Bank, | Ammerall Beltech Ltd, |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Unit C1 – vacant (Davies) Unit C2 Continuum Insurance Brokers | Vitesse Networks Telecoms, |
| Unit C3 Vacant Unit C4 vacant Unit D vacant | Fishpools Distribution Centre |
| Unit E1/2 WSP Transport Engineers | |
| Unit F Vacant – Davies offering these vacant units for £15 ftsq. | |
| Watermark Way: | Harforde Court: |
| Tate House 1-3 1 st fl Blue Square Marketing, Gnd Fl. Keymile | 1/2/3/4/10 Spacelabs Healthcare |
| Caxton House – 4-5 Vision (office automation) ltd, | 5 veratase |
| Chaucer House 6,7,8,9 Vision (office automation) ltd, | 6. Lead Media |
| Mercer House 10, JMJ Accountancy, 11 Honister Partners 12 vacant | 7/8 Enspire Health |
| 13. K+S UK and Eire Ltd 14, Capital Catering Services, 15 Honister Partners, | 9. Semicron innovation & service |
| 16 vacant, 17 K+S UK & Eire Ltd, 18. Gnd. Fl vacant 1 st fl. Agenda Recruiting. | 11. Silent Sentinel |
| | 12. Custom Security Solutions |
| | 13 to let Davies |
| | 14. Information Internet |
| | 15.Biotarge UK |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Current a number of vacancies in The Chase but this is not thought to reflect market demand. |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | · | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes – except for the Mercedes Garage | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | |

| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Estate: Hartham Lane, Hertford (Great Northern Works) | | | | |
| Owner: Ekins, Gt. Northern Works, Hartham Lane, Hertford | | | | |
| Managing Agent: as above | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy EDI | E1 the follow | ing sites are de | fined as Employr | ment Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved for industry, comprising Classes I | 31 Business | and B2 Genera | al Industrial uses: | Hartham |
| Lane/Station Approach. | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2 | 012 Comments | s and Rating: | |
| This estate benefits from above average quality of buildings, good parking provision and flexibility. There appears to be good demand, especially from smaller occupiers. The site also scores well in terms of sustainability. Its relative proximity to the centre of Hertford means that it achieves a good score on its proximity to a train station and facilities, factors perceived highly by some occupiers as they can assist in attracting and retaining staff. Assessment: Green | suggesti e included recently Assessr | ng strong dema McMullens Bre | ewery within this a a Sainsbury's su | ether Halcrow 2008 area but part |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

| Great Northern Works | |
|--|--|
| Ekins & Co Builders | Hertford Joinery |
| Unit 2 Evanta Motor Company | LD Engineering |
| TAG Distribution | Unit 4a – Aston Studios screen printers |
| Unit 4b BW Revival Fashions | Unit 4c HDC Cabinet Makers |
| Unit 7 Rothschild & Bickel Glass Merchants | Unit 9a Vit Image Technology – Mnfr/Distribution of security |
| | cameras. 9b Highway Cycles |
| Hartham View Industrial Estate | Units 10-18 Mobile Stationary & Printing |
| Unit 14 Logic RC – games distributors | McMullens Brewery |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Strong demand/no | | |
| | | | vacancies | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Good | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | | | |
| parking provision | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Estate: Pegs Lane, Hertford SG13 8EQ | | | | | |
| Owner: Various | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: No allocation | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and | - | | | Deve Leve is |
| This cluster includes a number of good quality office buildings with occupiers ranging from East Herts District Council and Hertfordshire County Council to the Police. The cluster benefits from its central location in Hertford and is expected to maintain strong demand for B1 use in the future. It scores well across all qualitative categories. Assessment: Green. | This cluster has not fared we vacant as is Sovereign House Wurlings pub. The governme they would form a useful rede reasonable quality, they and c/o/u to a care home) are not For the L.A buildings, this how central location is valuable ar although an element of reside Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | e, the former g nt building pa evelopment si Bentley Hous flexible and c wever is acad nd the site sho ential develop | government bu rticularly is unl te. While the lo e (mostly vaca lo not lend the emic in the for buld be retaine | ilding and the adj ikely to be re-occ ocal authority buik nt but subject to a mselves readily to eseeable future. I d predominantly f | joining Elbert upied and together dings are of an application for b alternative uses. Nevertheless, the for employment use |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Redevelopm | nent of former IR building and a | djoining PH | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Wallfields - East Herts District Council | County Hall - Hertfordshire County Council |
|--|--|
| Gates Ford Dealer | Herts Police (Mercury House) |
| Various in new offices | Sovereign House -vacant |
| Elbert Wurlings PH (vacant) | Bently House – mostly vacant |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Significant vacancies | | |

| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Generally good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
|---|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Estate: Windsor Industrial Estate, 424 Ware Road, Ware, S | G13 7EW | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Areas: In accordanc | e with Policy EDI | E1 the followin | g sites are def | ined as Employm | ent Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved for industry, com | prising Classes | B1 Business a | nd B2 General | Industrial uses: V | Vindsor |
| Industrial Estate, Ware Road. | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 C | omments and | Rating: | | |
| The estate scores highly in terms of visibility although the | estate scores highly in terms of visibility although the As per Halcrow – estate fully let January 2013 | | | | |
| overall quality and range of its stock are mostly average. Its | | | | | |
| location and high occupancy rate are strong points for its | Assessment: | Green | | | |
| safeguarding for employment use. | See Appraisal | Criteria belov | w | | |
| Assessment: Green | | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Flyers Group | 2. Heating and Bathroom Supplies B8 |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Nicky Cornel Furniture | 4. STS Tyres |
| 5. Halfords Autocentre | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|-----------|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Fully let | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| | | | | |

| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | |
|---|-----|--|
| parking provision | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes for local demand, no for access to strategic road network | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | |

MEAD LANE AREA:

The area of employment land best known as Mead Lane (together with the Dicker Mill complex to the north of the river) represents a major employment area in Hertford. In the 2008 Halcrow Report, Dicker Mill was described separately but the Mead Lane area was split up into: (1) Marshgate Drive and (2). Merchant Drive. It is not clear how the business premises on Mead Lane including the Lockhouse Industrial Estate were dealt with.

For the purpose of this review, the area is described in the following terms:

- 1. Marshgate Drive both south and north of the river
- 2. Merchant Drive/Fountains Drive
- 3. Mead Lane Business Centre
- 4. Centros, Mead Lane
- 5. The Lockhouse Industrial Estate and adjoining land
- 6. Conbar House, Expo House, Orland House and Chelsing House served directly off Mead Lane

These areas have different characteristics but all share the same issue of restricted access to the strategic road network in that all traffic has to use Mill Road. All comments on accessibility if the schedules below are subject to this caveat. This is considered further in paragraph. 5.21 of the main report.

