

Vale of White Horse District Local Plan Part 2: Landscape Capacity Study







APPENDIX 1

Capacity Sifting Sheets March 2017

VOWH Local Plan Part 2 – Summary of Initial Site Assessment

Site Could the site be de		the site be develo	pped?	Summary
	Yes	Yes Part of the No		
		site		
1 – Harwell Campus	Х			The majority of the site could
				be developed without adverse
				impacts on the wider AONB.
				The north-western field is
				more sensitive.
2A – West of Wantage			X	Essential separation between
(north)				Wantage, Grove and East
				Challow
2B – West of Wantage			X	Essential separation between
(south)				Wantage and East Challow
3 – North West of	x			The site will be enclosed by
Grove				development on both sides
				and so would be appropriate
				for future development. The
				site has been given a high
				capacity in previous studies.
4 – East of Grove			X	The site is separate from
				existing settlement and is
				located in an intact part of the
				wider landscape.
5- West of Harwell		х		The part of the site to the
				north of Grove Road (5B)
				could be developed and
				extended. The remainder of
				the site (5A) forms part of the
				setting to the AONB and the
				essential separation between
				Harwell village and Rowstock.
6 - South East of			Х	Essential separation between
Sutton Courtney				Sutton Courtney and Didcot.
				Locally valued landscape.
7A – Rowstock east			Х	The site forms part of the
				setting to the AONB and the
				essential separation between
				Harwell village and Rowstock
7B – Rowstock west			Х	The western part is part of the
				wider open rural landscape
				and setting to the AONB. The
				eastern part is less open but
				inappropriate as isolated
0.4 4.411				development.
8A – Milton Heights -	Х	X		The northern parcel is suitable
east				for development. The
				southern and south-eastern
				fields are more sensitive to

south of The Grove Farm should not be developed, but the existing access could be used to provide a secondary road link. 8B – Milton Heights – west 8B – Milton Heights – west 9A – Appleford East 2			T	T	1
should not be developed, but the existing access could be used to provide a secondary road link. 8B – Milton Heights - west					development. The fields to the
the existing access could be used to provide a secondary road link. 8B – Milton Heights - west 8B – Appleford East Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement. Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site form site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. Scheduled in morthern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. Scheduled in morthern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. Scheduled in morthern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The s					
### Be Milton Heights - west X Northern section is well contained and largely in arable production. Southern area is well established orchards. 9A – Appleford East X Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West X Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon X High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon X Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting.					should not be developed, but
Rothern section is well contained and largely in arable production. Southern area is well established orchards.					the existing access could be
Northern section is well contained and largely in arable production. Southern area is well established orchards.					used to provide a secondary
west Contained and largely in arable production. Southern area is well established orchards. Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. Pa - Appleford West					road link.
arable production. Southern area is well established orchards. 9A – Appleford East x Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. North-eastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Open and rural landscape	8B – Milton Heights -		х		Northern section is well
area is well established orchards. 9A – Appleford East x Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape	west				contained and largely in
9A – Appleford East x Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Open and rural landscape					arable production. Southern
Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. PB - Appleford West					area is well established
site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting.					orchards.
site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting.	9A – Appleford East			х	Scheduled monument within
contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West 10 – North Abingdon x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 11 – South West of Abingdon Abingdon 11B – South of Abingdon 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon 11B – South of X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonell House. 12 – North East of Drayton 13 – West of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting.					site. Setting to village. The site
between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot. X Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon X High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon Abingdon X Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 12 – North East of Drayton 12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Open and rural landscape					
future settlement edge of Didcot. 9B – Appleford West x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape					•
Didcot. 9B – Appleford West x Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South Of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape					1 1
Second					9
relationship to settlement. 10 – North Abingdon x High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape	9B – Appleford West			x	
10 - North Abingdon	32 Appletora West				•
prominent location within the Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon x Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon x Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting.	10 – North Abingdon			x	·
Green Belt 11A – South West of Abingdon Abingdon The south of Abingdon Abingdon The south of Abingdon Abingdon Abingdon The south of Abingdon Abingdon The south of Abingdon Abingdon The site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. The south of Drayton The south of Drayton The site forms the setting to the setting to the setting to the site forms the setting to the site forms the setting to the setting to the site forms the setting to the site forms the setting to the site forms the setting to the setting to the set	10 110111171011180011				
11A – South West of Abingdon X Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon Abingdon X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					
Abingdon Abingdon part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon Abingdon The separation between Abingdon and Drayton. Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape	11 A - South West of				
capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon Abingdon The separation between Abingdon and Drayton. Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape			^		_
important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon Abingdon X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape	Abiliguoli				,
between Abingdon and Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon					
Drayton. 11B – South of Abingdon X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton The South of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					
11B – South of Abingdon X Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					
Abingdon Site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape	11D Couth of				
Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape			^		•
the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 2 North East of Drayton x Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 3 - West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. North- eastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 4 - South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 - South West x Open and rural landscape	Abiliguoti				
Abingdon and Drayton. The site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					
site forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton The properties of Way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. The properties of Drayton Drayton Drayton The properties of Drayton Drayton Drayton Drayton The properties of Drayton Drayt					•
listed building Stonehill House. 12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. North- eastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					
12 – North East of Drayton X Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					
Drayton numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 - West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 - South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 - South West x Open and rural landscape.	10 11 5 1 6				
Higher value than wider landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape				X	•
landscape to east. 13 – West of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape	Drayton				_ ,
13 – West of Drayton x Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape					_
Noise from A34. Northeastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					·
eastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape	13 – West of Drayton	X			
to wider landscape. 14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West X Open and rural landscape					
14 – South of Drayton X Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape					·
Could be contained with new planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape					•
planting. 15 – South West x Open and rural landscape	14 – South of Drayton	Х			
15 – South West x Open and rural landscape					
					·
	15 – South West			Х	
Botley within the Green Belt.	Botley		1	1	I tale to the control of the
Separation between Botley					within the Green Beit.
and Cumnor.					Separation between Botley

x Within the Green Belt, links to Conservation Area, historic field pattern 17 – North of Radley x Open Landscape within the Green Belt. Separation between Radley and Oxford (Kennington) and Radley with Radley College. x Green Belt. Separation area, paddocks and arable field. No well-defined boundary to the south-east 19 – South of Wooton x Green Belt. Northern part of the site has a higher capacity for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within western fields). No	16 Courth of Courses				Mithin the Creen Belt links to
Section Sect	16 – South of Cumnor			X	
x Open Landscape within the Green Belt. Separation between Radley and Oxford (Kennington) and Radley with Radley College. 18 – South of Radley x Green Belt. Separation area, paddocks and arable field. No well-defined boundary to the south-east 19 – South of Wooton x Green Belt. Northern part of the site has a higher capacity for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham – east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					•
Green Belt. Separation between Radley and Oxford (Kennington) and Radley with Radley College. 18 – South of Radley 20 – South of Wooton 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 23 – East of East Hanney 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east 25 – North of Marcham - east 25 – North of Marcham - east 3 × Strong relationship to new development. 3 × Green Belt. Separation area, paddocks and arable field. No well-defined boundary to the south-east from the Unit of the Step Power of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. 3 × Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. 4 × Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 5 × Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape and disconnected from the Village. 5 × The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the Village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings.					·
between Radley and Oxford (Kennington) and Radley with Radley College. 18 – South of Radley 18 – South of Radley 20 – South of Wooton 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 23 – East of East Hanney 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 26 – South of East Hanney 27 – North of East Hanney 28 – South of East Hanney 29 – South of East Hanney 20 – East of East Hanney 20 – East of East Hanney 21 – South of East Hanney 22 – South of East Hanney 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 25 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 25 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 26 – North of East Hanney 27 – North of East Hanney 28 – North of East Hanney 28 – North of East Hanney 29 – North of East Hanney 29 – North of East Hanney 20 – North of East Hanney 21 – North of East Hanney 22 – North of East Hanney 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – North of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 26 – North of East Hanney 27 – North of East Hanney 28 – North of East Hanney 28 – North of East Hanney 29 – North of East Hanney 29 – North of	17 – North of Radley			х	Open Landscape within the
(Kennington) and Radley with Radley College.					Green Belt. Separation
(Kennington) and Radley with Radley College.					
Radley College. 18 – South of Radley 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 22 – Dalton Barracks 4					·
X Green Belt, recreation area, paddocks and arable field. No well-defined boundary to the south-east					
paddocks and arable field. No well-defined boundary to the south-east 19 – South of Wooton x Green Belt. Northern part of the site has a higher capacity for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x Aparts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X X X X X X X X X X X X X	10 Courth of Dodlov				
well-defined boundary to the south-east 19 – South of Wooton x Green Belt. Northern part of the site has a higher capacity for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within	18 – South of Radiey			X	,
South of Wooton X Green Belt. Northern part of the site has a higher capacity for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement.					·
X					·
the site has a higher capacity for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 22 – Dalton Barracks 23 – East of East Hanney 23 – East of East Hanney 23 – East of East Hanney 23 – South of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east 25 – North of Mooton 3					south-east
for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 22 – Dalton Barracks 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east 3 – Strong relationship to new development to west (within)	19 – South of Wooton		х		Green Belt. Northern part of
for development than the southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 22 – Dalton Barracks 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east 3 – Strong relationship to new development to west (within)					the site has a higher capacity
southern area due to it's relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks x x x Deen part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – South of East Hanney 26 – South of East Hanney 27 – South of East Hanney 28 – South of East Hanney 29 – South of East Hanney 29 – South of East Hanney 20 – South of East Hanney 20 – South of East Hanney 30 – South of East Hanney 31 – South of East Hanney 32 – South of East Hanney 33 – South of East Hanney 44 – South of East Hanney 55 – South of East Hanney 56 – South of East Hanney 57 – South of East Hanney 58 – South of East Hanney 59 – South of East Hanney 50 – South of East Hanney 51 – South of East Hanney 52 – South of East Hanney 53 – South of East Hanney 54 – South of East Hanney 55 – South of East Hanney 56 – South of East Hanney 57 – South of East Hanney 58 – South of East Hanney 59 – South of East Hanney 50 – South of East Hanney 60 – South of East Hanney 61 – South of East Hanney 61 – South of East Hanney 62 – South of East Hanney 63 – Sou					
relationship with existing settlement. 20 – East of Wooton x Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. 21 – North of Wooton x Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					·
Settlement. 20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 22 – Dalton Barracks x x x x Deen part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development. x Deen part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Kanney 25 – North of Marcham - east X X X X X X X X X X X X X					
20 – East of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 22 – Dalton Barracks 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east 25 – North of Marcham - east X Open part of the Green Belt No landscape capacity for development. X Open part of the Green Belt No landscape and the Green Belt and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					
No landscape capacity for development. 21 – North of Wooton x Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east x Strong relationship to new development to west (within					
Deep part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings.	20 – East of Wooton			Х	· · · · ·
21 – North of Wooton 21 – North of Wooton 22 – Dalton Barracks 22 – Dalton Barracks x x X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					
separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					development.
separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					
separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within	21 – North of Wooton			х	Open part of the Green Belt
Henwood. Setting to listed buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks X X Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					
buildings. 22 – Dalton Barracks x x Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					-
22 – Dalton Barracks x x x x Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village x The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of Marcham - east X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					
developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east developed, could be removed from the main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. Strong relationship to new development to west (within	22 - Dalton Parracks	V	V		
from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. Strong relationship to new development to west (within	22 - Daiton Barracks	*			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney Industry Industr					• •
area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. Strong relationship to new development to west (within					
greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. Strong relationship to new development to west (within					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
landscape sensitivity to further development. 23 – East of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					area should be assessed in
The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east 27 – East of East Hanney 28 – East of East Hanney 29 – South of East Hanney 20 – South of East Hanney 20 – South of East Hanney 21 – South of East Hanney 22 – South of East Hanney 23 – East of East Sopen to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25 – North of Strong relationship to new development to west (within)					greater detail to test
The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village 24 – South of East Hanney 25 – North of Marcham - east 27 – East of East Hanney 28 – East of East Hanney 29 – South of East Hanney 20 – South of East Hanney 20 – South of East Hanney 21 – South of East Hanney 22 – South of East Hanney 23 – East of East Sopen to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25 – North of Strong relationship to new development to west (within)					landscape sensitivity to
23 – East of East Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					-
Hanney 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within	23 – Fast of Fast			x	
from the village 24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within				^	·
24 – South of East Hanney X The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within	Hanney				
Hanney Induscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of X X Strong relationship to new development to west (within	24 6 11 65 1				
from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of x x x Strong relationship to new development to west (within				X	· '
orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of x x x Strong relationship to new development to west (within	Hanney				·
is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of x x X Strong relationship to new development to west (within					_
Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of x x x Strong relationship to new development to west (within					orchard is more contained but
Conservation Area and listed buildings. 25A – North of x x x Strong relationship to new development to west (within					is adjacent to the
buildings. 25A – North of x x x Strong relationship to new development to west (within					Conservation Area and listed
25A – North of x x Strong relationship to new development to west (within					buildings.
Marcham - east development to west (within	25A – North of	Y	Y		
		^	^		
western neids). No	Iviai chani - Cast				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
J. J 1012					· I
development within ancient					·
woodland. Development of					-
the whole site would require					the whole site would require
					extensive mitigation to the
					extensive mitigation to the

				eastern and southern
				boundaries.
25B – North of				
Marcham -west			Х	Parkland landscape. Setting to
Marcham -west				Denman College and
2C North of				Conservation Area. The land north of the site is
26 – North of	X			
Steventon				key to the separation between
				Steventon and Drayton.
				Potential for development
				south of the transmission line
07 5 . 6.00				easement.
27 – East of Kingston	Х			Part of the setting to the
Bagpuize				Conservation Area and forms
				the eastern approach to the
				village. Open views to the
				road would need addressing.
28 – South of Kingston		x		Parts of the site would be
Bagpuize				suitable for development. The
				site forms part of the setting
				for a number of listed
				buildings to the east. The
				south-eastern fields are open
				to the wider landscape.
				Development may cause
				feature loss in some areas.
29 – West of Kingston		x		Site extends west beyond
Bagpuize				settlement and is poorly
				related to existing settlement.
				Northern part of site is well
				contained. Southern part is
				currently open to the wider
				landscape, new planting along
				the boundaries, so this is likely
				to change in the long term.
30 - Fyfield			х	Key landscape considerations
				include: retention of
				nucleated settlement pattern,
				setting to Conservation Areas
				and retention of existing
				features. Separation between
				Kingston Bagpuize and Fyfield,
				across bypass a constraint to
				development.
				development.

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 1 Harwell campus		
•	05/12/2016	2505 - 2565
	11am	
	Sunny	

Plan Reference

Мар А			

LANDFORM

Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau		Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
Plain		Undulating	х	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
Steep	х	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
Upland		Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
Lowland		Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
Other:					

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

√	Arable	✓	Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture	✓	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
✓	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common		Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation		Avenues		Open water
	Other:						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small	Large	Linear	Irregular
	Medium	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:			

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows	Banks	>>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
✓	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	✓	Fence – urban	✓	Open
	Other:					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River		Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream		Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	✓	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:				

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
V	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	dge Scattered Church / chapel			Mineral workings – current			
	Village	Isolated	Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused			
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications		Military			
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts		Airfield			
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins		Industrial			
✓	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	✓	Commercial			
	Linear Manor/parkland Earthworks - historic				Golf course			
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern					
√	Other: Part of Harwell Oxford Campus - Science and research facility							

VIEWS

The majority of the site is well contained, with only glimpsed and partial views from roads and public rights of way immediately adjacent to the site. Views are generally of boundary trees and hedgerows with glimpses of the existing buildings within the site beyond.

The exception is the arable field to the north-west of the site, which is clearly visible from the Icknield Way, to the immediate north. There are open views of this part of the site from a small section of the A4185 Newbury Road, from higher ground to the north-east and from the footpath Winaway, to the north-east of the site. From these viewpoints, views are of an arable field surrounded by tree belts on three sides.

There are partial views of the fields in pasture to the north-east of the site from the Icknield Way. These views are broken up by chain link fencing and lines of trees.

The site is contained to the west by a strong tree belt and another tree belt blocks the majority of views into the site from the North. Trees lining the A4185 to the east filter views into the site from the stretch of road to the east of the site.

PERCEPTION

FLICEFION					
VIEWS	Distant From north-western field	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful To north-west	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	•	CONDITION				
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor		
Woodland copse	Small copses within the site		✓				
Tree belt	To the north, east and west	✓					
Individual trees	To the south-west and east		✓				
Hedgerows	Occasional		✓				
Native scrub	Colonising unmanaged areas to south-west			√			
Arable field	To north-west		✓				
Fields in Pasture	To north-east			✓			
Existing buildings	At centre			✓ Unnatractive industrial buildings			

	Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
ļ	Comments:	raiold Ma			
	Security fencing and unused, unattractive commercial buildings. Sewage works adjacent to the lck	meia wa	У		
ļ					

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding		Good	✓	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character are	ea	North-western field and tre areas of open space	eed	Rest of the site		Degraded site	
Intact						Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features						Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes x No						
Green Belt						
Yes		No	x			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

		Qua	antity	
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	х			
Listed buildings	х			
Scheduled monuments	х			
Registered Park and Gardens	х			

|--|

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	IO THE ONE WITHIN AT ECOD BONE						
		Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

I OBEIO AGGEGG				
Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site				
	X		X					
What type of right of way? A bridle way, and a restricted bridle way. The Icknield Way								

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	X Campus buildings	X Existing housing	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			Х

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	To north-west	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	x	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	x	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
			x

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			ı

No x

	VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 – HDA INITIAL CAF	PACITY REV	/IEW - FIELD
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settle	ements?	Yes	
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No
Site number(s):		·
Comments:		

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS
Site number(s):
Comments:

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	
	WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

	Site number(s):
	Comments:
ı	

2008	1 4 4 1	Dec	A DE	CTI	IDV
ZULIX	ΙΔΝ	1150.	$\Delta P =$	211	11) Y

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
		i l	ı

IF YES

Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	ı	No
Comments (if no):			

2014 CAPACITY STUDY

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Adjacent to the study area	Yes	X	No	

IF YES

Is the boundary the same? Different part of the campus but adjacent to site	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	nas been given? Medium / Low			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	X	No	

Comments:

The site assessed within the 2014 study is to the north-west of the site. It has the same character as the north-western field, but has stronger links to the wider landscape than the site does. The remainder of this site is more contained and has much stronger links with the Campus.