| Part 1. Summary | |
|--|---|
| Estate: Marshgate Drive, Hertford, (Mead Lane) | |
| Owner: Various | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | |
| | e Favourable consideration will be given to the redevelopment of the Mead |
| Lane Area, west of Marshgate Drive, as defined on the Proposals Ma | |
| | ies HSG3 and HSG4. HE8 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy |
| EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the P | |
| Classes B1 Business and B2 General Industrial uses: Mead Lane (E | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: |
| Marshgate Drive | Land on the west side of Marshgate Drive has been redeveloped for or |
| This estate is well occupied (one vacancy was recorded at the | has permission for residential redevelopment (former TXU site and |
| time of the survey) but its overall qualitative score ranges from | Marshall Panelcraft.) To the east there is a vacant site at the junction of |
| poor to good. Given that most units are currently in manufacturing | Mead Lane, a 1.48ha vacant site (former laboratories/yards) adjoining |
| use, the estate would be a good candidate for redevelopment to B1 | Norbury's Builders Yard and to the north, the vacant National Grid land. |
| if demand for B2 units declines (as projected by the employment | North of the river there are modern Industrial Units 6-11 Marshgate Drive. |
| forecasts). | Assessment: Amber |
| Assessment: Amber. | See Appraisal Criteria below |
| | units on Marshall Panelcraft and adjoining land granted on appeal 29.1.08. |
| Application for renewal submitted under 3/10/1147 but yet to be dete | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Opportunity for redevelopment of | f vacant land once Mead lane access issues resolved. |

| South of River, West of Marshgate Drive | South of River, east of Marshgate Drive |
|--|--|
| Unit 3, Marshall Panelcraft – car repairs | Norbury's Fencing/building materials |
| Unit 7.Bridge Neworks | Vacant site, junction Marshgate Drive/Mead lane |
| North of river - new business units | Former laboratory and land 1.48acres adjoining Norbury's – currently marketed by Derrick Wade & Waters |
| Units 6-8 Emco Group – lighting suppliers B8 | Hertford Gas Holder Station between Norbury's and canal. Registered is a NIHHS (hazardous) site. |

| Unit 11. Chapman Bespoke Woodwork | Unit 3. Neocell skincare products |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Unit 4. Jameson Press | Unit 8. Crossbrook Furniture |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | No | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Mainly vacant | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Poor/contaminated | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | No | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | No | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Yes – residential in Marshgate Drive | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Νο | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | If access resolved | Is the estate in a good position? | yes | |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | N/A | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | Residential in Marshgate Drive | |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Merchant Drive/Fountains Drive, Hertford, SG13 7BH

Owner: N/K

Managing Agent: Merchant Drive (west side) – Mead Lane Industrial Estate - managed by DTZ 0845 603 1485. Merchant Drive (east side) managed by Kenningtons 202 7224 2222.

EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Areas In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 Business and B2 General Industrial uses: Mead Lane (East of Marshgate Drive).

| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and | Rating: | | | |
|--|---|----------|-------|-----------|----------|
| This estate appears to have some | Good quality development but shares access constraints with the rest of the Mead Lane | | | | |
| vacant units and overall average | area | | | | |
| characteristics. As for Marshgate Drive | Assessment: Green | | | | |
| it should be considered for B1 | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | |
| redevelopment if demand for B2 | | | | | |
| declines and vacancies persist. | | | | | |
| Assessment: Amber | | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Improved access | | | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

| Merchant Drive (west) | |
|---|--|
| 1. Cougar Lubrication – lubricant development and manufacture | 2. Neptune Engineering – injection moulding tools – B2 |
| 3. Hertford Autocentre | 4. High Line Autos – vehicle servicing |
| 5-8 Huco Engineering – precision engineers | 9. Vacant |
| 10. PJ Pipes and Valves – valve mnfr. and distribution | 11. 4 Aces Ltd – supply/distribution of liquid packaging |
| | materials |

| 12. Vacant | |
|--|--|
| Merchant Drive (east) | |
| 13. Kuehne & Nagel - logistics | 14 Old English Tiles – tile stockist/supplier |
| 15. to let | 16. G.W Cowler precision Engineers |
| 17. Howden Joinery – wood joinery depot – B8 | 18/19. Qualiturn products – precision engineers |
| 20. GE Transportation – transport engineers | 21. Transport & Signage Solutions |
| Fountain Drive | |
| Unit 3. Speed Alloys – alloy suppliers | Regal Printing – printers and printing supplies |
| Astute Electronics – electronic components – B1, B2, B8 | 10/11 F.J Beswick |
| Unit 1. Pope & Meads Engineers – precision engineers | Unit 6. Air Energy – Compressed air products |
| Unit 5. John Hart Flooring – carpet & flooring suppliers | Unit 4, Harris Performance Products – motorcycle |
| | p5roducts and parts – B2/B8 |
| Unit 12. vacant | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancies | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | yes | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | no | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | yes | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | yes | Is the estate in a good position? | yes | | |
| Is the estate visible | yes | Is the estate flexible? | yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment | yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent | no | | |
| good? | | uses? | | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | yes | | | | |

| Estate: Mead Lane Business Centre | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| anagement | | | | | |
| usiness Centre Management I | td Unit 14. | | | | |
| Areas In accordance with Polic | y EDE1 the f | ollowing sites | s are defined as I | Employment | |
| primarily reserved for industry, | comprising (| Classes B1 B | usiness and B2 (| General Industrial | |
| ve). | | | | | |
| EHDC 2012 Comments and | Rating: | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | ayout spaciou | is and the ma | ajority are in use. | | |
| Assessment: Green | | | | | |
| See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| S | | | | | |
| | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority | |
| | usiness Centre Management L Areas In accordance with Polic primarily reserved for industry, ve). EHDC 2012 Comments and This area comprises busines Conbar House and lying to th are of good quality and the la Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria belo | usiness Centre Management Ltd Unit 14. Areas In accordance with Policy EDE1 the forimarily reserved for industry, comprising (ve). EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: This area comprises business units frontin Conbar House and lying to the rear of Co are of good quality and the layout spaciou Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | Areas In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites orimarily reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 B ve). EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: This area comprises business units fronting Mead Land Conbar House and lying to the rear of Conbar House a are of good quality and the layout spacious and the ma Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | Areas In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as I orimarily reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 Business and B2 (ve). EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: This area comprises business units fronting Mead Lane between Marsh Conbar House and lying to the rear of Conbar House and Orland House are of good quality and the layout spacious and the majority are in use. Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | |

| Fronting Mead Lane – two storey brick industrial units | |
|--|--|
| Units 1/2 PADS printing/stationary | Units 3/4Watergel Technologies |
| Unit 5 Business Card Co. Ltd | |
| To rear: 7. Tindall Security | 8. LG Bland Electrical/Tindall Property Services |
| 9. D+L Medical Gasses | 10. MD Electrical |
| 11. FJE Plastic Developments | 12. Jamieson Press |
| 13. Adapta Clothing | 14. Herts & Essex Printers |
| 15 RES On-line Solutions | 16. H&E Digital/Linards Ltd |
| 17. RS Taylor | 18. ? |

| 19/20. The Fine Confectionary Company Ltd | 21. Fumair Ltd |
|---|--|
| 22. Neil Display | 23. The Fine Confectionary Company Ltd |
| 24. to let | 25. E&E Ltd/Club King Ltd |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancy | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | | | |
| parking provision | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes – but general comments on access to the Mead Lane area apply | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Centros, Mead Lane, Hertford

Owner: TRE Hertford 01962 843211

Managing Agent: Lambert Smith Hampton 01727 834234

EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 Business and B2 General Industrial uses: **Mead Lane (East of Marshgate Drive).**

Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating:
Not clear how Halcrow dealt with the various
elements of Mead Lane in 2008EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating:
Vacant site in 2008. Modern business units built within the last 5 years. Good quality
environment but shares the access issues with the rest of Mead Lane

Assessment: Green

See Appraisal Criteria below

Outstanding Planning Consents: None Opportunities for Enhancement: Improved access to whole of Mead Lane area Proposal: Partners Costs Timeframe Priority

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Bravington Vine – food non/food product suppliers – B8 | 2. PDC Ltd - Debt Collection Agency |
|---|---|
| 3/4 to let | 5/6 FT Solutions – print management and marketing |
| 7 Istec Engineering consultants | 8. Edmunson – electrical wholesalers |
| 9. Vacant | 10. ? |
| 11? | 12 Farecla – paint product distribution |
| 13? | 14. Power Valves International power valves mnfr/supply |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | |
|--|------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Several vacant units | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes but restricted access | | |

| | | | from main road network |
|---|-----------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | See above | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Estate: Mead Lane: Lockhouse Industrial Estate and Adjoining | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Areas: In accordance with | Policy EDE1 the follow | /ing sites are de | fined as Employn | nent Areas on |
| the Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved for industry, o | comprising Classes B1 | Business and B | 2 General Industr | r ial use: Mead |
| Lane (East of Marshgate Drive) | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: (Described as 'Marshgate | EHDC 2012 Comment | ts and Rating: | | |
| Drive') | The area comprises the | | | |
| This estate is well occupied (one vacancy was recorded at the | Lockhouse Industrial Estate together with a modern brick office building, | | | |
| time of the survey) but its overall qualitative score ranges from | Collier House. The are | . . | | • • |
| poor to good. Given that most units are currently in manufacturing | and a number of units appear vacant. It would benefit from | | | |
| use, the estate would be a good candidate for redevelopment to B1 | redevelopment for B1 | | • | |
| if demand for B2 units declines (as projected by the employment forecasts). | National Grid Land whe | en access to the | whole of Mead Lan | e is improved. |
| Assessment: Amber | Assessment: Amber | | | |
| | See Appraisal Criteria | a below | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

| Matthews Haulage – haulage yard and associated vehicle repair/sales | Collier House: Team Q |
|---|-------------------------------|
| businesses | |
| Lockhouse Industrial Estate: | |
| Igloos Toilet Manufacturers | Riverside Sports Cars |
| Packaging Direct Ltd | The Tint Shop |
| Forum Events | Creative Star (71, Mead Lane) |
| Herts Electrical Contractors | CSL Care Group |
| Lighting Design Solutions | Andrews Steel |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | No | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Poor |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Poor | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Same issues as rest of Mead Lane |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | · | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Congested in places – Shares Mead lane access problems | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | No | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Poor | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Estate: Conbar House, Expo House, Orla | and House and Chelsing House f | ronting Mead | d Lane | | |
| Owner: Various | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Ar | eas: In accordance with Policy El | DE1 the follo | wing sites are | e defined as Emp | loyment Areas on |
| the Proposals Map and will be primarily | reserved for industry, comprisin | g Classes B1 | l Business ar | nd B2 General Inc | ustrial use: Mead |
| Lane (East of Marshgate Drive) | | • | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and R | ating | | | |
| Not clear how Halcrow dealt with the various elements of Mead Lane in 2008 | Conbar House is a modern (19 four to the rear where the exten- storey office with an attached w a large modern warehouse wit currently under construction. Chelsing House is a two storey Assessment: Amber See Appraisal Criteria below | 970s) brick of ded ground fl orkshop to th h a two store | oor comprises e rear which a y office block | workshop units. I appears to be vaca fronting Mead La | Expo House is a two ant. Orland House is ane. An extension is |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Access | improvements to Mead Lane | | | | |
| Proposal: | •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Conbar House – various serviced office suites – not listed | Workshops Units Ground Floor to rear – 3 in vehicle repair |
|---|--|
| | uses, fourth East Herts Signs/Engraving |
| Expo House appears vacant | Chelsing House: Chelsing Assemblies Ltd, Mode Lighting UK |
| | Ltd |
| Orland House. SOP International Asian/Oriental Food Importers | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | All occupied |

| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
|--|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| | | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes (Mead Land | | |
| parking provision | caveats) | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

Part 1. Summary Estate: Mimram Road, Hertford, SG14 1MM Owner: Jill Parry, 07887 877640 Managing Agent: as above EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Areas: In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 Business and B2 General Industrial uses: Mimram Road. Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: Assessment: As Halcrow. The estate functions well and vacancy rate is low. But This estate has mostly average qualitative characteristics. It offers relatively small units appealing to local occupiers and it would benefit from improved signage from the A414, an issue raised by several in that sense fulfils an important local function. It included a occupiers. They also suggest that the owner is reluctant to invest in number of B2 units that could be considered for B1 improvements. Unit 3 currently available for £4 ftsg. redevelopment if B2 demand declines Assessment: Green Assessment: Amber See Appraisal Criteria below Outstanding Planning Consents: None **Opportunities for Enhancement:** Better signage from A414 **Proposal: Improved signage** Timeframe Partners Costs Priority

Part 2. Occupiers @ October 2012

| Priory House – Smart Merchants Electrical Wholesalers | 151. Hertingforbury Road James Stuart Creative Print ADMINISTRATION |
|---|--|
| 1. Mimram Service Centre/Crossfit Gym B1/SG | 4. ND Aquatics – aquarium mnfrs B2 |
| 2. Marabese Ceramics B8 | 8. RS Taylor & Co. Vehicle cabs/metal fabrication B2 |
| 6. J25 Motorcycles B2 | 12. Sierra Leone Clothing Ltd. Import/export/sale of |
| | clothing/leather goods B8 |
| 10. Gata Tyres B2 | 16. Fasttrack electrical/lightworld – lighting/heating suppliers |

| 14. County Fireplaces – fireplace suppliers B8 | Replas House ? | Replas House ? | | |
|---|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 18. Graphic Nature Recording Studio/Folding/Sli | ding Door Shop S | G/A1 | | |
| Part 3– Appraisal Criteria | | | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | | |
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Good/low vacancy | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | · · · | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | | |
| parking provision | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Citteria 5. Marketability | | | | |
|---|---------|---|-----|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Average | | | |

Part 1. Summary

| Estate: Taylor Trading Estate, Ware Road, Hertfor | d | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Owner: N/K | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: No allocation | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comment | s and Rating | : | | |
| This estate has mostly average qualitative characteristics. Approximately one third of the units were vacant at the time of the survey. Refurbishment and improved marketing should be considered to make the estate more attractive. The vacancy rate will need to be monitored and if it remains high, the site should be considered for B1 development. | Estate comprises Ware Garages Renault dealer, SAM autocentre and a number of poor quality industrial units at the rear. A further part of the estate to the west has been cleared and boarded and pp granted for residential development and a vets surgery (the justification for loss of employment land). Should the garage close redevelopment of the remaining part of the estate for residential (with an element of employment) may be difficult to resist. | | | | |
| Assessment: Amber | See Appraisal Criteria | a below | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: Residential/vets s | surgery on western part o | f the estate. | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: | | | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

| 1. SAM Centre – car parts (312 Ware Road) | Ware Garages, 356-364 Ware Road |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 3/3a RoyCarter Repairs | 4. Bentley Calor Sales |
| 4a Bentley TNT Dispatch | 5. MS Installations/Absolute Windows |
| 5a ? | 6. MRS Motorcycles/ACE Couriers |
| 7. Hand wash (car)/Hi-Q Tyre Services | 8/8a ACE Couriers |
| Part 3– Appraisal Criteria | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | |

| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | low |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average to poor | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | adequate |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Not at present |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|---------|---|----------------|
| Is the estate marketable? | no | Is the estate in a good position? | yes |
| Is the estate visible | yes | Is the estate flexible? | no |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | Not at present |
| Is the market perception positive? | no | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Estate: Warehams Lane, Hertford | | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Are | as: In accordance with Policy ED | E1 the follow | ing sites are de | efined as Employ | ment Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved | for industry, comprising Classes | B1 Business | and B2 Gener | al Industrial uses: | Warehams Lane. |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and R | ating | | | |
| This estate has a mixed qualitative profile ranging from poor to good. It appears to have no major conflicts with adjacent land uses however and some flexibility making it a potential candidate for B1 redevelopment. Assessment: Amber | As for Halcrow – an estate of gr modern industrial units and Wh local need. Assessment: Amber See Appraisal Criteria below | | | • | 0 |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: | | • | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Direct Carpets | 2. Budget Tyres |
|--|--|
| 3. Yard – self storage- Towey Construction | 4. Temple Car breakers - scrapyard |
| 5. Contract Scaffolding/Vands Scaffolding | Henry's of Hertford Agricultural & Automotive contractors and distributors |
| 7. Hertford Craft Centre/Pinflair | 8. MRH Hertford |
| 9. /Hertford Craft Centre/Pinflair | 12. Green Building Design |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Strong demand |

| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Varies – good to average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Good to average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