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	X
			1

Comments:

Parts of this site have a higher capacity for development than previously assessed. As they are already within the developed area of the campus, they would have much lower potential impacts on the character and appearance of the AONB than the 2014 study site. The north-western field would have similar judgements to the study, however the effects of development in this location would be easier to mitigate.

SUMMARY
The majority of the site could be developed without adverse impacts on the wider AONB. The north-western field is more sensitive, may be acceptable as open space.
NOTES
Any on site contamination that would constrain development?

23/09/2016 SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 2A		
West of Wantage (North)	23/09/2016	1823 - 1841
	4pm	
	Sunny	
	_	

lan Reference		
Іар В		

LANDFORM

Flat	Strongly rolling	X	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
Plain	Undulating	x	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
Steep	Gently undulating	x	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	titboot Lit tiok an that app	.,. •	oodolollai	_ 1100110	Ochopicacac		
✓ ✓	Arable	Pa	rkland		Broadleaved woodland	✓ ✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Но	rticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Pa	ddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Se	t-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Co	mmon		Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Gre	een		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Re	creation		Avenues		Open water
	Other:						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	√	Large	Linear	✓	Irregular
Medium		Geometric	Sinuous		Regular
Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows		Banks	>>	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	✓	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
✓	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Motorway	✓	Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Town edge	Scattered Church / chapel			Mineral workings – current	
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused	
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications		Military	
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts		Airfield	
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	✓	Industrial	
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	✓	Commercial	
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic		Golf course	
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern			
	Other:					

VIEWS

The site is well contained from settlement with no existing views into the site from Wantage or Grove. The new housing to the north-east of East Challow has open views into the western part of the site. There are also open views from the western edge of the Crown factory to the west of the site and glimpsed and partial views from Grove business park to the north.

Tree belts screen views from the road to the north of the site, although there are long views through the gap in the tree belt, just before the business park.

There are open views of the site from Woodhill Lane, which forms the western boundary to the site. These views are of large open fields, contained by tree belts. From the higher ground to the north, the views extend across the valley to the higher ground in the south.

A permissive route runs through the centre of the site, along Woodhill Brook and footpaths run along the southern and western boundaries. The path to the south and the permissive route within the site are enclosed by vegetation and tree belts, with the site only visible through gaps in the vegetation. The footpaths to the west of the site have open views of the site.

There are views of the higher ground to the north of the site from the bridleway to the west of East Challow, and from the B4507 Ickleton Road, which defines the northern edge of the North Wessex Downs AONB. The site is visible in views from the high ground within the AONB, including stretches of the Ridgeway National trail. These are distant views of the site (particularly the northern part) seen as part of a wide panorama. Within some of these views there are likely to be cumulative impacts with the Grove Airfield development, which would cause the visual coalescence of Wantage and Grove.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY		CONDITION							
PEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor					
Ancient woodland	A small area to the north of the site		✓							
Tree belt	Frequently occur along field boundaries		✓							
Hedgerows	Along some boundaries			Some outgrown with bramble						
Hedgerow trees	Occasional		✓							
Arable fields			✓							

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
The factory visible to the north-east of the site, detracts from the otherwise rural character of the site	e.			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding		Good	✓	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	ea	Intact Good condition Occasional detractor.			Degraded site	
Intact		Cocacional dell'actor.			Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features					Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?								
Yes		No	x					
Green	Green Belt							
Yes		No	х					

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

112111111111111111111111111111111111111		Quantity							
	None	1	>1	>5					
Conservation Area	х								
Listed buildings	х								
Scheduled monuments	х								
Registered Park and Gardens	х								

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	
SSSI	
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	X to the north-west

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site		
Flood Zone 3		х				
Flood Zone 2		х				

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
Х			Х	
What type of right of w	ay? Public footpaths and	a permissive footpath.	·	•

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		x nearest part of proposals is SuDS	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Partially	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	X	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
X			
Would join Wantage, Grove and East Challow			

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
East Challow, glimpses of Grove Airfield				

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL CA	PACITY RE	VIEW - FIELD SUI	SVE	/ FORN
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	V		<u> </u>	
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes		lo	X
Site number(s):			•	
Comments:				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x N	lo	
Site number(s):	II.	l l		
Comments:				
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	N	lo	
Site number(s): 2A (this site) and 2B (West of Wantage – south)			<u> </u>	
Comments:				
The development of both sites would have cumulative impacts on the perceived separation betwe and Grove. Such a development has the potential to merge the three settlements.	en Wanta	age, East Cha	allov	N
and Grove. Such a development has the potential to merge the three settlements.				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Comments:				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS				
Site number(s):				
Comments:				

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	х	No	
		<u> </u>		
IF YES				
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes		No	х
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	x	No	
What character area is the site in?	The ed	ges of	Crown H	
	(1) and		Side (3)	
What capacity has been given?	Low			
	1			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
Comments (if no):		<u> </u>		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		No	х
IF YES Is the boundary the same?	Yes		No	
What capacity has been given?			_	
what capacity has been given?				
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes		No	
Comments:				
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
	163		NO	
Comments:				

SUMMARY
Essential separation between Wantage, Grove and East Challow.
NOTES

23/09/2016 SURVEY REF

Location Site 2B	Date / time / weather	Photographs
West of Wantage (South)	23/09/2016 4.30pm Sunny	1842 - 1854

Plan Reference		
Мар В		

LANDFORM

Flat	Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
Plain	Undulating	х	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
Other:		-		

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	THE COLUMN THE CAP	· · <i>y</i> ·		0006.0000		
✓	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
√	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:					

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small		Large	Linear	Irregular
~	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓	Hedgerows	, ,	Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches	< <	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line	✓	Fence – urban	Open
	Other:					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	✓	Canal	Res	ervoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream		Lake	Dry	valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch		Pond	Win	terbourne	Salt march
	Other:					

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
~	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

The site is visible from both the eastern edge of East Challow and the Western edge of Wantage, with both settlements visible from the footpath that runs through the site.

Tree belts and bunding screens views from the road to the south of the site, although there are long views available through gaps in the vegetation opposite the college. Site 2A is visible within these views.

There are open views of the site from the footpath running through the centre of the site. Views are of medium sized fields to the north and small fields in pasture to the south, bound by hedgerows.

The footpath to the north of the site is enclosed by trees and vegetation, with the disused canal located between the path and the site. The site is only visible through gaps in the vegetation.

PERCEPTION

FLICEFIION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic On southern edge	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	CHANTITY	,	CON	IDITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Tree belt	Along northern boundary		√		
Hedgerows	Typical boundary feature				Gappy and some outgrown with bramble
Hedgerow trees	Occasional		✓		
Arable fields			✓		
Fields in pasture				√	
Ponds			✓		
Fencing	Post and wire fencing to all internal boundaries			√	

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments:	1			1
Some storage of agricultural equipment / tipping in the north-western corner				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character are Intact Rare elements / features		Characteristic he features are in de		Degraded site Frequent detractors Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?					
Yes		No	x		
Green Belt					
Yes		No	х		

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5		
Conservation Area	х					
Listed buildings		х				
Scheduled monuments	х					
Registered Park and Gardens	х					

|--|

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	IS THE SITE WITHIN AT LOOP LONE							
		Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site				
Flood Zone 3	х							
Flood Zone 2	х							

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site			
Х			Х				
What type of right of way? Public footpaths.							

DEL	ATIONICHID	TO EXISTIN	IC CETTI	CMCNIT
REL	AHONSHIP	IO EXISTIN	IG SELIL	EWENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

1122/110/10/11 10 11/2/11200/11 2				
Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	X	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Partially	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	х	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
X			
Would join Wantage and East Challow			

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:	•			
East Challow.				

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL CA	APACITY RE	VIEW - FIEI	LD SURVE	y fori
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes		No	X
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 2A (West of Wantage - north) and 2B (this site)		<u> </u>		
Comments:				
The development of both sites would have cumulative impacts on the perceived separation between and Grove. Such a development has the potential to merge the three settlements.	en Wanta	age, Eas	t Challo	W
and Grove. Such a development has the potential to merge the three settlements.				
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Comments:				

Site number(s):			
Comments:			

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	x	No	
IF YES				
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes		No	X
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	x	No	
What character area is the site in?	Part of	Stockh	am Park	(5)
What capacity has been given?	Low			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	х	No	
		^		
Comments (if no):				
2011 CARACITY OTHER				
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		No	х
10 110 010 1111111 010 01 1110 01 1110 0111111				
IF YES				
Is the boundary the same?	Yes		No	
What capacity has been given?				
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes		No	
Comments:				
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY
Essential separation between Wantage and East Challow.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location Site 3	Date / time / weather	Photographs
North West of Grove	23/09/16 2pm Sunny	1-36 Office Camera

Plan Reference

LANDFORM

✓	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
✓	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
√√	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation	Carr
✓	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland	Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards	Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues	Open water
	Other:			•

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	√√	Large	Linear	Irregular
Medium	√√	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

√ √	Hedgerows	Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway	✓✓	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes	National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track	Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓ ✓	Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge		Scattered		Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	✓	Isolated	✓	Graveyard / Cemetery	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet		Historic		Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular		Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings		Modern		Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated		Urban		Moats	Commercial
	Linear		Manor/parkland		Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings		Earthworks - modern	
	Other:				·	

VIEWS

There are open and partial views into the site from Denchworth Road through frequent gaps in the hedgerow lining the road to the south. Views are of large, open, fields in pasture with the escarpment of the North Wessex Downs AONB forming the skyline to the view.

The north-western edge of Grove is clearly visible from the site and there are open views of the site from these properties.

There are no views of the site from the railway to the north and views of the site from public rights of way are limited.

The land to the north-east and south of the site is allocated for housing development. The character and visibility of the site will change considerably once this development is in place.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent (Along the road)	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured (rough pasture)	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote (along track)	Vacant	Peaceful	Active (along the road)	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY		CONDITION							
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor					
Tree belt	Along the trainline			✓ inconsistent						
Hedgerows	Along the track to the west of the site.		✓ occasional gaps							
Hedgerows	Along the northern boundary and internal boundaries				√ In decline					
Fields in pasture	Majority of site		✓							

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments: Pylons Noise from the road Occasional noise from the railway				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character are Intact Rare elements / features	ea	Key hedgerow for decline A number of det		Degraded site Frequent detractors Features in decline	1

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?							
Yes		No	x				
Green	Belt						
Yes		No	x				

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE								
		Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5				
Conservation Area	х							
Listed buildings	х							
Scheduled monuments	х							
Registered Park and Gardens	х							

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	THE GITE WITHIN AT LOOP LONE							
		Quantity						
	None	Whole site						
Flood Zone 3	х							
Flood Zone 2	х							

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	No	X
			1

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
What type of right of v	vay?			

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
X			

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	X	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	Х
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	X Soon to be contained by housing	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
			х

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:		1	<u> </u>	.1
Distant views of the factories to the north of Wantage. Grove Airfield and Monks farm allocations	are clearly	y visible) .	
Ç	•			

	A.D.A. O.ITT. / T.	FIELD	
VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL C.	APACITY REVIEW -	· FIELD SURVE	Y FOR
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	Х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes x	No	
Site number(s): Site 4 East of Grove			
Comments:			
Grove is due to experience major growth. The development of this site would not cause significan	nt adverse effer	cts, howeve	er the
development of both sides would.			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS			
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF CITES WOOLD HAVE THE EGWEST FOR EXTINE MIN ACTO			
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	х	No	
				<u> </u>
IF YES				
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	х	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	х	No	
What character area is the site in?	Denchworth Road and Denchworth Field			<u> </u>
What capacity has been given?	High			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	х	No	
Comments (if no):		I		1
L				
2014 CAPACITY STUDY		ı		1
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	
IF YES				
Is the boundary the same?	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	High	ı		
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes		No	x
Comments:				ł
		1		1
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY
The site will be enclosed by development on both sides and so would be appropriate for future development. The site has been given a high capacity in previous studies.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 4		
East of Grove	23.09.2016	37-162
	3pm	Office camera
	Sunny	

Plan Reference

Мар В

LANDFORM

х	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland			
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography			
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made			
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble			
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand			
х	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff			
	Other: Very gradual slope down to the North.						

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

√√	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws			
✓	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland			
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr			
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice			
	Meadow	Common	Orchards		Scrub			
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh			
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues		Open water			
√√	Other: Semi mature tree planting (poplar) and Solar Farm							

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	√√	Large	Linear	✓	Irregular
Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous		Regular
Other:		·			

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
√ √	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
✓	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge		Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
√ √	Village	✓	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet		Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings		Modern	Ruins	Industrial
✓	Nucleated		Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear		Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
✓	Other: Solar farm				

VIEWS

The site is large and open, with views from a number of visual receptors. There are open views from the properties within the site, including the listed building Tulwick Farm. There are also open views from the public rights of way that run through the site and from the footpath on Crab Hill, to the south. Views consist of open arable or pasture fields, contained by hedgerows and tree belts

Open views are also experienced from local road Grove Park Drive, which runs through the site. Open and partial views can be seen from the A338 Station Road, to the west of the site.

Views into the site from Grove are filtered by trees and vegetation on the edge of the village and by the semi-mature trees on the south-western edge of the site.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant (from South)	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active Adjacent to the A338	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	CHANTITY	,	COND	ITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Plantation woodland	Semi mature poplar trees to the west		Good condition for age		
Tree belt	To the North of the site.		✓		
Small copses	Within northern fields		✓		
Hedgerows	Many field boundaries		✓		
Arable fields	To the north of the site		✓		
Fields in pasture	To the south of the site		✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
Overhead cables.				
Noise from the main road				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average		Poor	
Typical of the character are	Features in Go Intact and varie Very few detra	ed landscape			Degraded site Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline		

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?					
Yes		No	x		
Green Belt					
Yes		No	х		

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5		
Conservation Area	х					
Listed buildings		х				
Scheduled monuments	х					
Registered Park and Gardens	х					

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS TH	IAT COLLI D BE VEEECTED	BY DEVEL ODMENT WITH	IN THE SITE
WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS IN	IA I GUULU DE AFFEGTEU	DI DEVELUPINIENI WII I	IIN 1 HE 211 E

MEDEN E DECICION MONO	THE COOLD BE AN I LOTED BY DEVELOR MENT WITHIN THE ONE
SAC	
SSSI	
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	Quantity				
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site	
Flood Zone 3	х				
Flood Zone 2		х			

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
Х			х	
What type of right of wa	y? Public footpath, bridlew	ay and byway open to all t	raffic.	

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		Х	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Yes	X	No	
Yes		No	х
Voc		No	x
162		NO	^
		Yes	Yes No

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		х	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				

The housing allocation at Crab Hill in Wantage would be visible from parts of the site at completion. Isolated dwellings to the east are also visible.

VOMELLO CAL DI ANI DADTO L'IDA INITIALIO	2 A D A OITV DEV ((E) A		
VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL C	CAPACITY REVIEW	- FIELD SURVE	Y FOR
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes x	No	
Site number(s): Site 3 North West of Grove			
Comments:			
Grove is due to experience major growth. The development of both sites would cause significan	t adverse effec	ts. This site	
should not be developed			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s): Site 3 North West of Grove			
Comments:			
The development of both sites would cause significant adverse effects. This site should not be of	developed		
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS			
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s):			
Comments:			

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?		·	
What capacity has been given?	1	-	
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	<u> </u>		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
, .			
IF YES		 	Ī
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
L			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
	162	INU	
Comments:			

SUMMARY						
The site is separate from existing settlement and is located in an intact part of the wider landscape.						
NOTES						

SURVEY REF

Location Site 5 West of Harwell	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Village	26/09/2016 and 07/12/2016	1953 – 1982
	12.30	2566 – 2660
	Overcast	•

Plan Reference

Мар А			

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	x	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	x	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	TIPE TO TELL TO THE COLUMN TO	<i>j</i> .			00110610410	
	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
√	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation	Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland	Coppice
	Meadow		Common		Orchards	Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh
	Heath	✓	Recreation	✓	Avenues	Open water
✓	Other: Tree line					·

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small	Large	Linear	Irregular			
✓	Medium	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular			
	Other:						

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓ Conspicuous

•	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
V	Other: Trees on bund				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway	✓	Sunken lanes	National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads		Track	Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓ ✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

The south-eastern part of the site is part of the recreation ground and is accessible to the public, with a perimeter route for dog walkers. The field to the west (part of which is within site 7A (Rowstock east) is clearly visible from the recreation ground, through the line of trees and fence that form the boundary. There are open views of the field to the north of the recreation ground and glimpses of the field beyond, which lies to the south of Grove Road. There are no views of the field to the north of Grove Road from this location.

The southern boundary of the site consists of a gappy hedgerow and there are frequent views into the site from the A417 Reading Road, to the immediate south. There are clear views of part of the site from the higher ground on the A4185 and Winaway, to the south of the site within the AONB. Views are of fields in pasture, with a backdrop of trees, which appear as woodland. The recreation ground is also visible, however the southern-most edge of the site is partly screened by vegetation lining the road. The northern field is not visible from these viewpoint locations.

There are open views of the northern part of the site from the footpath running through it and from the footpath to the immediate east, however the views from the east are likely to change as the land to the immediate east of this part of the site has planning permission for housing. The views from the eastern footpath will be obscured by the new housing. The existing views of the site from housing within The Croft, to the east, will also be obscured by the new development.

The southern part of the site is visible from properties on Orchard Way (identified within a reverse view). There are no other open views of the site from properties within Harwell, however there are views of the south-western part of the site from Rowstock, to the west.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active Within the rec	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	CHANTITY			DITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Tree belt	Around northern field		✓		
Lines of Poplar	At field boundaries		✓		
Avenue trees	Within recreation ground		✓		
Hedgerows	Occasional			✓	
Recreation Ground	South-east part of site	✓			
Fields in pasture	Majority of site		✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	✓	No	
Comments:				
Pylons running through central field. Minor detractor.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	Generally intact Few detractors Part of the setting to AONB) the		Degraded site Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	Setting			
Green Belt						
Yes		No	x			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AS	HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE							
		Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5				
Conservation Area	х							
Listed buildings	х							
Scheduled monuments	х							
Registered Park and Gardens	х							

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

10 THE OHE WITHIN AT EGOD EGNE								
		Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site				
Flood Zone 3	х							
Flood Zone 2	х							

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	Х	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
	х			Х
What type of right of wa	ay? Public footpath.			

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		х	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	X		

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	To the south	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	To the north	No	
-				
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Only the	No	
character?		northern part		

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
Rowstock is visible from the southern part of the site				

Yes x

No

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Site number(s): 7A Rowstock east and 8A Milton Heights east				
Comments:				
Development of all sites in their entirety would cause Harwell village and Rowstock to merge and	would hav	ve adve	erse impa	acts
on the setting of the AONB. Development of site 8A in conjunction with this site would erode the s			•	
Heights and Harwell village.	•			

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	Х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	X	No	1
Site number(s): 8A Milton Heights - east, 8B Milton Heights - west, 5 West of Harwell Village and	7B Row	stock -	west	

Comments:

Only parts of a combination of sites could be developed. The development of all sites to their full extent would cause significant adverse impacts.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Development of all sites (8A, 8B, 5, 7A and 7B)

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?

Comments:

Development of both 5 and 7A would cause Harwell and Rowstock to merge. If The entirety of 8A and 8B were developed in addition, Milton Heights would also merge with Harwell and Rowstock.

Development of the southern part of 5, 7A and 7B would also have adverse impacts on the setting to the AONB

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Part of this site with parts of 8A Milton Heights east and 8B Milton Heights west

Comments:

The northern part of this site, combined with the northern parts of 8A and 8B. Parts of all three areas could be developed in combination.

2008	1 4 4 1	Dec	A DE	CTI	IDV
ZULIX	ΙΔΝ	1150.	$\Delta P =$	211	11) Y

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		No	Х
	i	1		l

IF YES

Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			<u> </u>
What capacity has been given?			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	I		

2014 CAPACITY STUDY

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	

IF YES

Is the boundary the same? Very similar	Yes		No	X
What capacity has been given?	Medium			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
			1	

Comments:

The fields to the south of Grove Road are visible from publicly accessible viewpoints within the AONB and contribute to the setting of the AONB.

The area to the north relates well to the proposed development and is contained from the wider landscape.

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	X
			ı

Comments:

The site to the north of Grove Road now has a higher capacity for development than the area previously identified within the recreation ground, which is a popular and well used facility in good condition. Agree that the land to the west should not be developed.

SUMMARY

The part of the site to the north of Grove Road could be developed and extended. The remainder of the site forms	
part of the setting to the AONB and the essential separation between Harwell village and Rowstock.	

NOTES

Rows of mature Lombardy poplar on site – characteristic feature, so should be retained, however development would need to be sited ~20m from tree line.

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 6 South East of Sutton		
Courtney	15/09/2016	1646 - 1672
	11.45	
	Clear and sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар С			

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling	X	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			·	

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards	✓	Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:				

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small		Large	Linear	Irregular
✓	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

·	Hedgerows	Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
٧	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	✓	Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

		transcrupery:	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	00::06::00::0	
		River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
		Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
	✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
ĺ		Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	Rural lanes	✓ ✓ ✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway	Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	Track		Wide verges	✓	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads	Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	✓	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications		Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts		Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	✓	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats		Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic		Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern		
	Other: Landfill			•	

VIEWS

The site is reasonably well contained. Views are from footpaths associated with the site and from the adjacent dwellings to the east. There are open views from the footpaths that run through the site and within the southern boundary. Intermittent views are possible from the footpaths to the north and east, through gaps in the boundary vegetation.

Visibility from the adjacent properties varies. Some have open views, while others are screened from the site by vegetation. There is a semi-soft edge to the settlement. Field boundaries and the copses to the north of the site provide enclosure. Views to the south-east are dominated by the cooling towers of Didcot power station.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate Small Medium		Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	E Smooth Textured		Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	CHANTITY		CONDITION					
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor			
Woodland	Small copse to north		✓					
Tree belt	To south		✓					
Hedgerows	Frequent		✓	✓ Some are gappy				
Arable fields	Majority of site		✓					

O-manufacture (1997)				
Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	

Comments:

The cooling towers at Didcot are currently visible in views to the south-east. Both power lines and telephone lines cross the southern part of the site.

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character are	a	Generally good co some detractors. T landscape beyond	he	Degraded site	
Intact		the east is in poor so this is good by		Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features		comparison.		Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green	Belt					
Yes		No	x			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HENTIAGE AS	ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BT DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE							
		Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5				
Conservation Area	х							
Listed buildings	х							
Scheduled monuments	To south-west							
Registered Park and Gardens	х							

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	THIN AT EGGD LONE						
		Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
X			X	
			To east	
What type of right of	fuery? Dridlewey within eit	and buryou to north footne	th to cost and bridleway to	couth Dights of way

What type of right of way? Bridleway within site and byway to north, footpath to east and bridleway to south. Rights of way are well used.

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X To the north	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	To the north	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Generally – some gaps in boundary vegetation	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	√	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	✓	No	
Comments: The cooling towers of Didcot are visible and there could be intervisibility with the committed housing	ng schem	e to the	e north.	

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIA	AL CADACITY DEVIEW	EIEI D SI IDVE	V EOI
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	AL CAFACIT KLVILW	- I ILLD JORVL	1101
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):	I		<u> </u>
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	х
Site number(s):			<u> </u>
Comments:			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	.		
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):

Rev	1

Comments:

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
IF YES			
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			
<u> </u>			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
L			
IF YES			
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments:			

SUMMARY			
Essential separation between Sutton Courtney and Didcot. Locally valued landscape.			
NOTES			

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 7A Rowstock - east		
	26/09/2016	1941 – 1952
	13.00	1966 - 1971
	Overcast	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар А			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Х	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	mile of the man and app	<i>,</i> -	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		00::00:000	
	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
√	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation	Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland	Coppice
	Meadow		Common	✓	Orchards	Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation		Avenues	Open water
✓	Other: Tree line					•

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small		Large	Linear	Irregular
✓	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes	National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track	Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
✓	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

There are open views of the site from Grove Road to the north, The A4130 to the west and the A417 Reading Road to the south. There are also clear views of the site from properties within Rowstock (identified within a reverse view).

There are clear views of part of the site from the higher ground on the A4185 and Winaway, to the south of the site within the AONB. Views are of fields in pasture, with a backdrop of trees, which appear as woodland. The southern-most edge of the site is partly screened by vegetation lining the road. The lines of Poplar and Alder trees within the site are a distinctive feature.

There are also views of the site from Harwell village, including open views from the recreation ground to the south-west of Harwell.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active Adjacent to roads	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	•	CON	DITION	
PEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Lines of Poplar and Alder	At field boundaries		√		
Hedgerows	Occasional			✓	
Orchard	Within centre of site		✓		
Fields in pasture	Majority of site			✓	

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	✓	No	
Comments:	•			•
Power lines				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character area	Bordering average Some features in good condition and others in			Degraded site	
Intact	decline. Setting to AONB			Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?	?		
Yes		No	Setting
Green	Belt		
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AS	SETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE					
		Quantity				
	None	1	>1	>5		
Conservation Area	х					
Listed buildings	х					
Scheduled monuments	х					
Registered Park and Gardens	х					

|--|

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	Quantity						
	None	None Part of site Majority of site Whole sit					
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	No	X
			l

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
What type of right of v	vay?			

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Partly	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	х		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:			1	
The western edge of Harwell is visible from parts of the site.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	х	No			
Site number(s): 5 West of Harwell and 8A Milton Heights east						
Comments:						
Development of all sites in their entirety would cause Harwell village, Rowstock and Milton Heights to merge and would have adverse impacts on the setting of the AONB.						

			Yes	^	No			
Site number(s): 7B Rowstock west		L						
Comments:								
Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of Rowstock and would harm the setting to the AONB.								

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):	•		
Comments:			
Not in combination with this site.			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Development of all sites (8A, 8B, 5, 7A and 7B)

Comments:

Development of both 5 and 7A would cause Harwell and Rowstock to merge. If 8A were developed in addition, Milton Heights would also merge with Harwell and Rowstock.

Development of the southern part of 5, 7A and 7B would also have adverse impacts on the setting to the AONB

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 5 West of Harwell with parts of 8A Milton Heights east and 8B Milton Heights west

Comments:

The northern part of site 5 West of Harwell, combined with the northern parts of 8A and 8B. Parts of all three areas could be developed in combination. 7A is inappropriate for development.

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment? Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No Comments (if no):
Is the whole site within the assessment? Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No
Is the whole site within the assessment? Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No
Is the whole site within the assessment? Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No
What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No
What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No
Comments (if no):
2014 CAPACITY STUDY
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes No x
IF YES
Is the boundary the same? Yes No
What capacity has been given?
What deputity has been given.
A CONTRACT OF CONT
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes No
Comments:
Should the recommendations be upheld?
Comments:
Comments:

SUMMARY
The site forms part of the setting to the AONB and the essential separation between Harwell village and Rowstock.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 7B Rowstock - west		
	26/09/2016 & 17/12/2016	1983 – 2007
	14.00 & 11.50	2666 – 2674
	Cloudy	
	Oloday	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар А			

LANDFORM

х	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	mile of the train an area app	 200000000000000000000000000000000000000	00110610410		
✓	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:				

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small	✓	Large	Linear	Irregular
~	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	√	Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads		Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
✓	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
✓	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
✓	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

There are glimpses of the site from the A417 Reading Road to the south, along with the footpath running parallel to the road, further to the south of the site, through gaps in the southern boundary vegetation. Glimpsed and partial views are experienced from Featherbed Lane to the west of the site and the A4130 to the east of the site. Again these views are through gaps in boundary vegetation. There are open views from the stretch of the A4130 to the north-east of the site, due to a lack of boundary vegetation. Views are of arable fields, with sheds to the north-east and Croom Cottages visible in the background.

Open views of the site are experienced from some of the properties to the immediate south of the site, including Croom cottages, the western edge of Rowstock and from the line of properties at the south of Milton Hill, to the north of the site. Open views are also experienced from the bridleway that runs through the site, where there are large gaps in the boundary hedgerows (generally in the northern section of the bridleway).

The western part of the site is visible from the footpath to the south, within the AONB. These are partial views in winter, but reduce in summer, when the southern boundary vegetation is in leaf. New development to the north of East Hendred is also visible from this path.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant To the west	Framed To the east	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE QUANTITY		CONDITION							
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor				
Woodland	To north of site		✓						
Tree belt	At site boundaries		✓						
Hedgerows	Along bridleway				✓				
Arable fields	Majority of site		✓						

Are there any detractors within the site?		Х	No	
Comments:		[
Pylons				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average		Poor		
Typical of the character are	Generally good condition Some features in decline Some minor detractors				Degraded site		
Intact	Setting to AONB				Frequent detractors		
Rare elements / features					Features in decline		

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?	AONB?					
Yes		No	Setting			
Green	Belt					
Yes		No	х			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AS	SSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE				
		Quantity			
	None	1	>1	>5	
Conservation Area	х				
Listed buildings	х				
Scheduled monuments	х				
Registered Park and Gardens	х				

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	TITIME AT LOOP LOT						
	Quantity						
	None	None Part of site Majority of site Whole sit					
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

n site / 1 crossing si	te 1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
Х			
o of right of way? Postricted	hridloway		
e of right of way? Restricted	bridleway		

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Eastern part	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments:		I	J	
Properties at Milton Hill and Quab Hill are visible from parts of the site.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	X	No
Site number(s): 8A Milton Heights east			
Comments: Development of both of these sites would result in the merging of Milton Heights and Rowstock.			

	Yes	X	No
Site number(s): 7A Rowstock - east	l	ı	
Comments:			
Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of Rowstock and wou	uld harm the setting to	the AO	NB

Yes	No	х
<u> </u>		1
	Yes	Yes No

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Development of all sites (8A, 8B, 5, 7A and 7B)

Comments:

Development of both 5 and 7A would cause Harwell and Rowstock to merge. If this site and 8A (Milton Heights east) were developed in addition, Milton Heights would also merge with Harwell and Rowstock.

Development of the southern part of 5, 7A and 7B would also have adverse impacts on the setting to the AONB

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 5 West of Harwell with parts of 8A Milton Heights east and 8B Milton Heights west

Comments:

The northern part of site 5 West of Harwell, combined with the northern parts of 8A and 8B. Parts of all three areas could be developed in combination. 7B is inappropriate for development.

No x

No No

No

No

No x

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART	2 - HDA INITIAL CAPACITY REVIEW - FII	ΕL
2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY		
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	
IF YES		
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	İ
What character area is the site in?		<u></u>
What capacity has been given?		_
	<u>_</u>	_
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	
Comments (if no):		_
2044 CARACITY CTURY		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes x	Τ
To the one manner on the areas control and areas, and control and areas.		L
IF YES		т
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	
What capacity has been given?	Medium	

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	X	No	
---	-----	---	----	--

Comments:

The eastern part of the site does not extend as far north as the 2014 study area. The potential for coalescence between the site and Milton Hill are reduced slightly as a result.

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	Х	
			1	

Comments:

The site forms part of the setting to the AONB and the essential separation between East Hendred and Harwell – two characteristic springline settlements. Development within the site would change the largely unsettled nature of the landscape between the two villages. The area is under intense development pressure, with permitted development and allocated sites at East Hendred, Harwell and Milton Heights. Additional development at Rowstock would have significant cumulative effects.

SUMMARY
The western part is part of the wider open rural landscape and setting to the AONB. The eastern part is less open but inappropriate as isolated development.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Date / time / weather	Photographs
26/09/2016 12.00 Overcast	1920 - 1940
	26/09/2016 12.00

PLAN REFERENCE

LANDFORM

Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau		Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
Plain		Undulating	х	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
Steep	х	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
Upland		Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
Lowland		Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
Other:					

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	mile of the train triat de	· · <i>j</i> ·		00110010000		
	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
✓	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees	✓	Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues	✓	Open water
	Other:					

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

		Small	Large		Linear		Irregular
	✓	Medium	Geometric	<	Sinuous	✓	Regular
ſ		Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
✓ Other: Tree line				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River		Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
~	Stream		Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
~	Ditch	✓	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:				

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes	National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track	Wide verges	✓	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge		Scattered	Church / chapel		Mineral workings – current
	Village	✓	Isolated	Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet		Historic	Fortifications		Military
✓	Farmsteads		Vernacular	Hill forts		Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings		Modern	Ruins	✓	Industrial
	Nucleated		Urban	Moats	✓	Commercial
	Linear		Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic		Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern		
	Other:					

VIEWS

The site is generally well contained, with few views available outside the boundary. There are glimpsed and partial views of the site from Milton Hill (road to the immediate west of the site), through the poplar trees that line the roadside. The eastern parcel of the site has intervisibility with the high ground to the north of Harwell and with a small part of the new housing within Great Western Park, to the south of Didcot.

There are no views of the site from the A34 or the nearby settlement of Harwell, however there are views of the eastern part of the site from the high ground on the footpath to the north of Harwell village. There are occasional glimpsed views of the site from Grove Road, to the south of the site.

Within the site, there are open views of the site from The Grove Farm and the line of 6 cottages within the centre of the site.

PERCEPTION

I LIKOLI IIOI					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	OLIANITITY		CONDITION						
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor				
Woodland	Frequent small copses		✓						
Tree belt	Common field boundary		✓						
Tree line				✓					
Pasture			✓						

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments: Telephone lines cross the site and there are some areas of agricultural waste. Didcot power station site.	n is visibl	e from	much of	the

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character area		Generally good but with some features in decline.		Degraded site	
Intact				Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?								
Yes		No	x					
Green Belt								
Yes		No	х					

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

		Quantity							
	None	1	>1	>5					
Conservation Area	х								
Listed buildings	х								
Scheduled monuments	х								
Registered Park and Gardens	х								

|--|

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	Quantity				
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site	
Flood Zone 3	х				
Flood Zone 2	х				

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	No	X
			ļ

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
What type of right of wa	y?			