Part 1. Summary

| Estate: Caxton Hill, Hertford | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Owner: Various | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: Hertford Industrial Estate - | – Jones Lang LaSalle – rest unkn | own | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: HE8 Employment Area | s: In accordance with Policy EDE | 1 the following | sites are defi | ned as Employm | ent Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be primarily reserved | for industry, comprising Classes | B1 Business a | nd B2 General | Industrial uses: | Caxton Hill/Ware |
| Road. | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Ra | ting: | | | |
| Caxton Hill is an older traditional estate | The estate comprises two main a | areas – the no | rthern part con | nprising the mod | ern print works of |
| primarily offering small warehouse units, | Stephen Austin, the extensive pr | emises occupi | ed by Fluorca | rbon and various | smaller industrial |
| with the quality of its stack being relatively | premises in Caxton Road and Ex | tension Road | some of whic | h are vacant and | d most of which are |
| poor. It scores poorly in terms of visibility as | of poor quality. The remainder of | f the estate cor | mprises the He | ertford Industrial | Estate consisting of |
| it is not accessible via the A414 and there | mainly single storey brick wareh | ouse units of p | oor to average | e quality worth ar | ound £4 - £5 ft sq, |
| are some adjacent residential properties | a number of which are vacant. | | | | |
| backing onto the estate causing potential | Access to the whole estate is fro | | | | |
| use conflicts. The estate seems to have | to pass through Hertford. There | are long stand | ing proposals t | to open access f | rom John Tate |
| poor flexibility and some vacant units. It | Road on the adjoining Foxholes | | | | |
| should be considered for release over the | vehicles. While this could encour | | | | |
| planning period provided that a better | new B1 units (as an extension to | , | | - | - |
| quality new site can be allocated for | should not be underestimated. Ir | - | | | |
| employment use. | end of Caxton Hill could be rede | | idential purpo | ses with alternat | ive employment |
| | provision being provided on Mea | id Lane. | | | |
| Assessment: Red | Assessment: Amber | | | | |
| | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: See above | e re. alternative access | | 1 | 1 | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Caxton Hill | |
|--|--|
| Stephen Austin Printers | Fluorcarbon - PTFE & Polymer mnfr/distributors |
| Units ABCD – appear vacant | Wordwide Recovery Systems – vehicle engineers |
| Extension Road | |
| Hertford Offset Printers (Graphic House) | RePlas – plastic injection moulding |
| Woodland Beds/Kitchens (Manufacture) – Unit B | |
| Hertford Industrial Estate | |
| 1/2. FJE Plastic Mouldings | 3. Marble Granite/Studio 3 Kitchens |
| 4. KA Foil Catering Equipment | 5. Dehra ? |
| 6. HDM The Halycon Group - classic goggles & accessories | 7. to let Davies & Co |
| 8.? | 9. Turnlea Ltd ? |
| 10a Budget Tyres | 11. Bottom Line Technologies – document processing systems |
| 12. Hawberry King – valuers & auctioneers | 13 ? |
| 14 ? Plastics | 15,16,17, MG Caravans |
| 18 ? | 19. Sanctuary Housing |
| 20/21 Dicker Mill Coachworks | 22/23 Enterprise Rent-a Car |
| 24/25. Caxton Hill Motors | 26/27 EO services Itd/.Everybody Organic – local food |
| | suppliers |
| 28/29 AM Printers | 30/31 VTS Steel Fabricators |
| 32/33 Jon Pac Food packaging | 34/35 to let |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | e | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Relatively high |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average to poor | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | No |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Some conflict along boundaries |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | No | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes – but limited appeal | Is the estate in a good position? | Potentially yes |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | No | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | Yes |
| Is the market perception positive? | Νο | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Estate: High Cross Oakley Horseboxes, SG11 1AD | | | | |
| Owner: Oakley Horseboxes | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/A | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: OSV7 Employment Areas: In accordate | nce with Policy EDE1, the follow | ving sites are d | efined as employme | nt areas on the |
| proposals map and will be reserved for industry comprising C | asses B1 Business, B2 Genera | I Industrial Use | s, subject to sub-se | ction (II) of this |
| policy, and, where well related to the transport network, B* sto | prage and distribution uses: Oak | ley Horsebox | es, High Cross. | |
| BH1,2,3 Archaeology | - | - | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC 2012 | Comments and Ra | ting: |
| The estate scores well across all categories and has been oc | cupied for a long time by an | As per Halcrow – no change | | |
| important local business (Oakley's). It is recommended that it | is safeguarded for employment | - | _ | |
| use. | | Assessmen | it: Green | |
| Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| | T T T |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Oakley's Horseboxes | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Occupied |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

Part 1. Summary

| Owner: Douglas Rose, Parsonage Farm, Sawbridgew | orth |
|---|---|
| Managing Agent: As above | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: Green Belt GBC1/Archaeology E | 3H1-BH3 |
| Halcrow 2008 Rating: This is an industrial estate of average of average quality. The high occupancy rate and lack of any major conflicts with adjoining land uses makes it fit for purpose as an industrial site. | EHDC 2012 Rating: Estate lies either side of Parsonage Lane and is dominated by vehicle-related uses. Open storage of vehicles/open parking and a number of containers used for storage make the estate unattractive and its buildings are of variable quality. Nevertheless, the Halcrow comments still apply and given its Greer Belt location, it is inappropriate to consider further development/redevelopment. |
| Assessment: Green | |
| | Assessment: Green |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Clarklands Therapeutic and Massage Spa | Orchard Works Garage |
|--|---|
| Woodland Car Sales | Robsons Scientific Technical Glass Products |
| Play Barn | Premier Automotive Service Centre |
| Bowler Energy | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Appears fully occupied |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | no |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | yes | | |

|--|

Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability

| Lotato Appraioar oritoria or markotability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | yes | Is the estate in a good position? | yes |
| Is the estate visible | yes | Is the estate flexible? | no |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | no | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | no |
| Is the market perception positive? | no | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Estate: Italstyle, Cambridge Road, Sawbridgeworth, CM23 2HE | | | |
| Owner: Mavrastar, Construction House, Runwell Road, Wickford | d, Essex | | |
| Managing Agent: as above | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: Green Belt GBC1. Not allocated as a major developed site in the green belt. | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | |
| This is a small estate of average quality. It is well located and | Two sets of buildings, modern two storey units 1-6 and older brick/asbestos | | |
| fully occupied and it is recommended that it is safeguarded for 7-12. – Different quality reflected in type of occupier and price – Unit 8 (older) | | | |
| employment use. | available at £5 ftsq. In flood zone 3 high risk. (evidence of recent flood | | |
| Assessment: Green | threat). One third units vacant. May suffer from better quality property in | | |
| | Harlow and nearby Enterprise Zone. | | |
| Assessment: Green | | | |
| See Appraisal Criteria below | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None but PP refused for resi | dential redevelopment in April 2005 3/05/0351/OP. Recent (March 2013) | | |
| application for flood defence work | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: Action to alleviate flooding | | | |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. CC Hydrosonics – industrial cleaning equipment mnfr/Crest Ultrasonics – | 2. CC Hydrosonics |
|--|------------------------------|
| ultrasonic instrument mnfrs – also | |
| 3. CC Hydrosonics | 4. as unit 1 |
| 5. To let Coke Gearing £5ftsq | 6.to let Coke Gearing £5ftsq |
| 7. PWP Coachworks/7a. Alleycat car rentals | 8.to let Coke Gearing £5ftsq |
| 9. Pheonix Land Rover Services | 10. vacant |
| 11. Site Safe/Scooter Store – mnfr of storage units for mobility scooters | 12. Bodyactive Gym |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpe | ose | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|---------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | average |

| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | yes |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | no |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | yes | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|--|---------|-------------------------------------|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | yes | Is the estate in a good position? | yes |
| Is the estate visible | yes | Is the estate flexible? | yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment | average | Is there any conflict with adjacent | no |
| good? | _ | uses? | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Hayters, Spellbrook, CM23 2EU