	ATIONICHID	TO EVICTIMO	SETTI EMENT
RFI	AIICINSHIP	1 () F X 15 11V(3	SELLI EMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	х		

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	Partially	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	✓	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Partially	No	
character?		-		

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	х	No	
Site number(s): 5 West of Harwell Village, 7A Rowstock – east and 7B Rowstock - west				
Comments: Development of all of these sites would result in the merging of Milton Heights with Harwell and R	owstock.			

Yes	х	No	
	1		
currently rural area.			
	currently rural area.		

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): Parts of 8B Milton Heights – west and 5 West of Harwell Village.	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
Comments: Only parts of a combination of sites could be developed. The development of all sites to their full e adverse impacts.	xtent wo	uld cau	se signifi	cant

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Development of all sites (8A, 8B, 5, 7A and 7B)

Comments:

Development of both 5 and 7A would cause Harwell and Rowstock to merge. If this site were developed in addition, Milton Heights would also merge with Harwell and Rowstock.

Development of 5, 7A and 7B in combination would also have adverse impacts on the setting to the AONB.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Part of this site in combination with part of 8B Milton Heights west and part of site 5 West of Harwell.

Comments:

The northern part of this site, combined with either the northern part of 8B and / or the northern part of 5. Parts of all three areas could be developed in combination.

2008	LAN	DSCAF	PE ST	ΓUDΥ
le the	s cito	within	ana	of th

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
			1

IF YES

Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	I		

2014 CAPACITY STUDY

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	
	,			

IF YES

120				
Is the boundary the same?	Yes		No	X
What capacity has been given?	High			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
---	-----	---	----	--

Comments:

There is intervisibility with Great Western Park to the east, from the south-eastern part of the site. The site extends further south than the boundary of the original capacity study. The south-western part of the site has a stronger relationship with the wider landscape and this part should not be developed. The existing access could be utilised, but the fields to the south of The Grove Farm should be retained in agricultural use.

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	X
			1

Comments:

There should be no built development within the fields to the east of the site. Consideration should be given to locate open space within the two fields to the south-east / allow for additional green infrastructure at the top of the slope. The fields to the north of the Grove Farm have capacity for development.

SUMMARY

The north-western parcel is suitable for development. The southern and south-eastern fields are more sensitive to development. The fields to the south of The Grove Farm should not be developed, but the existing access could be used to provide a secondary road link.

NOTES

Consideration should be given to locate open space within the two fields to the south-east / allow for additional green infrastructure at the top of the slope. Rows of mature Lombardy poplar on site – characteristic feature, so should be retained, however development would need to be sited ~20m from tree line.

SURVEY REF

Location Site 8B Milton Heights	Date / time / weather	Photographs
(west)	26/09/2016 11.30 Overcast but clear	1908 - 1919
	Overcast but clear	

PLAN REFERENCE

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
Х	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			•

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable	Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
√	Mixed farmland	Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common	✓	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation		Avenues		Open water
	Other:					

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

		Small		Large	Linear		Irregular
	✓	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	✓	Regular
Ī		Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
✓	Other: Tree belt				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes	National Trail	Pylons / power lines
,	Major roads	✓	Track	Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
•	Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:				

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	✓	Scattered	Church / chapel		Mineral workings – current
	Village		Isolated	Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused
✓	Hamlet		Historic	Fortifications		Military
✓	Farmsteads		Vernacular	Hill forts		Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings		Modern	Ruins		Industrial
	Nucleated		Urban	Moats	✓	Commercial
	Linear		Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic		Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern		
✓	Other: Business park		·			

VIEWS

The site is well contained from its surrounding by dense tree belts along the boundaries. The site is further contained to the north by bunding, which blocks all views from the stretch of the A4130 Abingdon Road, to the north of the site. There are only glimpsed views into the site from the eastern section of the same road.

Views into the site from the restricted byway to the south are also contained by vegetation.

There are clear views of the site from the dwellings within / immediately adjacent to the site including: Steventon House and the properties within the southern part of the site. These properties will have views of the orchards, shelterbelts and mixed crops grown within the site. The presence of the orchards and shelterbelts give a sense of containment and there are no long views across the site.

PERCEPTION

I LIKOLI IIOIT					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	•	CON	IDITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Shelter belt	Single species shelterbelts break up the site		✓		
Tree belt	Mixed tree belts at boundaries		✓		
Orchard	Majority of the site	✓			
Mixed crops	Fruit / vegetables		✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	х
Comments:		•	•

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character area	Intact landscape Rare elements / features (orchards)			Degraded site	
Intact	(Gronardo)			Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB1	?		
Yes		No	x
Green	Belt		
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

		Qua	antity	
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	х			
Listed buildings	х			
Scheduled monuments	х			
Registered Park and Gardens	х			

|--|

SAC	
SSSI	
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	TITILIT AT LOOD LOI	1		
		Qua	antity	
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site
Flood Zone 3	х			
Flood Zone 2	х			

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
				Х
What type of right of w	ay? Restricted byway to the	ne south of the site	•	1

DEI	ATIONSHIP	TO	EXISTING	SETTI	EMENT
n = L	AIIONSHIP	-	EXIOLING	$\mathcal{O} = I I I L$	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	
		Relationship with isolated	
		dwellings and business centre	
		rather than settlement	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		х	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes		No	х
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	x	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		x	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Site number(s): 8A Milton Heights	s - east	I	<u> </u>
Comments:			
Development of both sites in their	entirety would constitute major urbanisation of a	a currently rural area.	

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): Parts of 8A Milton Heights – east and 5 West of Harwell Village.				

Comments:

Only parts of a combination of sites could be developed. The development of all sites to their full extent would cause significant adverse impacts.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Development of all sites in the study area (8A, 8B, 5, 7A and 7B)

Comments:

Development of both 5 and 7A would cause Harwell and Rowstock to merge. If this site were developed in addition, Milton Heights would also merge with Harwell and Rowstock.

Development of 5, 7A and 7B in combination would also have adverse impacts on the setting to the AONB.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Part of this site in combination with part of 8A Milton Heights east and part of site 5 West of Harwell.

Comments:

The northern part of this site, combined with either the northern part of 8B and / or the northern part of 5. Parts of all three areas could be developed in combination.

No

Yes x

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		No	Х
				Ĺ
TE VEG				
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes		N.	1
is the whole site within the assessment?	res		No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes		No	
What character area is the site in?		<u> </u>		<u></u>
What capacity has been given?				
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments (if no):				<u> </u>
2014 CAPACITY STUDY				
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	x	No	
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	х	No	
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?		х		
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site extends further south that within the	Yes	х	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?		x		x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site extends further south that within the capacity study	Yes	х		x
IF YES Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site extends further south that within the capacity study What capacity has been given?	Yes High		No	
IF YES Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site extends further south that within the capacity study What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x		
IF YES Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site extends further south that within the capacity study What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Comments:	Yes High Yes	x	No	x
IF YES Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site extends further south that within the capacity study What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Comments: Agree with the commentary on character. Agree that the site is well contained, however the qu	Yes High Yes ality and con	x adition of	No No	
IF YES Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site extends further south that within the capacity study What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes High Yes vality and conthey were on	x addition of the community of the commu	No No the nonplace	ce.

Comments: Within the boundary shown within the capacity study. The land to the south is more sensitive to de	velopme	nt.	1	

Should the recommendations be upheld?

SUMMARY
Northern section is well contained and largely in arable production. Southern area is well established orchards.
Northern section is well contained and largery in arable production. Southern area is well established ordinards.

NOTES

Feature loss will be a key issue, particularly established orchards. There are rows of mature Lombardy poplar on site – characteristic feature, so should be retained, however development would need to be sited ~20m from tree line.

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 9A Appleford (East)		
	15/09/2016	1619 – 1626
	9.15	1642 - 1645
	Misty	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар С					

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling	x	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	mile of the train an area app	 200000000000000000000000000000000000000	00110610410		
✓	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:				

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	< <	Large	Linear	Irregular
Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓	Hedgerows	Banks	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
✓	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	Fence – urban	Open
	Other:			

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	<	Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads		Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
√	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	·	Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	✓	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications		Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts		Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins		Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats		Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic		Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern		
	Other:				

VIEWS

The field is open and irregularly shaped. Tall hedgerows at boundaries provide some screening, however there are large gaps within the hedgerows, which allow long views across the site.

The site is visible from dwellings on the eastern edge of the village, which back onto the site. Views from these properties varies with boundary treatment.

There are open views into and across the site to the church from the southern section of Main Road and the site is also visible from Appleford Crossing. Glimpsed and partial views of the site are possible from the bridleway along Moor ditch, to the east of the site.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	FEATURE QUANTITY		CONDITION				
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor		
Hedgerows	At boundaries. gappy and outgrown			✓			
Hedgerow Trees	Within boundaries		✓				
Arable field	Ploughed		✓				

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding		Good	Average	Х	Poor	
Typical of the character are	ea		Features in decline		Degraded site	
Intact					Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features					Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?					
Yes		No	x		
Green Belt					
Yes		No	x		

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings		х					
Scheduled monuments		Within site and to east					
Registered Park and Gardens	х						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	WITHIN AT LOOP LOTE							
		Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site				
Flood Zone 3	х							
Flood Zone 2	х							

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site				
			Х					
What type of right of way? Bridleways to north and east								

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	X		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

	Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
ſ				X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	✓ To the east	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)		and south		
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	✓
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	✓	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		X	
		Between Appleford and	
		Didcot	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes		No	X
Comments:	4511			
There could be views of the proposed South Oxfordshire Housing allocation, located to the north site.	of Didcot	and sou	uth-east o	of the
Site.				

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL	CAPACITY RE	√IEW - FIEL	.D SURVE	y fo
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	1			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes		No	X
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): 9B	<u> </u>			
Comments:				
Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village.				
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	X
Site number(s):				
Comments:				

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 9B

Comments:

Maximum development on both sites would have the highest impacts.

WHICH SITE / COMBINATION OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 9B

Comments:

Site 9A relates better to the village of Appleford, but contributes more to the setting of the village and the separation between Appleford and Didcot. Site B is more contained and is low value, however it has no relationship to the village. Neither site should be developed.

Medium / High

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		No
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes		Na
is the whole site within the assessment?	res		No
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes		No
What character area is the site in?		<u> </u>	
What capacity has been given?			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes		No
Comments (if no):			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY	T		
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No
IF YES			
Is the boundary the same? Site 9A corresponds to area 1 within the 2014 capacity study. The	Yes		No

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	Х	No	

Comments:

What capacity has been given?

boundary is different as the site follows the existing hedgerow line.

Site 9A corresponds to area 1 within the 2014 capacity study. The boundary is different as the site follows the existing hedgerow line. The sensitivity judgements for the site remain the same, however the landscape value of the site has been judged to be higher than previously assessed as the site includes a scheduled monument and forms the setting to the village and a listed building. Land to the south-east (within South Oxfordshire) has been allocated for housing. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot.

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	X
Comments:				
The site forms the landscape setting to the village and is more characteristic of the level area than	tha land	aaana t	a tha war	~ +

The site forms the landscape setting to the village and is more characteristic of the local area than the landscape to the west, which has been subject to mineral workings and landfill. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and Didcot.

SUMMARY
Scheduled monument within site. Setting to village. The site contributes to the separation between Appleford and the future settlement edge of Didcot.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 9B Appleford (West)		
	15/09/2016	1627 - 1641
	10.30	
	Clear and sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар С					

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling	x	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	tion an that ap		O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	Odriopicadao		
√	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	✓	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:		·	·		

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small	✓	Large	Linear	Irregular
	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows		Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
✓	Clipped hedges	✓	Ditches with tree line	✓	Fence – urban	Open
	Other:					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
V	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	>	Public footpath/bridleway	✓	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

		117			
	Town edge	Scattered	d Church / chapel		Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	√ ✓	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet Historic		Fortifications		Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts		Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins		Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats		Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic		Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern		
	Other: Landfill				

VIEWS

Both sites (northern and southern) are extremely well contained.

The southern site has glimpsed views from the B4016 to the north, and no views from any other roads or properties. There are open views from the adjacent footpath.

Views of the northern part of the site (north of the B4016) are obstructed by bunding. The site is currently in use as a quarry.

There is no intervisibility with site 6 at Sutton Courtney.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY					
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	
Tree belt	To south		✓			
Tree line	Next to B4016		✓			
Hedgerows	Divides field			✓		
Conifer hedge	At eastern boundary			✓		
Arable fields	Lots of weeds in crop – set aside?				✓	
Ditches	Dry with reeds		✓			

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments: Overhead pylons cross the western section of the site. Noise from railway Adjacent quarry / Waste site.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	Poor	X	
Typical of the character are	ea		Degraded site		
Intact			Frequent detractors		
Rare elements / features	elements / features		Features in decline		

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green	Belt					
Yes		No	x			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HENTIAGE AS	LIS IIIAI COOLD	BETS THAT COOLD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE								
		Quantity								
	None	1	>1	>5						
Conservation Area	х									
Listed buildings	х									
Scheduled monuments	х									
Registered Park and Gardens	х									

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	TIME AT LOOP LO	••=			
	Quantity				
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site	
Flood Zone 3	х				
Flood Zone 2		X Northern edge			

PUBLIC ACCESS

I OBEIO AGGEGG				
Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site			
		Х		Х			
What type of right of way? Footpath within northern part of the site, Bridleway to south							

DEI	ATION	ICHID	TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	.A HUI	NOUL	10	EXIOLING	SELIL	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X
			Settlement not visible

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			Х

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	✓ Wider landscape is also in poor condition	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	✓ relationship is with degraded landscape to west	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	✓	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	existing separation)	X Between Appleford and	
		Sutton Courtney	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	TIDI (TIMITI LE OAT ACITT REV	ILVV TILLD SORV	L110
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x No	T
Site number(s): 9A			

Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village.

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
Comments.			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 9A

Comments:

Maximum development on both sites would have the highest impacts.

WHICH SITE / COMBINATION OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 9A and 9B

Comments:

Site 9A relates better to the village of Appleford, but contributes more to the setting of the village. Site B is more contained and is low value, however it has no relationship to the village. Neither site should be developed.

2008 LANDSCA	APE STUDY
Is the site with	in one of th

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
			1

IF YES

Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			<u> </u>
What capacity has been given?			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	N	0
Comments (if no):			l l

2014 CAPACITY STUDY

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	

IF YES

Is the boundary the same? Site 9B corresponds to areas 2 and 3 within the 2014 capacity	Yes		No	X
study.				
What capacity has been given?	High and Medium / High		gh	

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	X	No	
, ,				1

Comments:

The northern parcel (number 2 in the capacity study) is now being quarried. The sensitivity and value judgements for the site remain the same. There is evidence that the site is Landfill, which would not be suitable for development. The small site to the north is divorced from settlement and has the opportunity to be restored fully after the quarrying. This area is the least suitable for development.

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	X

Comments:

The capacity of the site should reflect its lack of association with Appleford. The capacity of the northern part of the site (parcel 2) should be reconsidered and judged against the proposed restoration strategy of the quarry. It has the opportunity to contribute to the wider landscape and the approach to Appleford.

SUMMARY
Low value landscape but no relationship to settlement.
NOTES
Landfill – not suitable for development. The trees on the northern boundary are some of the best features within the site. Consider siting development with access at the point that would cause the least damage to existing features.

SURVEY REF

Location Site 10 North Abingdon	Date / time / weather	Photographs
	25/09/2016 18.00 Sunny	1878 - 1907

PLAN REFERENCE

Map D			

LANDFORM

Flat		Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau	х	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
Plain		Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
Steep		Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
Upland		Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
Lowland		Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

_,	Extraction and that apply. A Cooldinate of Evident And Conspication								
√	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws		
	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland		
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr		
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice		
	Meadow		Common		Orchards		Scrub		
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh		
	Heath		Recreation	✓	Avenues		Open water		
	Other:								

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	✓	Large		Linear	✓	Irregular
Medium		Geometric	✓	Sinuous		Regular
Other:						

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River		Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream		Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
v	Ditch	✓	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:				

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway	Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
✓	Major roads	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
	Rural roads	Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:				

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Town edge		Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
	Village		Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	✓	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings		Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated		Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	✓	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:	·			

VIEWS

The Oxford Greenbelt Way runs along a ridge through the site. The western part of the path is contained by dwellings and hedgerows and the eastern part runs along the line of a double avenue, which filters views of the wider landscape. Where gaps in the vegetation afford views, these are open and panoramic, with long views to both the north and south.

The northern part of the site would be visible from high ground to the north, at Sunningwell, Sugworth Farm and potentially Boars Hill (visible in reverse view from the site). The southern part of the site has intervisibility with Peachcroft Farm and the north-eastern part of Abingdon.

Views of the site are of large arable fields contained by tree belts.

PERCEPTION

I LICOLI IIOI					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed On ridge top	Open On ridge sides	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	•	CONI	DITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Ancient woodland	A small copse to the south of the site		✓		
Woodland	Sugnell Copse		✓		
Tree belt	Frequently Occuring		✓		
Avenue	Double avenue through the centre		original sweet chestnut avenue has been replaced with new oaks		
Tree copse	Small copses at edges of fields and surrounding water features		✓		
Hedgerows	At field boundaries		✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments:	I.			
Pylons cross northern field.				
Disused Nursery and contractors yard to the north-west				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Х	Good	Average		Poor	
Typical of the character a	rea				Degraded site	
Intact					Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline		

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes No x						
Green Belt						
Yes	x	No				

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AG	HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE						
	Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings			X Site is part of setting to Radley College				
Scheduled monuments	х						
Registered Park and Gardens	X Is part of a designed landscape						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SI	ITE
---	-----

SAC	
SSSI	
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	✓ to south

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

IS THE SITE WITHIN AT EGOD ZONE								
		Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site				
Flood Zone 3	x							
Flood Zone 2	Х							

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	Х	No	
		1		, ,

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
Х				
What type of right of wa	y? Public footpath/ nationa	al trail. Also a permissive fo	potpath to the west.	