Owner: Hayters

Managing Agent: N/A

EH 2007 Local Plan: GBC4 Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and Rural Area. 4.6.6 The following sites within the Green Belt are identified and delineated on the Proposals Map as Major Developed Sites: Hayters plc, Spellbrook

| Halcrow 2008 Rating: The Hayters site in Spellbrook is a major developed | EHDC 2012 Rating: As for Halcrow – Hayters are a major |
|--|--|
| site currently occupied by Hayter Lawnmowers. It scores relatively highly on | local employer but the nature of the premises renders them |
| proximity to an A road and the nature of the properties on the site are suited to | less suited to reuse as smaller units though they could be re- |
| its current use. The site is fit for its current use but if the site was to become | occupied for B8 purposes given proximity to the by- |
| available it would likely not appeal to the current profile of demand in the | pass/A120. |
| district. Therefore the sire should be safeguarded for employment use but its | |
| status should be reviewed if its circumstances change. | Assessment: Green |
| | |
| Assessment: Green | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | |

Opportunities for Enhancement: None

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

Hayters

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | N/A |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |

|--|

Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability

| Estate Applaisal official of marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | No | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | N/A | | |

Unit 3D - The Steam Team - ironing services

Part 1. Summarv Estate: Standon Business Park, Stortford Road, Standon, SG11 1PH **Owner: Connect Scaffolding** Managing Agent: Connect 01279 757113 – contact Toby Cave Managing Partner 07768 547 887 EH 2007 Local Plan: Subject to Policy OSV7 and described as 'area bounded by A120, the River Rib and the dismantled railway' - defined as an employment area and reserved for B1, and B2. 'Any proposed alternative use and/or developmentwill be considered against the employment needs for East Hertfordshire and (will be) expected to be subject to a development brief prepared or approved by the Council' Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: Assessment: Standon Business Park Poor guality estate, both in terms of layout and guality of buildings. This Standon Business Park achieves an average score in terms equates to low rents (£3.50-£4 ftsg), high turnover of tenants, poor of general quality of environment and visibility as it is located maintenance and ongoing management problems. Mix of B1 and B2. Location directly on the A120. In terms of market perception it is not is too far from Stansted for occupiers to benefit from airport economy. Meets deemed to be a prime location in terms of road access needs of occupiers wanting basic low cost accommodation for uses such as compared to the A10 but it has a good occupancy rate car repairs and ironing services. Current vacancy level 25%-30%. indicating it is a small estate that meets local needs. See Appraisal Criteria below. Assessment: Green. Assessment: Amber Outstanding Planning Consents: None **Opportunities for Enhancement:** Owners are considering putting forward a mixed use scheme which could result in the redevelopment of some of the industrial buildings with new units. Would be interested in discussing options with EHDC. It is difficult to see a positive future for this estate as current values do not support redevelopment without subsidy. Adjacent to River Rib so could be flooding issues. **Proposal:** None to date Timeframe Prioritv Partners Costs Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013 Unit 1A – Strikesoft Scaffolding design Unit 3E. 3F. 3G vacant Unit 1B - Regent Office Care - office cleaning Unit 4 – R B Tyler Scaffolding Unit 1C – Novo Construction Unit 5 A – Novo Construction – bldg design/project managers Unit 2A – W3W tyre recycling Unit 5 B,C,D - 119 Events Management - B1 Unit 2B – " Unit 5E – J+B Lift Truck Services – hire/repair/salesB2 Unit 2C – vacant Unit 3A – vacant Unit 3B – Herts and Essex Autos Unit 3C - vacant

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | No | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | 25%-30% |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Poor | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Good access to A120, poor internal circulation |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | No | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | No | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Only for low value uses | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | No | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | |

| Estate: Langley House, Station Road, Standon | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Owner: N/K | | | |
| Managing Agent: None | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: OSV7 Employment Areas: In accordance w | h Policy EDE1 the following sites are de | fined as Employ | ment Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Class | s B1 Business and B2 General Industria | I Uses, subject to | o sub-section (II) of |
| this policy; and, where well related to the transport network, B8 St | rage and Distribution Uses: Area east o | of Station Road, | Standon; |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | |
| Station Road scores reasonably well in terms of quality and | Site now in full use and given Halcrow | comments on qu | uality, location and |
| location but the site appears to be vacant and should be | lack of conflicts, could be reclassified a | s Green The on | ly notential caveat |
| | | ' | |
| considered for redevelopment for employment use given its good | is the nature of building which appears | to be essentially | y a large warehouse |
| considered for redevelopment for employment use given its good flexibility and no major conflicts with adjacent land uses. | | to be essentially | y a large warehouse |
| considered for redevelopment for employment use given its good | is the nature of building which appears | to be essentially | y a large warehouse |
| considered for redevelopment for employment use given its good flexibility and no major conflicts with adjacent land uses. | is the nature of building which appears with a mezzanine floor. PP granted 3/0 B2/B8 Assessment: Green | to be essentially | y a large warehouse |
| considered for redevelopment for employment use given its good flexibility and no major conflicts with adjacent land uses. Assessment: Amber | is the nature of building which appears with a mezzanine floor. PP granted 3/0 B2/B8 | to be essentially | y a large warehouse |
| considered for redevelopment for employment use given its good flexibility and no major conflicts with adjacent land uses. Assessment: Amber Outstanding Planning Consents: None | is the nature of building which appears with a mezzanine floor. PP granted 3/0 B2/B8 Assessment: Green | to be essentially | y a large warehouse |
| considered for redevelopment for employment use given its good flexibility and no major conflicts with adjacent land uses. | is the nature of building which appears with a mezzanine floor. PP granted 3/0 B2/B8 Assessment: Green | to be essentially | y a large warehouse |

Enfield Safety Supplies. – suppliers of protective clothing.