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	
		Settlement on Lodge Hill. No	
		relationship to Abingdon	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes		No	х
character?				^

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		x	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	х	No
Comments:	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
The proposed housing allocations at North Abingdon and North-west Radley could be visible	e from the site.		
to proposed flouding allocations at North Abilinguon and North West Nadicy could be visible	o morn the site.		

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIA	AL CADACITY DEVIEW	EIEI D SI IDVE	V EOI
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	AL CAFACIT KLVILW	- I ILLD JORVL	1101
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):	I		<u> </u>
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	х
Site number(s):			<u> </u>
Comments:			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	.		
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):

Rev	1

Comments:

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
IEWEO			
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			
	I		
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	<u> </u>		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
IF YES			
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
What Capacity has been given:			
	<u> </u>		
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
	100		
Comments:			

SUMMARY
High Value landscape in a prominent location within the Green Belt.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 11A South West of		
Abingdon	15/09/2016	1752 - 1793
	16.00	
	Sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар С					

LANDFORM

Flat		Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau		Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
Plain		Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
Steep	х	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
Upland		Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
Lowland		Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
Other:				•

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

√ ✓	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:	<u>.</u>	·		

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small	√ √	Large	Linear	✓ ✓	Irregular
✓	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous		Regular
	Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
✓	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	Rural lanes	✓ ✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
✓	Dual carriageway	Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads	Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:				

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓	Town edge		Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
	Village		Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic		Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings		Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	✓	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear		Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:				

VIEWS

A local ridge runs east-west across the site, splitting the western part of the site into two. There are open views of the southern edge of the site from byway to the south of the site at Drayton and from the new housing to the north-west Drayton.

There are open views of the northern part of the site from the rights of way within the site and from the southern settlement edge of Abingdon. The northern part of the site has a stronger relationship with Abingdon.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic (SE)	Corridor (N)
SCALE	Intimate	Small (NW)	Medium (W)	Large (S+E)	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful (in centre)	Active (near settlement + A34)	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	CONDITION						
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor			
Woodland copse	1 to north-west + 1 to east		✓					
Hedgerows			✓	✓ (some are gappy)				
Arable fields			✓					

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	x	No	
Comments:	l			I
Pylons cross the site				
Noise from the A34				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Х	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	Generally good condition The southern part has lir the wider landscape to the	ks to		Degraded site	
Intact	west. Urban influence increases to the north.	west. Urban influence		Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?	?		
Yes		No	x
Green	Belt		
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

TIERTIAGE AG	HERITAGE AGGETO THAT GOOED BE ALLEGTED BY DEVELOT MERT WITHIN THE SITE						
		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings	х						
Scheduled monuments		X Within eastern part of site					
Registered Park and Gardens	х						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE							
		Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	x						
Flood Zone 2		X Northern edge					

PUBLIC ACCESS

	Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	x	No	
--	--	-----	---	----	--

If ves:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
Х				
What type of right of wa	l y? 1 byway and 2 bridlewa	l ys. Well used.		

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	X		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	To SW	No	To North
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	To North	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	If reduced in	No	
character?		area.		

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		
	Between Abingdon and		
	Drayton		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments: The permitted (half built) development at North Drayton is visible from the southern edge of the sit western part.	e, particu	larly to	the soutl	า –

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	No	ı
Site number(s): 12 North East of Drayton + 13 West of Drayton				
Comments: Development on both sites would significantly reduce the separation between Abingdon and Drayt Potential intervisibility with both sides.	on			

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 14 in combination with parts of 13 + / 11	•	•		

Comments:

All of 14 and parts of the remaining sites could be developed in combination. Only the northern part of this site (land to the north of the local ridgeline) should be developed.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 11 (A and B), 12 and 13

Comments:

Development of sites 11, 12 and 13 in their entirety would have the highest potential impacts. The southern half of this site and 11B, in combination with the northern half of site 12 (North East of Drayton) have the highest contribution towards the separation between Drayton and Abingdon. Development of all of these sites in combination would have significant effects on the separation between Abingdon and Drayton.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 14 with 13 and parts of 11 (north)

Comments:

Site 14 has the highest development potential in landscape terms, as long as an appropriate access can be provided. In combination both sites 14 and 13 could be developed without significant cumulative effects. With sufficient mitigation the northern part of this site (11A) could be considered.

2008	LANI	Dec	A DE	CTI	IDV
ZHEX	IΔN	1150.	$\Delta P =$	211	11) Y

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	
				ı

IF YES

11 120				
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	X	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	х	No	
What character area is the site in?	2, 3, 5 a 4.	2, 3, 5 and a small part of 4.		t of
What capacity has been given?	Modera	Moderate – areas 1-6		

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	X	No	X	l
		character		capacity	l
Comments (if no):					l

The character judgements remain relevant. The development of the parcel of land to the north-west of Drayton makes character areas 3 and 4 more sensitive to change. Development plan options 2 & 3 that include development within these character areas are no longer viable without the merging of settlements (Abingdon and Drayton). Option 1 is still possible, however the proposed structural planting should follow existing field boundaries and connect to the existing copse in the east.

2014 CAPACITY STUDY

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	

IF YFS

120				
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	x	No	
What capacity has been given?	Mediun	n		

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	х
Comments:			

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	X	No	
	1			İ

Comments:

Agree with the capacity judgements, however the recommended contingency site area could increase slightly and the indicative green infrastructure could also follow the field boundaries on the high ground to form a green corridor and to mitigate for potential visual impacts of the development.

SUMMARY

Low lying land within northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important to the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. The introduction of major infrastructure would change the character of the site and would require the subsequent reassessment of the site's capacity for development.

NOTES

Development within this site would need to consider the Scheduled Monu	iment (to the east) and its setting.
--	--------------------------------------

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 11B South of Abingdon		
	15/09/2016	1702 - 1711
	16.00	
	Sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

LANDFORM

Flat		Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau		Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
Plain		Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
Steep	х	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
Upland		Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
Lowland		Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
Other:				•

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
√ √	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	✓✓	Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common		Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation		Avenues		Open water
	Other:	•		•			

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small		Large	Linear	✓ ✓	Irregular
	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous		Regular
	Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
✓	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
✓	Other: Tree line				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
~	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓	Town edge		Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
	Village		Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet		Historic	Fortifications	Military
✓	Farmsteads		Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings		Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	✓	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear		Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:				

VIEWS

The eastern part of the site is visually contained and rural in character, with views reduced to glimpses from the byway running through the site and from the listed building Stonehill House.

The western part of the site is screened from Abingdon by a tree belt to the north, however there would be glimpsed views of the site from the permitted development to the immediate north. Views from the adjacent road and byway are generally screened by boundary hedgerows.

The southern part of the eastern parcel is visible from the bridleway to the north and east, and can be glimpsed from the B4017 to the west.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	OLIANITITY	CONDITION							
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor				
Woodland copse	To north and small copse to south-east		✓						
Hedgerows			✓						
Fields in pasture			✓						
Individual trees			✓						

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments: Intermittent disturbance and noise from the haul road that runs along the byway through the site for	or the adja	acent q	uarry.	

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	х	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	Generally good condition intimate pastoral landsca with close associations t	ре		Degraded site	
Intact	Stonehill Farm.			Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green	Green Belt					
Yes		No	x			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

		Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5				
Conservation Area	х							
Listed buildings		X Within site						
Scheduled monuments	х							
Registered Park and Gardens	х							

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

		Quantity						
	None Part of site Majority of site Whole							
Flood Zone 3	х							
Flood Zone 2		X Eastern edge						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site			
	х						
What type of right of way? 1 bridleway.							

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		х	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	To east	No	To south
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	х	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)		Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		
	Between Abingdon and		
	Drayton		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	x	No
Comments:	1	1	
The permitted (half built) development to the immediate north can be glimpsed through the tree be	elt to the	north of	the site.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 12 North East of Drayton				
Comments: Development on both sites would significantly reduce the separation between Abingdon and Drayt Potential intervisibility with both sides.	on			

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	X	No	ļ	ĺ
Site number(s): 14 in combination with site 13 + parts of 11 (A&B)					ı

Comments:

All of 14 and 13 and part of sites 11A and 11B could be developed in combination. Only the north-western part of this site (land to the north of the bridleway) should be developed.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 11 (A and B), 12 and 13

Comments:

Development of sites 11, 12 and 13 in their entirety would have the highest potential impacts. The southern half of this site and 11A, in combination with the northern half of site 12 (North East of Drayton) have the highest contribution towards the separation between Drayton and Abingdon. Development of all of these sites in combination would have significant effects on the separation between Abingdon and Drayton.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 14 with 13 and 11 (north)

Comments:

Site 14 has the highest development potential in landscape terms, as long as an appropriate access can be provided. In combination both sites 14 and 13 could be developed without significant cumulative effects. With sufficient mitigation the northwestern part of this site (11B) could be considered.

Yes x

No

VOWITEGOALT DAVITAGE OF	II ACIII KE	VIL VV - I IL	LD JOKVE	i i Okiv
2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	
IF YES				
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	х	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant? The northern part of area 7 is being developed	Yes	Х	No	Х
for housing.		(8)		(7)
What character area is the site in?			art of 7	and
What capacity has been given?	the nort			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes		No	
	res		NO	Х
Comments (if no):	. حادید در داد		المنسط مطا	
The northern-most field is currently under development. The capacity of the remaining 2 fields to t is slightly higher than suggested in this study. The capacity of the rest of the site is in line with this	ine nortn- s study	west of	the bridie	eway
is original ingrior and rouggestion in and study. The supposit of the root of the site is in and	otaay			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	х	No	
is the site within one of the areas covered by the study:	163	^	140	
IF YES				
Is the boundary the same? The site is area B in the study	Yes	X	No	
What capacity has been given?	Mediun	n		
	1			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes		NO	X
Comments:				
	•			
	1			

Comments:

Should the recommendations be upheld?

SUMMARY

•	art of site has highest capac	city. Southern part is im	portant to the separation	between Abingdon and
Drayton.				

NOTES

This site is small scale and contained, but well related to the rural farmstead that it surrounds. The site also forms the setting to the listed building Stonehill House. Development within this site would also need to consider mature landscape features within the site and provide for their retention.

SURVEY REF

5/09/2016 .30 unny	1709 - 1734
.3	0

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар С

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:	<u> </u>			

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small	√ √	Large	Linear	Irregular
✓	Medium		Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	✓	Hedgerows	Banks	>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
		Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
Ī		Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	✓	Open
Γ		Other: Tree line					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Motorway		Rural lanes	✓ ✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
Major roads	✓ ✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
/ Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
Other:	•	•	•	<u> </u>	

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered		Church / chapel	✓ ✓	Mineral workings – current
✓ ✓	Village	Isolated		Graveyard	✓	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic		Fortifications		Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular		Hill forts		Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern		Ruins		Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban		Moats Earthworks - historic		Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland				Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings		Earthworks - modern		
	Other:					

VIEWS

There are open views of site from rights of way within the site and varying degrees of view from the bridleway to the east, which is contained in part by hedgerows and tree lines. Views to the wider landscape are contained by tree belts and hedgerows.

There are views of the northern part of the site from housing at the north-western edge of the village.

The southern half of site is more contained, however there are open views from the footpath that crosses it and from the B4016 to the immediate south. These views currently contain the site and the two large industrial sized barns within the site.

PERCEPTION

I LIKELI HOR					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active (near Haul road)	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OHANTITY		CONDITION							
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent Good		Average	Poor					
Tree belts	To the north west + between 2 halves of site		✓							
Hedgerows	At some boundaries			✓						
Arable fields			✓							
Line of trees	To east		✓							

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	×	No	
Comments: Haul road to east – for quarry. Intermittent traffic. Southern field has large barns. There are also telephone lines crossing the southern field.				
1 7				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	х	Average		Poor	
Typical of the character are	Higher quality than landscape beyond the site to the east. The southern field has more		Degraded site			
Intact	detractors.	na nao moro			Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features					Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?	?		
Yes		No	x
Green	Belt		
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AS	KITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE						
	Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area		Х					
Listed buildings			X (no intervisibility)				
Scheduled monuments	х						
Registered Park and Gardens	х						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

IO THE ONE WITHIN AT EGOD EGNE						
	Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site		
Flood Zone 3	х					
Flood Zone 2	х					

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
x				Х
What type of right of wa	y? 3 footpaths and 1 bridle	way within the site, 1 bridle	eway to east of site	

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	X (northern parcel)	X (Southern parcel)	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	To the east	No	
		and south		
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	To the east	No	To the north
character?		and south		

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X Between Abingdon and Drayton		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments: Stonehill farm is visible from northern edge. Permitted development to the North-west of Drayton is clearly visible from the northern part of the	site.			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): 11 South of Abingdon				
Comments:	·			

Development on both sites would significantly reduce the separation between Abingdon and Drayton Potential intervisibility between the two.

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?

Site number(s): 13 and 14

Comments:

If all sites were developed, the settlement of Drayton would expand significantly. This site should not be developed.

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?

Site number(s): 14 in combination with site 13 + parts of 11 (A&B)

Comments:

All of 14 and 13 and part of sites 11A and 11B could be developed in combination.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 11 (A and B), 12 (this site), 13

Comments:

Development of sites 11, 12 and 13 in their entirety would have the highest potential impacts. The southern half of site 11 and the northern half of this site (12) have the highest contribution towards the separation between Drayton and Abingdon. Development of both of these sites in combination would have significant effects on the separation between Abingdon and Drayton. This site should not be developed.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 14 with 13 and parts of 11 (north)

Comments:

Site 14 has the highest development potential in landscape terms, as long as an appropriate access can be provided. In combination the development of sites 14 and 13 could be developed without significant cumulative effects. With sufficient mitigation the northern part of site 11 could also be considered.

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?		·	
What capacity has been given?	1	-	
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	<u> </u>		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
, .			
IF YES		 	Ī
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
L			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
	162	INU	
Comments:			

SUMMARY
Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher value than wider landscape to east.
open landscape with numerous rights of way. Fligher value than wider landscape to east.

NOTES

This site is highly accessible, open and is in good condition. It makes a high contribution to the local landscape. The southern part of the site has more detractors, but is generally separated from the settlement edge and lies adjacent to the Conservation Area.

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 13 West of Drayton		
	15/09/2016	1680 – 1701
	3.30	1734 – 1750
	Sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

LANDFORM

X(S)	Flat	Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	X(N)	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	tien an triat appry.	0000010110		Corropious	040		
√	Arable	Parkland	d	Broadleave	d woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticult	ture	Mixed wood	dland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocl	ks	Conifer plar	ntation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-asid	le	Hanging wo	odland		Coppice
	Meadow	Commo	n	Orchards			Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green		Scattered tr	ees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreat	ion	Avenues			Open water
	Other:						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small		Large	Linear	✓	Irregular
✓	Medium	✓ ✓	Geometric	Sinuous		Regular
	Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓ ✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	Rural lanes	✓ ✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
✓	Dual carriageway (to west)	Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
✓ ✓	Rural roads	Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:				

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓ ✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
✓	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

There are views of site from western edge of Drayton, which has a hard edge when viewed from within the site. There are also open / partial and glimpsed views from the various rights of way running around and through the site, along with intermittent views from the A34.

The southern part of the site is much more contained than the north. There are long views to both the north and the south from the bridleway to north of site. (High ground)

There are no views of the site from the east and views from the west are limited to land on higher ground to the north-west, beyond the A34.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic (only from northern boundary)	Corridor	
SCALE	Intimate	Small (S)	Medium (N)	Large	Vast	
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed (S)	Semi-enclosed	Open (N)	Exposed	
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform	
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough		
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish		
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active (A34)	Busy	

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	CONDITION					
	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor		
Tree belt	Frequent at edges of A34 and between fields.		√				
Hedgerows	Some hedgerow boundaries			√ gappy			
Arable fields			✓				

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	x	No	
Comments:	•		•	
Noise from the A34				
The western edge of Drayton has an urbanising effect on the character of the landscape.				

What is the general condition of the site? - Varies

Outstanding		Good	✓	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character area		Good quality		Some noise from the A34		Degraded site	
Intact		Long views		Some features in decline		Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features						Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?	?		
Yes		No	x
Green	Belt		
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HENTIAGE AS	LIS IIIAI COOLD	BE AFFECTED BT DE		THE SHE	
		Quantity			
	None	1	>1	>5	
Conservation Area	х				
Listed buildings	х				
Scheduled monuments	х				
Registered Park and Gardens	х				

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	TITIME AT LOOP LOT			
	Quantity			
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site
Flood Zone 3	х			
Flood Zone 2	х			

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
X				Х
What type of right of w	ay? 3 bridleways			

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	хN	No	x S
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	x S	No	хN
-				
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	x	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		x N	x S

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
Permitted development to north is visible from northern boundary.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): 11A	· ·	1	1	
Comments:				
Potential for intervisibility between the northern edge of this site and southern edge of 11A (Sout	h of Abing	don).		
oteritial for intervisibility between the northern edge of this site and southern edge of TTA (South	i oi Abilig	uorij.		

Site number(s): 12 and 14 Comments:	
Comments:	
If all sites were developed, the settlement of Drayton would expand significantly	

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): 14 in combination with this site and parts of 11				
Comments:				
All of 14 and 13 and part of sites 11A and 11B could be developed in combination.				

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 11, 12 and 13

Comments:

Development of sites 11, 12 and 13 in their entirety would have the highest potential impacts. The southern half of site 11 and the northern half of site 12 have the highest contribution towards the separation between Drayton and Abingdon. Development of both of these sites in combination would have significant effects on the separation between Abingdon and Drayton.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 14 with 13 (this site) and parts of 11 (north)

Comments:

Site 14 has the highest development potential in landscape terms, as long as an appropriate access can be provided. In combination the development of sites 14 and this site (13) could be developed without significant cumulative effects. With sufficient mitigation the northern part of site 11 could also be considered.

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY								
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes No								
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No						
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No						
What character area is the site in?	'							
What capacity has been given?								
	<u> </u>							
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No						
Comments (if no):								
			ļ					
SALL CARACITY OTHER								
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х					
15 the Site Within One of the group covered by the state.								
IF YES								
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No						
What capacity has been given?								
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No						
	169	140						
Comments:								
			•					
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No						
Comments:	<u> </u>							

SUMMARY

Well related to settlement. Noise from A34. North-eastern part has stronger links to wider landscape. This site is highly
accessible, open and is in good condition, however it has a strong relationship with the existing settlement edge, is generally cut
off from the wider landscape by the A34 and has detractors, including the noise from the A34 dual carriageway.

NOTES

Good tree belts are present around the site, which should be retained. Green infrastructure to be introduced to the north-west to link to existing tree belts and mitigate for views from the bridleway to the north.

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 14 South of Drayton		
	15/09/2016	1673 - 1679
	13.00	
	Sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар С			

LANDFORM

Х	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation	Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland	Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards	Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues	Open water
	Other:	· ·		•

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small		Large	Linear	Irregular
✓	Medium	√ √	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

//	Hedgerows	Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	✓	Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:	·		

VIEWS

The site itself is an open arable field, with views to the landscape beyond through the gappy eastern hedgerow boundary, with long views across the site to Didcot power station and pylons to the east.

Views into the site are limited to the north-western boundary and adjacent properties to the west. There are open views from the access track to the north-west as the boundary treatment is post and wire fencing at this point. The footpath to north is enclosed by hedgerows, with only glimpses of the site in summer.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	CONDITION				
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	
Hedgerows	To north		✓			
Remnant hedgerow	To east				✓	
Arable field			✓			

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	х
Comments:			
Didcot power station and pylons visible to the east, beyond the site boundary.			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	х	Poor	
Typical of the character are	а	The northern bounda hedgerow is in good and the field is typica	condition	Degraded site	
Intact		local landscape, how eastern hedgerow is	ever the	Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features		decline and the west boundary has urban influences from the a housing.	ern	Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green	Green Belt					
Yes		No	x			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HENTIAGE AS	ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE						
		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings	х						
Scheduled monuments	х						
Registered Park and Gardens	х						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	O THE OTTE WITHIN AT EGGD EGRE						
		Qu	antity				
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site			
		X		Х			
What type of right of way? 1 bridleway to the north – enclosed by hedges on both sides.							

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	X		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		x	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
Could the site he contained with mitigation planting without domaning level	Vaa		NIS	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	X	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		x	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
Glimpses of permitted development to north.				

	ΙΔΤΙ		

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	Х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Site number(s): 12 and 13		
Comments:		
fall sites were developed, the settlement of Drayton would expand significantly		

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 12 and 11 (A and B)			1	
Comments: Site 13 and the northern parts of site 11 could be developed in combination with this site without	significant	advers	se effects	

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 11, 12 and 13

Comments:

Development of sites 11, 12 and 13 in their entirety would have the highest potential impacts. The southern half of site 11 and the northern half of site 12 have the highest contribution towards the separation between Drayton and Abingdon. Development of both of these sites in combination would have significant effects on the separation between Abingdon and Drayton.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 14 (this site) with 13 and parts of 11 (north)

Comments:

This site (14) has the highest development potential in landscape terms, as long as an appropriate access can be provided.

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	Х
IF YES			
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
IF YES Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
what capacity has been given?			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
L			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments:			

SUMMARY
Well related to gettlement. Could be contained with new planting
Well related to settlement. Could be contained with new planting.
NOTES
Access? The northern hedgerow should be retained and the remaining field boundaries should be enhanced.

SURVEY REF

Location Site 15 South West of	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Botley	15/09/2016 5pm Sunny	IMG1610 - 1618

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар E

LANDFORM

	Flat	Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Х	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
X	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	This to the time to be a second to the secon							
< <	Arable	Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws			
	Pasture	Horticultur	е	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland			
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks		Conifer plantation	Carr			
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside		Hanging woodland	Coppice			
	Meadow	Common		Orchards	Scrub			
	Chalk grassland	Green		Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh			
	Heath	Recreation	า	Avenues	Open water			
	Other:							

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	✓✓	Large	Linear		Irregular
Medium		Geometric	Sinuous	✓	Regular
Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

·	Hedgerows	Banks	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	Fence – urban	✓	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway	Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
✓	Major roads	Track	✓	Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
	Rural roads	Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:				

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Town edge (suburban)	Scattered		Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
	Village	Isolated		Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic		Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular		Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern		Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban		Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland		Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings		Earthworks - modern	
	Other:		•	•	•

VIEWS

Panoramic views are possible views from the high ground on the northern edge of the site, across the clay vale to the south. Several settlements are visible in the distance. Didcot power station is visible to the south. There are no views of Cumnor.

Views of the development to the north of the site are filtered by strong boundary vegetation lining the roads that run to the north and north-west of the site.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active (busy road)	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

CEATURE	OLIANITITY		CONDITION									
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor							
Hedgerows	Boundaries to 3 sides		✓									
Arable fields			✓									

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding		Good	✓	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	ea				Degraded site	
Intact					Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features					Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?							
Yes		No	x				
Green	Belt						
Yes	x	No					

Note: no robust boundaries and open

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity				
	None	1	>1	>5	
Conservation Area	х				
Listed buildings	х				
Scheduled monuments	х				
Registered Park and Gardens	х				

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	Adjacent to east (Hurst Hill)
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	THE ONE WITHIN AT LOOP PORE						
		Quantity					
	None	None Part of site Majority of site Whole s					
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
		Х		
What type of right of wa	ay? Bridleway crosses sout	h-west corner of site		

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	✓	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	✓
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes		No	√

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		x	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

	Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	✓	No	
ſ	Comments:				

Panoramic views are possible to the south from the northern edge of the site. Several settlements are visible in the distance. There are no views of Cumnor.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS
Are there conflicts with propo

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	ı	No	X
Site number(s):		.		
Comments:				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	ı	No	x
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	ı	No	
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS				
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS				
Site number(s):				
Comments:				

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		No	x
]]	
IF YES				
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes		No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	<u> </u>	No	
What character area is the site in?				
What capacity has been given?				
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments (if no):				
2014 CAPACITY STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	х	No	
IF YES Is the boundary the same?	Yes	x	No	
What capacity has been given?	Low			
	_	_	_	_
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes		No	X
Comments:		<u> </u>		
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	Γ.,	No	1
	162	X	No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY
Open landscape within the Green Belt. Should not be developed.
NOTES
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location Site 16 South of Cumnor	Date / time / weather	Photographs
	15/09/2016 4.30pm Sunny	1593 - 1612

PLAN REFERENCE Map E

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	X	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
✓	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards	✓	Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:					

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

✓✓	Small		Large	Linear		Irregular
	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	✓	Regular
	Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓ ✓ ✓	Hedgerows		Banks	>>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
✓	Hedgerow trees	✓	Ditches		Fence – rural	✓	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban		Open
	Other:						

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	< <	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
✓	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

This is a very contained landscape. Views into the site are generally blocked by boundary vegetation. Footpaths are contained by hedgerows on one or both sides. Field boundaries are high - >3m and the site has a strong southern edge, consisting of tree belts.

There are open views of the small fields within the site from the footpaths within them. There are only glimpsed or no views from Appleton Road and Cumnor village. There are 2 houses to the west of the site that have open views into one of the paddocks to the immediate east of the properties.

There is a long vista to the wider landscape experienced from the central footpath, which runs north-south through the site. There are no views into the site from public rights of way outside the site.

Some of the key views identified within Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal are within the site.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	OSURE Confined E		Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	RIETY Complex		Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	xPeaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	CONDITION							
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor				
Woodland	Small copses		✓						
Tree belt	Frequent		✓						
Hedgerows	Frequent		✓	✓ Some are outgrown					
Native scrub	Occasional			✓					
Hedgerow trees	Frequent		✓						
Pasture	Frequent			✓					
Arable fields	Occasional			✓					

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	Х
Comments:			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	a Generally good condition			Degraded site	
Intact	features and fields cou improved. Slightly scru	uld be		Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features	appearance. The site represents an example historic field pattern	appearance. The site represents an example of the		Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green	Green Belt					
Yes	x	No				

Note: robust boundaries

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity				
	None	1	>1	>5	
Conservation Area		х			
Listed buildings		х			
Scheduled monuments	х				
Registered Park and Gardens	х				

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

Ougantitus							
	Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

I OBEIO AGGEGG				
Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site		
Χ						
What type of right of way? Two footpaths crossing through centre of site						

DEI	ATION	ICHID	TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	.A HUI	NOUL	10	EXIOLING	SELL	

Strong (2 sides or	r more) Mediu	m (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X Settlement on three sides but not visible in summer - soft edge	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes		No	✓
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	✓	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	√	No	
character?	103		110	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
			х

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIA	AL CADACITY DEVIEW	EIEI D SI IDVE	V EOI
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	AL CAFACIT KLVILW	- I ILLD JORVL	1101
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):	I		<u> </u>
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	х
Site number(s):			<u> </u>
Comments:			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	.		
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):

Rev	1

Comments:

No x

No No

No

No

No x

Yes

Low

VOWITEOCALILARIARIZ	TIDA IMITAL CALACIT REVI	ILVV - I II	
2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		
			_
IF YES			
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes		
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes		
What character area is the site in?			<u>L</u>
What capacity has been given?			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes		
Comments (if no):	-		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	
	<u> </u>		
IF YES			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	X	No	

The boundary is the same for Site A in the capacity study. Site B has been excluded.

Comments:

Is the boundary the same?

What capacity has been given?

The fieldwork had similar findings, however some of the judgements on the site differ, e.g the contribution that the site makes to the setting of the Conservation Area and which of the paddocks within the site is the most suitable for development. The landscape sensitivity findings are the same. The site is a good example of the historic field pattern. The management and general condition of the site could be improved.

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
The site date not have a high conscitutor development. The parthern most field has some notantic	al for day	بصممام	ant haus	

The site does not have a high capacity for development. The northern-most field has some potential for development, however this would be small scale and could come through the Neighbourhood planning process rather than the local plan.

SUMMARY
The site lies within the Oxford Green Belt and therefore should only be developed in 'exceptional circumstances. There are aspects of the site location and landscape structure that would contribute to the special circumstances for removal from the Green Belt, however there are also factors, including the distinctive character type and links to the adjacent Conservation Area, which reduce the capacity of the site for development.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 17 North of Radley	05/00/0040	4055 4000
	25/09/2016	1855 - 1866
	4.30pm Sunny	
	Sumy	

PLAN REFERENCE

Map D

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling	X	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	mile of the man and app	- · <i>J</i> ·		0000.0000		
✓	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:			•		

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	✓	Small		Large		Linear	Irregular	
	√	Medium		Geometric		Sinuous	Regular	
ſ	Other:							

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	✓	Fence – urban	✓	Open
✓	Other: Railway					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River		Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream		Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
v	Ditch	✓	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:				

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	Rural lanes		Public footpath/bridleway	✓	Railway line
	Dual carriageway	Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads	Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
✓	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

There are open views into the northern part of the site from Kennington Road to the north-west and views into the southern part of the site from Church Road and properties to the south. There would be open views of the site from passengers travelling on the railway line.

Glimpses of the site can be seen from the footpath leading north from Lower Radley. The site is not visible from the Thames Path.

Views are of flat, open, arable fields with tree belts to the west. The site has strong links to the wider landscape to the north and east.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active When trains are passing	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	CONDITION									
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor						
Woodland copse	To west and in centre of site		✓								
Tree belt	To west of site		✓								
Individual trees	Within defunct hedgerow boundaries			✓							
Hedgerows	At field boundaries			✓ - There is a strong hedgerow to the north and south- west. The remaining hedgerows are defunct / degraded							
Arable field	Majority of site		✓								
Field in pasture	Small field to west		√								

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:	I			
Noise from railway. Minor.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character are	ea			Degraded site
Intact				Frequent detractors
Rare elements / features				Features in decline

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?									
Yes		No	x						
Green	Green Belt								
Yes	x	No							

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AS	HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE							
		Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5				
Conservation Area	х							
Listed buildings			х					
Scheduled monuments	х							
Registered Park and Gardens	х							

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

IO THE GITE WITHIN AT EGOD LONE							
	Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
				Х
What type of right of wa	ay? Public footpath/ Nation	al trail		•

DEI	ATION	ICHID	TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	.A HUI	NOUL	10	EXIOLING	SELL	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		x	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
-				
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	X (southern	No	
character?		part)		

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	х
Site number(s):			上
Comments:			
Johnnents.			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
liether of the Radley sites are suitable for development.			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
Niether of the Radley sites are suitable for development.			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):			
Comments:			
Johnnents.			

Site number(s):		
Comments:		

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes		No	X
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes		No	
			INO	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes		No	
What character area is the site in?				
What capacity has been given?				
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments (if no):				
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?		T 1	No.	
is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	X	No	
IF YES				
Is the boundary the same? This site extends further north	Yes		No	Х
What capacity has been given?	Low			,
What capacity has been given:	LOW			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes		No	x
Comments:				
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY
Open Landscape within the Green Belt. Setting to village and listed buildings. Separation between Radley and Oxford (Kennington). Should not be developed.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 18 South of Radley		
	25/09/2016	1867 - 1877
	5.30pm	
	Sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	X	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:				

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks	Conifer plantation	Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside	Hanging woodland	Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards	Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh
	Heath	√	Recreation	Avenues	Open water
	Other:			•	

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small	✓	Large	Linear	Irregular
	Medium		Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	✓	Open
✓ Other: Fence with tree line					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:	•		

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Motorway	✓ ✓	Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway	✓	Railway line
Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes	National Trail		Pylons / power lines
Major roads		Track	Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting		Telecom mast
Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
✓	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			

VIEWS

Northern part of site comprises a recreation ground and sports pitches, which are in public use. There are open views of the southern part of the site through the fenced boundary to the south of the recreation ground. The southern part of the site is part of a larger arable field, with long views to the south.

The settlement of Radley is not visible from the majority of the site. Only the northern part of the recreation ground has a relationship with the village.

There are open views of the site from Thrupp Road, to the west of the site.

PERCEPTION

FERCEFION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic To the south	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium To the south	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

CEATURE	OHANTITY	•	CONDITION							
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor					
Recreation ground			✓							
Tree belt	Between the northern and southern parts of the recreation ground and at the northern and eastern boundaries		✓							
Arable field			✓							
Tree line to south				√						
Fields in pasture				✓						

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average		Poor	
Typical of the character are	a				Degraded site	
Intact			Frequent detractors		Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline		

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?					
Yes		No	x		
Green Belt					
Yes	x	No			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE							
		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings	х						
Scheduled monuments			X To the east and west of the site				
Registered Park and Gardens	x						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	
SSSI	
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

		Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	No	Х

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site		
What type of right of way?						

DEI	ATION	ICHID	TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	.A HUI	NOUL	10	EXIOLING	SELIL	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	X only the	No	X
		northern part		
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Partly	No	
character?		-		

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		x	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements? Site number(s): Comments: Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: No in in in it is in it i	VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL C	CAPACITY REVIEW -	FIELD SURVE	Y FO
Site number(s): Comments: Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):		Yes	No	Х
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x No x No x No x No in the same settlement? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Which could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Comments:			
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	х
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Comments:			
Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	x
Comments: Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Neither of the Radley sites are suitable for development WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s):	Neither of the Radiey sites are suitable for development			
Site number(s):				
Site number(s):				
Site number(s):				
Site number(s):	WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS			
Comments:	Site number(s):			
	Comments:			

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS
Site number(s):
Comments:

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?		·	
What capacity has been given?	1	-	
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	<u> </u>		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
, .			
IF YES		 	Ī
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
L			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
	162	INU	
Comments:			

SUMMARY									
Green Belt, recreation area, paddocks and arable field. No well-defined boundary to the south-east. The recreation area is well used. Need to consider the setting to adjacent scheduled monuments.									
NOTES									

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 19South of Wootton		
	28/09/2016	2152 - 2165
	2.15	
	Sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар E

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

_	mile of the man and app	· · <i>y</i> ·		0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1		
	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
√	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:					

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

		Small		Large	Linear	Irregular
	✓	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Ī		Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	✓ Hedgerows	Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
Γ	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	< <	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway Sunken lanes			National Trail	Pylons / power lines	
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads Green lane			Lighting	Telecom mast	
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	own edge Scattered		Mineral workings – current		
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused		
	Hamlet	et Historic		Military		
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield		
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial		
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial		
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course		
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern			
	Other:					

VIEWS

The site is generally well contained by hedgerows and tress, with few open views of the site. Views from public rights of way are limited to glimpses and partial views through gaps in the boundary / internal vegetation.

Views into the site from surrounding properties vary with boundary treatments and orientation of the property. The site is enclosed by settlement on three sides and a number of properties have some intervisibility with the site (verified through reverse views).