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Occupied |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | | Is the estate flexible? | See comments on flexibility of building |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Estate: The Maltings, Stansted Abbots, SC | G12 8HG | | | | |
| Owner: French and Jupp | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: French and Jupp – Liz Sa | vary 01920 870015 | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: ST4 Employment Are | a: In accordance with Policy El | DE1 The Mill | Stream/Maltir | ngs area off Royo | don Road will be |
| primarily reserved for industry comprising | g B1 Business and B2 General | Industrial Us | es. | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and R | ating: | | | |
| This estate scores well in terms of general quality of its stock which is largely B1 offices. The estate is clearly branded and appears to be well managed. However the estate has a relatively low level of visibility as it does not have direct access to the major road network and is accessed by travelling through Stanstead Abbots. Assessment: Green | Halcrow comments still apply. T programme of improvements as present and as at 30.1.13, only few light industrial - B1(c) but th although larger commercial bus frontage. While lacking the flexil need for small office premises. have no plans for redevelopmen Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria below | a units become 10 of these we ere is no B2/E inesses occup pility of moder Apart from on- | e vacant. Betw ere vacant. Th 38. The majorit by the free-stat n industrial un going improve | veen 150 and 200 he majority are in I ty of tenants are lo nding buildings or its, the estate clea | businesses are B1(a) office use, a ocal businesses of the Roydon Road arly serves a local |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | 1 | I | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Given the | 150-200 current | occupiers and conti | al turnover, individual |
|-----------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| piers | are not recorded | - | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | High demand/low vacancy | | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Good parking, accessibility constrained by location | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|----|
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes – see above | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | For B1(a) yes | | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|
| Estate: Leeside Works, Stanstead Abbots, SG12 8 | DL | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: No allocation | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: This estate has good visibility, accessibility and parking, average quality and image of building stock and no major conflicts with adjoining land uses. Its good occupancy rate indicates strong demand. Assessment: Green | EHDC 2012 Comme Halcrow comments s Assessment: Green See Appraisal Crite | till apply. Full | • | d site layout work | s well. |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: N/A | | | | | |
| Proposal: None | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Front Building: Strata Sports Marketing, New Star Sports Ltd, Elster Energy | |
|---|--|
| ICT (energy management systems) | |
| Unit 1. Thomas Precision Engineers | Unit 2. Home Trend Supplies |
| Unit 3. Lovett & Shim – cleaning materials | Unit 4. Abbot Tool and Die Company – mnfr & design |
| Unit 5. Universal Signs – sign/silk screen printers | Unit 6. Heath Saws |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | No vacancies |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | · | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |

| parking provision | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | | |

| L | Estate Ap | praisal | Criteria | 3: | Marketability |
|---|-----------|---------|----------|----|---------------|
|---|-----------|---------|----------|----|---------------|

| Estate Appraisar officina o. Marketability | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | No |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |
| | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|-----------|----------|
| Estate: Riverside Works, Amwell End, S | anstead Abbots | | | | |
| Owner: Jest and Ruskin | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: Jest and Ruskin | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: No allocation | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: This relatively small estate is of average overall quality but it is fully occupied indicating strong market demand Assessment: Green | EHDC 2012 Comments an Mix of buildings of varying Reasonable location in terr Assessment: Green See Appraisal Criteria be | quality/constructio ns of access to A4 | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| BMG Industries – printers | Jest & Ruskin Properties |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Marshall Double Glazing – Unit 3 | RC Range Vehicles MoTs Unit 5 |
| Harley Engineering – Unit 6 | Tyre Shop Unit 7 |
| ID Sports Sportswear - Unit 8 | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancy | | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | Backs onto residential development | | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|------------|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes – for local | Is the estate in a good position? | Reasonable | | |
| | businesses | | | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | See above | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Low | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Estate: The Spinney, Hoddesdon Road, S | tanstead Abbots | | | | |
| Owner: D Carter, 3 The Spinney | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: No allocation | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: This small estate is of average quality. At the time of the survey, one out of the three units was vacant. Future vacancy rates should be monitored and if they persist, redevelopment should be considered. Assessment: Amber | EHDC 2012 Comments and Ra Majority of the units appear vaca to Kingfisher Environmental. Litt Assessment: Red See Appraisal Criteria below | ant although a | | | • |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: 3/13/006 decision. 3/08/0278/LC – Demolition of comr erection of 2 dwellings – approved. Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | /0437OP (51, | The Spinney |) demolition of exis | sting buildings and |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Kingfisher Environmental Services Unit 3 | ISTEC – defence contractors |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Remaining units appear vacant | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | No | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Appears high vacancy | | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | yes | | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | no | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | no | | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | average | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | no | Is the estate in a good position? | no | | |
| Is the estate visible | no | Is the estate flexible? | no | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | no | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | no | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Estate: Warrenwood Industrial Estate, Stapleford | | | | |
| Owner: EHDC | | | | |
| Managing Agent: EHDC | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: Employment Areas OSV7: In accordance | | | | |
| the proposals map and will be reserved for industry comprising Class | | | | |
| this policy, and, where well related to the transport network, B* storage | ge and distribution uses: | c. Warrenwood | I Industrial Estate, | Stapleford |
| GBC1. Appropriate development within the Green Belt | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC 2012 | Comments and | Rating: |
| Warrenwood Industrial Estate scores highly in terms of visibility | | | alcrow would appe | |
| directly on the A119 running north of Hertford. Its location also | | apply althou | gh the estate has | not been |
| highly in terms of competition as there are no other employmen | • | inspected. | | |
| The site is also relatively isolated from opposing residential use | • | | | |
| conflicts with adjacent land uses. In terms of marketability, it sc | | | | |
| the estate is largely made up of small older workshops and war | | Assessment: Green | | |
| local small occupiers and therefore plays a significant role in me | eeting demand from | | | |
| smaller businesses. | | See Appraisal Criteria below | | |
| Assessment: Green | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |
| Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013 | | | | |
| Estate not inspected for the 2013 review | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | n/a | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | n/a | | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | n/a | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | n/a | | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | n/a | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | n/a | | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | n/a | | | | | |
| parking provision | | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | n/a | Is the estate in a good position? | n/a | | |
| Is the estate visible | n/a | Is the estate flexible? | n/a | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment | n/a | Is there any conflict with adjacent | n/a | | |
| good? | | uses? | | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | n/a | | | | |

Part 1. Summary

Estate: Thundridge Business Park, Thundridge

Owner: Kindale Ltd, 11 Bedford Road, Barton-le-Cley Milton Keynes MK45 4JU

Managing Agent: N/K

EH 2007 Local Plan: OSV7 Employment Areas In accordance with Policy EDE1 the following sites are defined as Employment Areas on the Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Business and B2 General Industrial Uses, subject to sub-section (II) of this policy; and, where well related to the transport network, B8 Storage and Distribution Uses: **Thundridge Business Park;**

| Halc | row 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | | |
|-------|---|--|----------|-------|-----------|----------|--|
| This | small estate scores highly across all | As per Halcrow. Only 1 unit vacant @ January 2013. | | | | | |
| quali | tative criteria and appears to be fit for | Assessment: Green | | | | | |
| purpo | ose as an industrial site | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | | |
| Asse | essment: Green | | | | | | |
| Outs | tanding Planning Consents: | | | | | | |
| Opp | ortunities for Enhancement: None | | | | | | |
| Prop | osal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority | |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Cupaz – office design, furniture and fir out | 2. AB Group Painters/decorators |
|---|---|
| 3 /4 B+S Glass | 5/6 Stephens Automotive vehicle repairs |
| 7. Vacant Paul Wallace £5.00 ftsq. | 8/9 KGK Printers |
| 10. Mode Copiers/Mode solutions | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | High demand | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | | | |

| parking provision | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | | |

Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability

| Lotato Appraioar oritoria oritoria di markotability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Estate: Broadmeads Estate, Ware | | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: WA8 Employment Areas In accordance with the Policy | EDE1 t | he follo | wing sites are | defined as Emp | loyment Areas on |
| the proposals map and will be reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 an | d B2 G | eneral I | ndustrial Uses | : Broadmeads | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | | EHDC | 2012 Comm | ents and Rating | j: |
| This estate is fully occupied with modern buildings of high quality. Some difficu | | | | | |
| are acknowledged with regard to access. However its relative proximity to the centre | | As per Halcrow. Single occupier, good quality | | | |
| of Ware means that it achieves a good score on its proximity to a train station a | | buildings/site | | | |
| facilities, factors perceived highly by some occupiers as they can assist in attra | • | Assessment: Green | | | |
| and retaining staff. Furthermore, the buildings appear capable of being altered | and | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | |
| re-used should their current use become obsolete. | | | | | |
| Assessment: Green | | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partne | ers | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |
| | | | | | |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Farecla – surface finishings – HQ office and distribution | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpose | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Fully occupied | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | | | |
| parking provision | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---------|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Average | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Estate: Ermine Point/Gentleman's Field, Ware | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: OSV7 Employment Areas In accordance with Policy ED | DE1 the followin | g sites are defi | ned as Employme | ent Areas on the |
| Proposals Map and will be reserved for industry comprising Classes B1 Busin | less and B2 Ge | neral Industrial | Uses, subject to | sub-section (II) of |
| this policy; and, where well related to the transport network, B8 Storage and I | Distribution Use | s: Ermine Poir | nt Business Park | , Nr. Ware. |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 C | omments and | Rating: | |
| Ermine Point Business Park and Gentleman's Field consist of standardised | Ermine Point Business Park and Gentleman's Field consist of standardised As for Halcrow. One unit vacant in January 2013. Estate works | | | |
| small scale warehouse/office units. Its position adjacent to the A10 | well enough a | Ithough parking | along the access | s road suggests |
| enhances its visibility and general market perception although it is rather | that provision | is inadequate c | on some units | |
| average in terms of attractiveness. The general quality of the estate is | Assessment: | Green | | |
| generally high and its standardised smaller units are appealing to locally- | See Appraisa | I Criteria belo | W | |
| based small occupiers. It is recommended that it is safeguarded for | | | | |
| employment use. | | | | |
| Assessment: Green | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: None | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| 1. Kituout – embroidery, canvas printing, engraving B1 | 1/2. A-Tech Leisure Group |
|---|---|
| | 3. A-Tech data solutions |
| 4. Digital Monkey printing & Graphics/Flair Graphics | 5. Harringtons Architectural Metal Work |
| 6. Macro Engineering | 7. MC Property/Plumbing Bathroom Showroom). |
| 8. MTEC Warehousing Ltd | 9. MC Property/Plumbing Bathroom Showroom). |
| 10/11/12. Yard and adjoining block – MTEC Freight Co – road haulage | |
| 13 Leary Brothers Bldg Contactor | 14. Hertford Controls electronic components |
| 5-17. Cash Convertors/ELCO | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancy | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes –see comments above | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes – but some | | | | |
| parking provision | parking on | | | | |
| | access road | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | Yes | | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | | |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Estate: Watton Business Centre/Cintel Works, Ware | | | | | |
| Owner: McLagan Investments Ltd. | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: No allocation | | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Co | mments and | Rating | | |
| This estate had no vacant units at the time of the survey | Apart from Ang | els at Play chi | ldren's nurser | y, the site is vaca | nt. See below for |
| indicating strong demand from businesses. It scores well in | details of pp for | ASDA Foods | tore | | |
| terms of accessibility and parking provision although its | | | | | |
| overall quality is mostly average. | Assessment: N | I/A | | | |
| Assessment: Green | een See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: 3/10/0386/FP: New ASD | A foodstore, 13 d | wellings, reter | ntion of childre | en's nursery, reten | tion and |
| refurbishment of kiln building. Approved 26.07.11 | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | | |
| Proposal: None | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| Angels at Play Children's Nursery | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
|-----------------------------------|--|

Part 3– Appraisal Criteria

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | | | |
|--|-----|---------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | N/a | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Totally vacant | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | N/A | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | N/A | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | N/A | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | N/A | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | N/A | | | | |
| parking provision | | | | | |

Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability

| Is the estate marketable? | N/A | Is the estate in a good position? | N/A |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| Is the estate visible | N/A | Is the estate flexible? | N/A |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | N/A | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | N/A |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes | | |

| Estate: GSK Ware | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Owner: GSK | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/A | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: WA8 Employment Areas. In accor | dance with Policy EDE1 the following | sites are defir | ned as Employment / | Areas on the |
| proposals map` and will be reserved for industry compris | sing Classes B1 and B2 General Indu | istry use. IV Pa | ark Road/Harris Lane | e (GSK) |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | - | EHDC 2012 | Comments and Ra | ting |
| The GSK compound in Ware scores highly based on the quality of its environment, visibility | | Halcrow comments still apply. | | |
| The Correcting and in Ware boored highly baced on the | | | millionito otin appry. | |
| and branding. The fact that the site is under single occur | | | ninents still apply. | |
| | pation has no doubt assisted in this. | | ninents still apply. | |
| and branding. The fact that the site is under single occur | bation has no doubt assisted in this. Derty market, unless it is vacated at | | ninenta sui appiy. | |
| and branding. The fact that the site is under single occur The GSK site is unlikely to be available to the wider prop | bation has no doubt assisted in this. Derty market, unless it is vacated at | Assessmer | | |
| and branding. The fact that the site is under single occur The GSK site is unlikely to be available to the wider prop some point in the future. It is a site of strategic importance | bation has no doubt assisted in this. Derty market, unless it is vacated at | Assessmer | | |
| and branding. The fact that the site is under single occur The GSK site is unlikely to be available to the wider prop some point in the future. It is a site of strategic importance employment use. | bation has no doubt assisted in this. Derty market, unless it is vacated at | Assessmer | nt: Green | |
| and branding. The fact that the site is under single occup The GSK site is unlikely to be available to the wider prop some point in the future. It is a site of strategic importance employment use. Assessment: Green | bation has no doubt assisted in this. Derty market, unless it is vacated at | Assessmer | nt: Green | |
| and branding. The fact that the site is under single occup The GSK site is unlikely to be available to the wider prop some point in the future. It is a site of strategic importance employment use. Assessment: Green Outstanding Planning Consents: | bation has no doubt assisted in this. Derty market, unless it is vacated at | Assessmer | nt: Green | Priority |

GSK

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpo | se | | |
|---|------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | N/A |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and parking provision | Yes | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | |
| Is the estate visible | Yes | Is the estate flexible? | No | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Yes | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| Is the market perception positive? | N/A | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Estate: Crane Mead and Crane Mead Business Park | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan : WA7 Crane Mead : I. The Crane Mead site is dereserved for industry comprising class B1. II. The council is anxious to Mead area from Station Road, passing under Viaduct Road, and will usupport the efforts of British Waterways to secure the implementation Navigation in order to facilitate the implementation of the proposed Comparison of the propose | secure the provision of a use appropriate measure of a new road bridge link | a second means s to facilitate this | of vehicular acce . III. The Council | ess to the Crane will continue to |
| WA8 Employment Areas : In accordance with the Policy EDE1, the for and will be reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 and B2 Generation and will be reserved for industry. | | | Areas on the pro | posals map |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 Comment | | | |
| The cluster of estates made up of properties on Marsh Lane and | The area comprises the | • | building Swains | Mill Magog |
| Crane Mead Business Park scores well in terms of sustainability | Industries and a free-s | • | | |
| because of its proximity to the centre of Ware and the train station. | northern side of Crane | | | |
| The fact that the cluster is made up of a range of different quality | a modern development | | | |
| stock, with some partially derelict units found on Marsh Lane | available for £5 ftsq) ar | | | |
| subtracts from the general quality of the environment. There is | 2002, offers good qual | • | | |
| potential for a better quality offering but the areas low level visibility | vacancy rates. The Sw | ains Mill site was | s considered for a | new food |
| and access points means the overall market perception is low. | store which has now be | een approved on | the Cintel Site. | |
| Assessment: Amber | Assessment: Amber | | | |
| | See Appraisal Criteria | a below | | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2 – Occupiers @January 2013