Views of the site from adjacent roads are limited to access gates into fields, where the gap in the vegetation allows glimpses into the site.

PERCEPTION

I EKCEI HON					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	,	CON	DITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Tree belt	To south-west		✓		
Fields in pasture	Majority of the site			✓	
Hadgerow trees	External boundaries		✓		
Hedgerows	External boundaries		✓		
Hedgerows	Internal boundaries			✓	

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding		Good	х	Average	х	Poor	
Typical of the character are	ea	At site boundaries		Within the site	·	Degraded site	
Intact						Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features						Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green	Belt					
Yes	x	No				

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HENTIAGE AS	LIS IIIAI COOLD	ETS THAT GOOD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE					
		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings	х						
Scheduled monuments	х						
Registered Park and Gardens	х						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	SAC located approximately 300m to west of the site.
SSSI	
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	IO THE ONE WITHIN AT EOOD LONE						
		Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

I OBEIO ACCESS				
Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
	Х		X	
What type of right of wa	y? Footpath within the site	and bridleway, footpath ar	nd byway at perimeter	

DEI	ATION	ICHID	TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	.A HUI	NOUL	10	EXIOLING	SELIL	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	x	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	х	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		X	
		Part of the separation	
		between Dry Sandford and	
		Wootton	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL CA	PACITY RE	∕IEW - FIEL	_D SURVEY	FORM
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	Х	No	
Site number(s): 22 Dalton Barracks				
Comments: If both were developed in their entirety the settlements of Wooton and Shippon would merge				
in both word dovoloped in their charety the collicination of western and emppor would marge				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	х	No	
	163	^	140	
Site number(s): 20 East of Wooton and 21 North of Wooton				
Comments:				
If all three sites are developed in their entirety, they would significantly increase the settlement of	/vooton.			
	1			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	X
Site number(s):	•		•	
Comments:				
Only site 22 Dalton Barracks has sufficient argument for development within the Green Belt				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS				
Site number(s): Development of all sites (19 – 22)				
Comments: If all four sites were developed in their entirety the settlements of Wooton and Shippon would mere	and h	oth cottle	monte u	ould
significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.	ge and bo	Jui Seine	inents w	oulu
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS				
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
Comments.				

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY				
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X	
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	Т	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No		
What character area is the site in?		•		
What capacity has been given?				
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No		
Comments (if no):				
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Vas	v. Na	_	
is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	x No		
IF YES				
Is the boundary the same? The site extends south to Honeybottom Lane	Yes	No	X	
What capacity has been given?	Medium			
	,			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x No		
Comments:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Some hedgerow features are in decline				
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x No	T	

The recommendations for this site should be upheld if there is a future Green Belt review, however there is currently insufficient

Comments:

justification for removal of this site from the Green Belt.

SUMMARY
Green Belt with no exceptional circumstances for removal from the Green Belt. Not suitable for development. SAC located approximately 300m to west of the site.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 20 East of Wootton		
	28/09/2016	2134 – 2151
	13.00	2166 – 2169
	Sunny	2190

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар Е			

LANDFORM

	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland		
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography		
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made		
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble		
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand		
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff		
х	Other: Gentle south-east facing slope					

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

_	zation and an anataphy: The anataphy and anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy and an anataphy anataphy anataphy and anataphy anataphy anataphy anataphy anataphy and anataphy anataphy ana						
	Arable		Parkland	✓	Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws	
√	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland	
	Mixed farmland	✓	Paddocks		Conifer plantation	Carr	
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland	Coppice	
	Meadow		Common		Orchards	Scrub	
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh	
	Heath	✓	Recreation		Avenues	Open water	
✓	Other: Allotments						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	✓	Small	Large	Linear	Irregular
		Medium	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Γ		Other:			

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	✓	Hedgerows	Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	✓	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
		Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
Γ		Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	< <	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
✓	Other: Playground			

VIEWS

There are open views of the site from the two footpaths that cross the site. Views are of paddocks, subdivided by post and rail fencing, bound by a hedgerow to the east and housing to the west. There are long views to Boars Hill in the east, particularly from the southern part of the site.

The site is visible from local properties, particularly those located on the western boundary of the site. The degree of intervisibility relates to the boundary treatment of the property.

The northern part of the site is a play area, recreation ground and allotments, with public access to each. The central part of the site is the most contained. A number of properties in Boars hill also have intervisibility with the site.

There are open views of the southern part of the site from the section of the B4017 adjacent to the south-western boundary.

PERCEPTION

I LICEI HOI					
VIEWS	Distant From the south	Framed	Intermittent From the north	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	OLIANTITY	CONDITION							
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor				
Allotments	To north-west		✓						
Tree line	To north-west		✓						
Recreation ground	To north-west		✓						
Field in pasture	Majority of site			To north-west					
Hedgerows	Within site and to east		✓						
Remnant hedgerow	To south-west				✓				

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	x	No	
Comments: Pylons				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	~	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	The northern part is condition the south			Degraded site	
Intact				Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?							
Yes		No	x				
Green	Green Belt						
Yes	x	No					

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE					
	Quantity				
	None	1	>1	>5	
Conservation Area	х				
Listed buildings			х		
Scheduled monuments	х				
Registered Park and Gardens	х				

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS TH	IAT COLLI D BE VEEECTED	BY DEVEL ODMENT WITH	IN THE SITE
WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS IN	IA I GUULU DE AFFEGTEU	DI DEVELOPMENI WII I	IIN 1 HE 211 E

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	Quantity				
	None	Part of site	Whole site		
Flood Zone 3	х				
Flood Zone 2	х				

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	х	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
X				
What type of right of wa	ay? Public Footpath.			

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	Х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Partly	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Partly	No	
character?		_		

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
			x

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments:	•			
Properties on Boars Hill				

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - HDA INITIAL CAF	PACITY RE	/IEW - FIE	LD SURVEY	/ FORM
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	х	No	
Site number(s): 22 Dalton Barracks				
Comments: If both were developed in their entirety the settlements of Wooton and Shippon would merge				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	х	No	
Site number(s): 19 South of Wooton and 21 North of Wooton			<u> </u>	
Comments: If all three sites are developed in their entirety, they would significantly increase the settlement of V	Vooton.			
		Ī		
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	X
Site number(s):				
Comments: Only site 22 Dalton Barracks has sufficient argument for development within the Green Belt				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s): Development of all sites (19 – 22)				
Comments:				
If all four sites were developed in their entirety the settlements of Wooton and Shippon would mero significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.	ge and bo	oth settle	ements w	ould/
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Comments				

Comments:

F YES s the whole site within the assessment? Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? What capacity study Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? What capacity study Should the same? Site extends further north FYES s the boundary the same? Site extends further north What capacity has been given? Medium Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes No Comments:	2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
s the whole site within the assessment? Yes No Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No Comments (if no): 1014 CAPACITY STUDY Yes No	Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	Х
s the whole site within the assessment? Yes No Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No Comments (if no): 1014 CAPACITY STUDY Yes No				
Are the character judgements still relevant? What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No Comments (if no): **Real ACAPACITY STUDY** Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? **Yes No **Types** **No **PYES** Is the boundary the same? Site extends further north Yes No What capacity has been given? **Medium** Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes No **Comments:** **Should the recommendations be upheld?** **Yes No	IF YES		T	
What character area is the site in? What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No Comments (if no): Cold CAPACITY STUDY			No	,
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No No No No No No No No No FYES Should the same? Site extends further north Yes No What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes No Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes X No Should the recommendations Ye	Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	•
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes No Comments (if no): **TYES** Sthe boundary the same? Site extends further north What capacity has been given? **Medium** Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes No Comments: **Should the recommendations be upheld?** Yes No	What character area is the site in?		<u> </u>	
Comments (if no): 2014 CAPACITY STUDY S the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes x No FYES S the boundary the same? Site extends further north Yes No What capacity has been given? Medium Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes No Comments:	What capacity has been given?			
Comments (if no): 2014 CAPACITY STUDY S the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes x No FYES S the boundary the same? Site extends further north Yes No What capacity has been given? Medium Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes No Comments:				
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No No No No No No No	Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	,
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No No No No No No No No No No	Comments (if no):		<u> </u>	
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No No No No No No No No No No				
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No No No No No No No No No No				
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No No No No No No No No No No				
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No No No No No No No No No No				
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No Yes x No No No No No No No No No No	2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes No No No No No No No No No No No No No N	Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	x No	,
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes No No No No No No No No No No No No No N			<u> </u>	
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes No No No No No No No No No No No No No N	IF YES			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Comments: Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes No	Is the boundary the same? Site extends further north	Yes	No	Х
Comments: Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No	What capacity has been given?	Mediur	n l	
Comments: Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No		I		
Comments: Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No				
Should the recommendations be upheld? Yes x No	Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	Х
	Comments:	I	<u> </u>	
	Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x No	,
Comments: The recommendations for this site should be upheld if there is a future Green Belt review, however there is currently insuffice.	Comments:		<u> </u>	

SUMMART	
Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development.	

NOTES

CLIBABAADV

The land within the site, but outside the 2014 assessment (excluding the recreation area, allotments and playground) has a higher potential for development, should another Green Belt review occur in the future. The northern fields are more enclosed and intimate. The tree line to the east could be strengthened to forma a robust green belt boundary. The loss of openness of the northern fields would be lower than in the southern part of the site.

SURVEY REF

Location Site 21 North of Wootton	Date / time / weather	Photographs
	28/09/2019 15.30 Sunny	2170 - 2184

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар Е			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	mile of the more and an area app	,-		00110010000	
	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
√	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks	Conifer plantation	Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside	Hanging woodland	Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards	Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues	Open water
	Other:	-			•

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	✓	Large	Linear	Irregular
Medium	<	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓ Conspicuous

	✓	Hedgerows	Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
		Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
		Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
ſ		Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:	•		

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	✓	Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads		Track		Wide verges	✓	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
✓	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
✓	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
✓	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:		·	

VIEWS

The site is extremely open and exposed. There are open views of the site from the bridleway to the north-east of the site and both footpaths running through the site. There are also clear views of the site from properties to the east and west.

There are open views across the site to Boars Hill from the B4017 to the south-west of the site.

Views are of fields in pasture, with uninterrupted views allowed by post and wire field boundaries. There are remnants of hedges within the site. The northern, eastern and western boundaries are vegetated, providing a soft edge to the settlement. Views are rural in character.

PERCEPTION

FLICEFIION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OHANTITY	CONDITION				
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	
Tree belts	To settlement edges		✓			
Fields in pasture	Majority of the site		✓			
Hedgerows	External boundaries		✓			
Hedgerows	Internal boundaries				✓	

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments: Telephone wires (minor)			I	

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor
Typical of the character are	эа	Internal features Rest of site is in condition		Degraded site
Intact		Condition		Frequent detractors
Rare elements / features				Features in decline

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green Belt						
Yes	x	No				

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE							
		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings			х				
Scheduled monuments	х						
Registered Park and Gardens	х						

|--|

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

IO THE OTTE WITHIN AT EGOD EGNE							
	Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site		
X						
What type of right of way? Public footpaths and bridleway.						

DEI	ATION	ICHID	TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	.A HUI	NOUL	10	EXIOLING	SELIL	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes		No	х

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
X			
Between Wooton and Henwood			

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments:				
Henwood and Boars Hill				

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes		No	Х
	100			
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	х	No	
Site number(s): 20 East of Wooton and 19 South of Wooton				<u> </u>
Comments:				
f all three sites are developed in their entirety, they would significantly increase the settlement of	f Wooton.			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	x
Site number(s):		<u> </u>		<u>. </u>
Comments:				
Only site 22 Dalton Barracks has sufficient argument for development within the Green Belt				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS				
Site number(s): Development of all sites (19 – 22)				
Comments:				
f all four sites were developed in their entirety the settlements of Wooton and Shippon would me significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.	erge and bo	oth settlem	ents v	wou
organical may increase in cize. The purpose of the Green Ben would be number.				

Rev	1

Comments:

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Comments (if no): 2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes x IF YES Is the boundary the same? This site is larger What capacity has been given? Medium / Low Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Yes Comments:	ES Le boundary the same? This site is larger Let capacity has been given? At capacity has been given? At there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes Mediur	N / Low	lo
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Comments (if no): 2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes x IF YES Is the boundary the same? This site is larger What capacity has been given? Medium / Low	ES le boundary the same? This site is larger at capacity has been given?	Yes Mediur	N / Low	lo
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Comments (if no): 2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes x IF YES Is the boundary the same? This site is larger Yes ES Le boundary the same? This site is larger	Yes	N		
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Comments (if no): 2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes x IF YES Is the boundary the same? This site is larger Yes ES Le boundary the same? This site is larger	Yes	N		
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Comments (if no): 2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? Yes X	e site within one of the areas covered by the study?			
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Comments (if no):		Yes	x N	0
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Comments (if no):				
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes				
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes				
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes				
What capacity has been given? Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld? Yes	nments (if no):			
		Yes	N	lo
	at capacity has been given?			
What character area is the site in?				
Are the character judgements still relevant? Yes		Yes	N	0
s the whole site within the assessment?		Yes	N	lo
	e whole site within the assessment?		N	0

SUMMARY
Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings.
NOTES

SURVEY REF

Date / time / weather	Photographs
28/09/2019 16.00 Sunny	2185 - 2189
	28/09/2019 16.00

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар F			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
✓	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common	Orchards	✓	Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation	Avenues		Open water
✓	Other: Army Barracks				

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small	✓	Large	Linear	Irregular
	Medium		Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Γ	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

,	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	✓	Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes		Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	✓	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane	✓	Lighting		Telecom mast
✓	Other: Runway						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel		Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications		Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	✓✓	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins		Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats		Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic		Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern		
	Other:	<u>.</u>			

VIEWS

There are open and panoramic views across the site from Honeybottom Lane to the north. These views consist of the large open area of runways, with Didcot Power Station and the North Wessex Downs escarpment visible in the distance. The large commercial buildings to the south-east of the site are also visible. There are open and panoramic views north from Barrow Road, to the immediate south of the site.

There are open views of the site from the properties lining Faringdon Road, to the west of the site, with some views from the road itself. The majority of the views from this road are filtered by boundary vegetation. Views consist of the large open airfield, with large industrial buildings to the east and some housing visible to the south-east.

To the east of the site, there are open views from Cholswell Road. These views contain the recreation ground to the north and east, with the red brick dwellings within the airfield visible beyond security fencing and ornamental tree planting to the east. The western-most dwellings on Rookery Close (to the south-east of the site) have open views of the airfield and the properties lining Sycamore Close and Hawthorn Avenue have open views of the Barracks.

Views from Blackhorse Lane to the north-west are blocked by hedgerows lining the road and tree belts on the boundary of the site.

Glimpses of the site can be seen through gaps in the vegetation within Dry Sandford Nature Reserve.

Distant views from Boars Hill have been identified from reverse views.

PERCEPTION

I LITOLI HOIT					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic At edges	Varied	Simple	Uniform Most of the site
TEXTURE Smooth		Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR Monochrome		Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote At runways	Vacant	Peaceful	Active Within settlement	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	-	CON	NDITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Tree belt	To west		✓		
Hedgerows	To perimeter		✓		
Individual trees	Within built –up area		✓		
Rough grassland	Majority of site			✓	
Native scrub	At edges		✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	Х	No	
Comments: Large industrial buildings are clearly visible.	1			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding		Good	✓	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character are Intact Rare elements / features	ea	Individual features and boundary vegetation		Majority of the site. Not typical of the character ar Internal features removed		Degraded site Frequent detractors Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB'	?		
Yes		No	x
Green	Belt		
Yes	x	No	

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity				
<u> </u>	None	1	>1	>5	
Conservation Area	х				
Listed buildings			X To south-east of site		
Scheduled monuments	х				
Registered Park and Gardens	х				

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	Within 300m of north-western site boundary
SSSI	To immediate north-west of site.
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	Quantity						
	None	None Part of site Majority of site Whole site					
Flood Zone 3	X Adjacent to part of western boundary						
Flood Zone 2	X Adjacent to part of western boundary						

PUBLIC ACCESS

i oblio nooloo				
Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If ves:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
				x
What type of right of wa	y? Byway open to all traffic			

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			X

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	Х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	Х
-				
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Partly	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
X			
Between Shippon, Dry Sandford and Wooton			

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	x	No	
Comments:		•		•
Southern edge of Wooton and Site 19 South of Wooton				

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 – HDA INITIA CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	L CAPACITY RE	VIEW - FIELD	SURVE	y for
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	х	No	
Site number(s): 19 South of Wooton and 20 East of Wooton		<u> </u>		
Comments: If all were developed in their entirety the settlements of Wooton and Shippon would merge				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes		No	х
Site number(s):	I	l l		
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	x
Site number(s):	•			
Comments: Only this site 22 has sufficient argument for development within the Green Belt (previously de	veloped land)			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s): Development of all sites (19 – 22)				
Comments: If all four sites were developed in their entirety the settlements of Wooton and Shippon would significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.	merge and bo	oth settlem	ients v	vould
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Comments:				

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
IEWEO			
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
IF YES			
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
What capacity has seen given.			
		, , ,	
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
Comments.			

SUMMARY

Parts of the site, previously developed, could be removed from the Green Belt and developed. The main open area should be assessed in greater detail to test landscape sensitivity to further development. The large industrial buildings and barracks could be redeveloped without detriment to the Green Belt. There is the potential for other areas within the site to be used for open space within a proposed development.

NOTES

Consideration should be given to the ecological designations to the north-west of the site. The runway area is extremely open and would not be suitable for built development. There are a large number of trees within the barracks, which should be surveyed and retained where possible.