| Crane Mead | Mill Studios |
|--|---|
| Swains Mill accommodates a number of small businesses not | Mill Studios contains a number of mainly B1 occupiers in small office |
| particularly evident from outside the building including B1. B2 and B8 | suites. |
| uses. The main one is Ware Rover on the ground floor fronting the | |
| river. | |
| Magog Industries 10 Crane Mead – Precision Engineers | |
| Crane Mead Business Park | |
| 1. Charriot Office Automation B1 | 2. Timber Connection/Physical Rehab Centre B8/SG |
| 3. The Probate Bureau – B1 | 4-6 Rapier Design Group |
| 7-8 Vacant | 9-10 Beaver Group – digital design B1 |
| 11-12 JPM Products (Education/medical products) B8 | 13. DP Electrics – Electrical Contractors B2 |
| 14. ACO Packaging – bottling machinery B2 | 15. To let |
| 16. Compass Braille – Braille Charity – B1 | 17-20 Ware Heating and Bathroom Supplies B8 |

| Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Average to good | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| | | |
| Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Yes | | |
| | Average to good Yes | Yes2. What is the demand/vacancy rate?Average to good4. Good accessibility/parking?YesIs there conflict with adjacent uses? |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|-----|
| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes |
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | Yes |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | Average to good | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Is the market perception positive? | Yes for Crane | | |
| | Mead Business | | |
| | Park | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Estate: Marsh Lane, Ware | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | |
| EH 2007 Local Plan: EDE1. Employment Areas: WA8 Employment Areas: | In accordance v | vith the Policy | EDE1 the following | ng sites are defined |
| as Employment Areas on the proposals map and will be reserved for industr | y, comprising C | lasses B1 and | d B2 General Indu | strial Uses: 1. Land |
| off Marsh Lane | | | | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments and Rating: | EHDC 2012 | Comments a | nd Rating: | |
| Crane Mead Business Park & Marsh Lane | Marsh Lane | contains a mi | xture of open yard | s, older industrial |
| The cluster of estates made up of properties on Marsh Lane and | | | | e Peerglow Centre. |
| Crane Mead Business Park scores well in terms of sustainability | A further 2.1 | 4 acres is cur | rently on offer fron | n Davies & Co. The |
| because of its proximity to the centre of Ware and the train station. | | | v and comments o | |
| The fact that the cluster is made up of a range of differing quality | credentials, | market percep | otion and visibility i | made by Halcrow |
| stock, with some partly derelict units found on Marsh Lane, | remain relev | ant. Neverthe | less, the area app | ears to perform a |
| subtract from the general quality of environment. There is | useful function | on and has a l | low vacancy rate. | Progressive |
| potential for a better quality offering but the area's low level of | redevelopme | ent for B1 sho | uld be encouraged | ł. |
| visibility and access points means that its overall market | | | | |
| perception is low. Assessment: Amber. | Assessmen | t: Amber | | |
| | See Apprais | sal Criteria be | elow | |
| Outstanding Planning Consents: | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: | | | | |
| Proposal: | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| HCC Marsh Lane Day Centre | Welding Engineers |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Services for young people | |
| Land for sale Davies – Thames water - | Morley Stoves and fireplaces |
| EFF European Flavours and Fragrances | David Head and Sons builders equipment/containers yard |
| PW Windsor/ the Windsor yard | Ware Royal Mail Delivery Office |

| Plumb Centre | Arriva bus depot |
|---|--|
| Smartwax/ Brewers paint supplier | PJ Roofing Contractors |
| Turnford Pipelines | Ware roofing supplies, sleepers, decking |
| Howe Green Steel Fabrications | Hanson Ready Mix plant |
| Pallet Yard | Blakeley Electrics, (Ware works) |
| Leeside Turned Parts | DWW to let |
| Shove turned parts (precision turned parts) | Makevale Ltd, Valley House |
| Spirex metal products | Hertstorage household storage |
| Old Charm Showroom/Wood Bros, Furniture Showroom & Works | Arnell House? |
| Peerglow centre small business units: | Bespoke Performance |
| 1. European Flavours and fragrances, 2, 3, Hall & Kay fire engineering, 4 | Millteck sports |
| Palmer Woods Building Projects, 5 DEP Construction Services 6. Direct | |
| Approach, 7 Web Site design, 8, to let Withers Thomas | |

Part 3– Appraisal Criteria

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | Se la | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | Yes | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | Low vacancy |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | Poor to average | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | Yes |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | Yes | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | No |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | Yes | | |
| parking provision | | | |

Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability

| Is the estate marketable? | Yes | Is the estate in a good position? | Yes | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|
| Is the estate visible | No | Is the estate flexible? | No | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | No | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | No | |
| Is the market perception positive? | No | | | |

| Part 1. Summary | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Estate: Widbury Hill, Ware | | | | | |
| Owner: N/K | | | | | |
| Managing Agent: N/K | | | | | |
| | ployment Areas: In accordance with the Policy I | | | | oyment Areas on |
| the proposals map and will be r | reserved for industry, comprising Classes B1 an | nd B2 General | I Industrial Use | es: Widbury Hill | |
| Halcrow 2008 Comments | EHDC 2012 Comments and Rating: | | | | |
| and Rating: | In 2008 this site comprised a large warehouse | | | | |
| This industrial estate is of | Consent was granted at appeal on 29.9.09 for the redevelopment of the depot and part of the Coachworks for | | | | |
| average overall quality and at | residential purposes together with 1880msq of office (new) and light industrial space (refurbishment of part of | | | | |
| the time | the Coachworks). The residential element has been constructed but not the new offices. The remaining part of | | | | |
| of survey had a number of | the coachworks is occupied for vehicle-related | | | | |
| vacant units. It is | contrary to policy, the Inspector noted that the | | | | |
| recommended that | location of the site and the difficulties of access made it unattractive for warehouse use and it was unsuitable | | | | |
| the quality of the estate is | for conversion into smaller units. He commented that its inclusion as an area of employment land appeared to | | | | |
| improved and if vacancies | reflect its historic use rather than a thorough analysis of its location and viability for development. In those | | | | |
| persist it is considered for | circumstances, he considered that in more buoyant economic times the Coachworks might well become fully | | | | |
| redevelopment. Assessment: | | | | | |
| Amber | | | | | -built offices) |
| Alliger | | | | | |
| together comprise an important resource in this part of Ware and it is recommended that it is retained for employment use. | | | | | |
| Assessment: Amber | | | | | |
| | See Appraisal Criteria below | | | | |
| Outstanding Planning Conse | Outstanding Planning Consents: 3/08/1399/OP – office building yet to be implemented. See above. | | | | |
| Opportunities for Enhancement: None | | | | | |
| Proposal: | | Partners | Costs | Timeframe | Priority |

Part 2. Occupiers @January 2013

| _ | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Part 3– Appraisal Criteria

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 1: Fitness for purpos | se | | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| 1. Is estate fit for its current purpose? | N/A | 2. What is the demand/vacancy rate? | N/A | | |
| 3. What is the quality of the land like? | N/A | 4. Good accessibility/parking? | N/A | | |
| Estate Appraisal Criteria 2: Sustainability | | | | | |
| Is the estate sustainable for its present use? | N/A | Is there conflict with adjacent uses? | N/A | | |
| Does the estate have good accessibility and | N/A | | | | |
| parking provision | | | | | |

| Estate Appraisal Criteria 3: Marketability | | | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|
| Is the estate marketable? | N/A | Is the estate in a good position? | N/A | |
| Is the estate visible | N/A | Is the estate flexible? | N/A | |
| Is the general quality of the environment good? | N/A | Is there any conflict with adjacent uses? | N/A | |
| Is the market perception positive? | N/A | | | |

Shared/economic and cultural development/economic development manager/david hughes/east herts employment land review 2013/no plans Last updated 25.03.13