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 23 East of East Hanney		
	23/09/2016	1794 - 1813
	1pm	
	Sunny	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар G			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	g Steep valley side	
x	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand
х	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable	Parkland	✓	Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws		
✓	Pasture	Horticulture		Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland		
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks		Conifer plantation	Carr		
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside		Hanging woodland	Coppice		
	Meadow	Common		Orchards	Scrub		
	Chalk grassland	Green		Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh		
	Heath	Recreation		Avenues	Open water		
✓	Other: Biomass crop - Miscanthus						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	< \	Large	Linear	Irregular
Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

~	Hedgerows	Banks	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
~	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	Fence – urban	✓	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current				
✓ ✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused				
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military				
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield				
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial				
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial				
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course				
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern					
	Other: New development under construction to the north							

VIEWS

There are open views into the site from Steventon Road to the north and partial and glimpsed views from the A338 to the west, which has a hedgerow boundary. The northern boundary is open to the road.

Views are currently foreshortened by the crop, which is approximately 2.5m high. When the crop is harvested, there will be long views across the site to the North Wessex Downs escarpment to the south. These views are currently experienced from the footpath to the south of the site, which also has open views of the site to the north.

The site is contained to the west by a small tree copse to the south-west and the hedgerow lining the road. Only one property within East Hanney has any intervisibility with the site. In contrast, the northern, southern and eastern boundaries are open.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent From north	Panoramic At edges	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active Near roads	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OHANTITY	CONDITION						
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor			
Tree belt	To north-west		✓					
Tree copse	In south-western corner		√ (semi-mature)					
Hedgerows	Along western boundary				✓ Gappy and degraded			
Miscanthus	Crop – extends beyond site		✓					

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	х	No	
Comments: Pylons Noise from the road to the west. Intermittent noise from the railway				

What is the general condition of the site?

Wilat io the general cond		or the one.					
Outstanding		Good	✓	Average		Poor	
Typical of the character are	ea	Some features in decline		Degraded site		Degraded site	
Intact				Frequent detractors		Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline		Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?					
Yes		No	x		
Green Belt					
Yes		No	x		

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AG		Quantity				
	None	1	>1	>5		
Conservation Area		х				
Listed buildings	х					
Scheduled monuments	х					
Registered Park and Gardens	х					

|--|

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

		Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	Χ	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
		Х		
What type of right of wa	y? Footpath			

DEI	ATIONISHID	TO EXISTIN	CETTI	CMENT
REL	A I IUNSHIP	I O EXISTIN	GSELLL	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes		No	х

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
			x

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes		No	X
	162		NO	*
Site number(s):				
Comments:				
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney				
Comments:				
Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village				
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	x
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments:	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments:	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments:	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments:	Yes		No	X
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Yes		No	x
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Yes		No	x

Rev	1	

Comments:

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	2
F YES			
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	\dagger
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	o
Comments (if no):	103	140	\perp
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	x No	
IF YES			
Is the boundary the same? The boundary of this site does not extend as far east.	Yes	No	2
What capacity has been given?	Medium	.	
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x No	T
Comments:		<u> </u>	
New development to the north of the site.			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	

The site is divorced from the existing settlement edge of East Hanney and has a strong relationship with the wider landscape. The site should not be developed.

Comments:

SUMMARY	
The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village.	
NOTES	

SURVEY REF

Date / time / weather	Photographs
23/09/2016 2.30pm Sunny	1814 - 1822
	23/09/2016 2.30pm

PLAN REFERENCE

Map G			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
X	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			•

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation	Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	✓	Set-aside		Hanging woodland	Coppice
	Meadow		Common	✓	Orchards (remnant)	Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation		Avenues	Open water
	Other:				<u> </u>	

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Small	✓	Large	Linear	Irregular
	Medium		Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Hedgerows		Banks	✓	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
Hedgerow trees	✓	Ditches	<	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	✓	Open
Other:						

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
✓	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	\	Rural lanes		Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads		Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:	-		<u> </u>		•	

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered			Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village		Isolated		Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	✓	Historic		Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular		Hill forts	Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings		Modern		Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated		Urban		Moats	Commercial
	Linear		Manor/parkland		Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings		Earthworks - modern	
	Other:			•		

VIEWS

The site is open to view from the roads to the north (Summertown) and east (A338). There are also open views from the western edge of the footpath to the south-east of the site and from Bradfield Grove Farm to the south.

Only glimpses of the site can be seen from the footpath adjacent to the Letcombe Brook to the west. The vegetation lining the brook screens most of the views. The southern edge of East Hanney has varied intervisibility with the site. The majority of views from the settlement are screened by intervening vegetation.

From within the site there are long views south and the North Wessex Downs escarpment is clearly visible.

PERCEPTION

FERGEFIION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent west	Panoramic east	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium west	Large east	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed west	Open east	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth east	Textured west	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY		CONDITION						
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor				
Tree belt	Along Letcombe Brook and within site to south-west		✓						
Orchard	To west of site				√ remnant				
Arable field			✓						
Set aside				✓					

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	X	No	
Comments: Noise from road and intermittent noise from the railway (Minor)				

What is the general condition of the site?

What is the general contained of the site?								
Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor				
Typical of the character are	Varies across the site. The eastern side is more typical of the character area. Degraded site		Degraded site					
Intact				Frequent detractors				
Rare elements / features				Features in decline				

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?								
Yes		No	x					
Green	Green Belt							
Yes		No	x					

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE								
		Quantity						
	None	1	>1	>5				
Conservation Area		х						
Listed buildings		х						
Scheduled monuments	х							
Registered Park and Gardens	х							

WILDLIEF DECICALATIONS	THAT COLL D DE	ACCEPTED BY DEVEL	ODMENIT WITHIN THE CITE
WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS	I TAI GUULU DE A	AFFEGIED DI DEVEL	OPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

		Quantity				
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site		
Flood Zone 3	X Adjacent to the west					
Flood Zone 2	X Adjacent to the west					

PUBLIC ACCESS

I OBEIO ACCESS				
Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	1

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
				Х
What type of right of wa	<pre>y? Footpath along Letcoml</pre>	be Brook		

DEI	ATION	ICHID	TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	.A HUI	NOUL	10	EXIOLING	SELL	

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	Х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	To west	No	To east
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	partially	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		х	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	x
Comments:	•	•	•

Site number(s): Comments: Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Yes x No Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s): Comments:	Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Yes x No Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes		No	Х
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Yes x No Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Yes x No Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Site number(s):				<u> </u>
Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No 3 Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Comments:				
Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No 3 Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.					
Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No 3 Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.					
Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No 3 Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.					
Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No 3 Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.					
Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No 3 Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Site number(s): 23 East of East Hanney Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development.	Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x	No	T
Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No : Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Comments: Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No 2 Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Development of both sites would significantly increase the size of the village Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No x Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Comments: Niether site is suitable for development. WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	x
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Site number(s): 24 South or 23 East Hanney		1		
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):					
Site number(s):	Site number(s):	Niether site is suitable for development.				
Site number(s):	Site number(s):					
Site number(s):	Site number(s):					
Site number(s):	Site number(s):					
		WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS				
Comments:	Comments:	Site number(s):				
		Comments:				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS		Site number(s):			•	

Comments:

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	x
IF YES			
Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			
	•		
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	x
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES			x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same?			x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same?			X
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given?	Yes	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?			x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given?	Yes	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	x
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study? IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	x
IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Comments:	Yes	No	x
IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Comments: Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	x
IF YES Is the boundary the same? What capacity has been given? Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork? Comments: Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	x

SUMMARY	
The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village. The remnant orchard is more contained but is adjacent to the Conservation Area and listed buildings.	
NOTES	

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 25A North of Marcham		
(east)	26/09/2016	2021 - 2026
	Overcast	
	15.30	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар F			

LANDFORM

X	Flat	Strongly rolling	X	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating Gentle valley side slop		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			•	

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	titboot Lit tiok an that app	<i></i>	O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		Conopicacao		
	Arable		Parkland	✓	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
√	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common		Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation		Avenues		Open water
	Other:						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

		Small		Large	✓	Linear		Irregular
	< <	Medium	~	Geometric		Sinuous	✓	Regular
ſ		Other:						

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows		Banks	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	✓	Ditches	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line	Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	< <	Public footpath/bridleway	Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting	Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
✓	Other: Allotments to noth-east	;	·	

VIEWS

The site is well contained by hedgerow boundaries. Views from the bridleway to the north are only possible through occasional, small gaps in the hedgerow, or at field gates.

Views of the site from local properties are restricted to the easternmost dwellings on Hyde copse and Anson Close, to the southwest of the site. There will also be open views from the newly built dwellings to the south of the site, once they are in operation.

Views of the site consist of rectilinear fields in pasture, with hedgerow boundaries and often a backdrop of woodland.

PERCEPTION

I EROLI HOR					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	CHANTITY		CON	DITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Ancient woodland	Copse in south- west corner of the site		√		
Hedgerows	Field boundaries	1			One of the hedgerow boundaries is defunct
Field in pasture			✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average		Poor	
Typical of the character are	Consistent character No detractors Generally good condi			·	Degraded site	
Intact	Certerally good condi-	ition			Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features					Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?				
Yes		No	x	
Green Belt				
Yes		No	x	

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AS	HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE						
		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area	х						
Listed buildings	х						
Scheduled monuments		X To north-east of site					
Registered Park and Gardens	×						

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

MILDEN E DEGIGITATIONS	THAT GOODS BE ALL EGILS BY SEVELOR MERT WITHIN THE GIVE
SAC	
SSSI	
National Nature Reserve	
Local Nature Reserve	
Ancient Woodland	In south-west corner of the site

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

		Quantity						
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site				
Flood Zone 3	х							
Flood Zone 2	х							

PUBLIC ACCESS

I OBEIO ACCESS				
Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
		Х		
What type of right of wa	ay? Bridleway to the north		_	

DEI	ATIONSHID	TO EVICTING	SETTLEMENT
REL	AIIONSHIP	I O EXISTING	SELLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		X	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	х		

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes		No	✓
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	✓	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	✓	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		√	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

VOWH LOCAL PLAN PART 2 – HDA INITIAL C			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Site number(s):			<u> </u>
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x No)
Site number(s): 25B North of Marcham (west)			
Comments:			
If both were developed in their entirety the size of the settlement would increase dramatically			
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
25B North of Marcham (west) is not suitable for development.			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS			
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS			
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	_
What character area is the site in?			
What capacity has been given?			
	I		
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	I		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	162	NO	Х
IF YES			
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
The state of the state and the 2040 Saldward O		N ₂	
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:	<u> </u>		
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments:			

SUMMARY

Strong relationship to new development to west (within western fields). There should be no development within ancient woodland or within a 15m buffer of the edge of the ancient woodland. Development of the whole site would require extensive mitigation to the eastern and southern boundaries.

NOTES

Access? Consideration for the setting to the Scheduled Monument. No development or access within 15m of Ancient Woodland.

SURVEY REF

Location Site 25B North of Marcham	Date / time / weather	Photographs
(west)	26/09/2016 Overeast	2027 - 2033
	Overcast 16.00	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар F			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
X	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:		<u>. </u>	

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

_=	tion an tracap	٠., .	Occasional Evident		Conopidadao		
	Arable	✓	Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
✓	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common		Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	✓	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	✓	Avenues		Open water
	Other:						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	✓	Large		Linear	Irregular
Medium		Geometric	✓	Sinuous	Regular
Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	✓	Wall – rural eg dry stone
Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban		Open
Other:					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	✓	Rural lanes		Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes		National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	✓	Track		Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
	Rural roads		Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
✓	Other: Through Denman College						

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge		Scattered	✓	Church / chapel		Mineral workings – current	
✓ ✓	Village		Isolated		Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused	
	Hamlet	✓	Historic		Fortifications		Military	
	Farmsteads		Vernacular		Hill forts		Airfield	
	Agricultural buildings		Modern		Ruins		Industrial	
	Nucleated		Urban		Moats		Commercial	
	Linear	✓	Manor/parkland		Earthworks - historic		Golf course	
	Low density		Landmark buildings		Earthworks - modern			
✓	Other: Denman College	•				-		

VIEWS

The site is extremely well contained from its surroundings by 2.5m boundary walls and tree belts within the walls.	Views are only
possible from the grounds of Denman College.	

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE QUANTITY Excellent Good Average						
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	
Tree belt	At edges of site	✓ Mature and intact				
Avenues	Within site		✓ Semi-mature			
Individual trees and small tree groups	Part of designed landscape		√ Semi-mature			
Stone Walls	To northern and eastern boundaries	✓				
Pasture			✓			

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	No	✓
Comments:			

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor	
Typical of the character are	ea Good co	character ndition the internal planting		Degraded site	
Intact	is semi-n			Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features				Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?						
Yes		No	x			
Green Belt						
Yes		No	x			

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

		Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5			
Conservation Area		х					
Listed buildings			х				
Scheduled monuments	х						
Registered Park and Gardens	х						

|--|

SAC			
SSSI			
National Nature Reserve			
Local Nature Reserve			
Ancient Woodland			

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

		Quantity					
	None	one Part of site Majority of site Whole site					
Flood Zone 3	X						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	No	X
			ļ

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
What type of right of v	vay?			

DEI	ATIONSHIP	TO	EVICTING	CETTI	CMENT
KEL	AHUNSHIP	- 10	EXISTING	SELIL	LEWENT

	Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
ſ			V	
			Part of Denman College	

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		√	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes		No	✓
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	✓	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	✓	No	

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
			✓

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	√
Comments:			

	Yes	No	х
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	163	140	^
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x No	1
		X 1.0	
Site number(s): 25A North of Marcham (east)			
Comments:			
If both were developed in their entirety the size of the settlement would increase dramatically			
Could make them are site by developed without simplificant consulative imported	Vas	No	T
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No	Х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			
This site is not suitable for development.			
	_		
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	3		
Comments:			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS			
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	ı		

Yes	No	х
Yes	No	
Yes	No	
Yes	No	
Yes	No	X
Yes	No	
	No.	
Yes	NO	
Yes	No	
	Yes Yes Yes	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No

SUMMARY

Parkland landscape with semi-mature internal features and mature boundary features – originally associated with Marcham Park (1875 OS map). Setting to Denman College listed building (previously known as Marcham House) and Marcham Conservation Area.

NOTES

Semi-mature features within the site replicate the historic planting pattern shown on the 1875 OS map.

SURVEY REF

Location	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Site 26 North of Steventon		
	26/09/2016	2008 - 2020
	14.00	
	Overcast but clear	

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар С			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	X	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling		Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating		Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating		Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp		Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope		Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:			<u>.</u>	

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

THE CONTAINE	tion an triat apply: Cocacional Evident Conspicação						
√ Arable	Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws				
Pasture	Horticulture	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland				
Mixed farmland	Paddocks	Conifer plantation	Carr				
Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside	Hanging woodland	Coppice				
Meadow	Common	Orchards	Scrub				
Chalk grassland	Green	Scattered trees	Wetland / marsh				
Heath	Recreation	Avenues	Open water				
Other:	· · ·						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

Small	✓	Large	Linear	Irregular
Medium		Geometric	Sinuous	Regular
Other:				

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓ ✓ Evident ✓ ✓ ✓ Conspicuous

,	Hedgerows	Banks	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line	Fence – urban	✓	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes	National Trail	✓	Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	\	Track	Wide verges		Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓ ✓	Village	Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
✓	Agricultural buildings	Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
✓	Other: Substation	·	•	

VIEWS

The site is part of a large arable field which extends to the north and south. The land to the south is in the process of being developed for housing. The field remains open to the north, with clear views of the southernmost properties of Drayton from within the site.

Views of the site are possible from gaps in the vegetation lining Steventon Road, to the east. There are currently open views of the site from the newly constructed dwellings to the south of the site and from the existing northern edge of Steventon. Views are of a large arable field, with pylons crossing the field and housing to the north-east, east and south.

There are no public rights of way with views of the site.

PERCEPTION

PERCEPTION					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	OLIANITITY	•	CONDITION						
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor				
Hedgerows	At eastern boundary			✓ Overgrown and gappy					
Hedgerows	At western boundary		✓						
Arable field			✓						

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	✓	No	
Comments:	<u> </u>			
Pylons				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor
Typical of the character are	er area		Degraded site	
Intact				Frequent detractors
Rare elements / features				Features in decline

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?					
Yes		No	x		
Green Belt					
Yes		No	x		

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

112111111111111111111111111111111111111	Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5		
Conservation Area	х					
Listed buildings	х					
Scheduled monuments	х					
Registered Park and Gardens	х					

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

		Quantity							
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site					
Flood Zone 3	х								
Flood Zone 2	х								

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	No	X
			ļ

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
What type of right of wa	y?			

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	X		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	х		

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	Х	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)		To the north		
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	Х
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	Х	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
	X		

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site? Yes x No

Comments:

The row of houses on the southern edge of Drayton (to the south of the A34) are visible. The permitted development sites to the south and to the east of Steventon Road are visible.

Site number(s): Comments:	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	X
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):		res	NO	X
Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement? Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments:	Site number(s):			
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Comments:			
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				1
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Yes No Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	No	Х
Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts? Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Site number(s):		•	•
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Comments:			
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):				
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	No.	
WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):		Yes	No	
Site number(s):		Yes	No	
Site number(s):	Site number(s):	Yes	No	
Site number(s):	Site number(s):	Yes	No	
Site number(s):	Site number(s):	Yes	No	
Site number(s):	Site number(s):	Yes	No	
Site number(s):	Site number(s):	Yes	No	
	Site number(s):	Yes	No	
Comments:	Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Yes	No	
	Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Yes	No	
	Site number(s): Comments: WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS Site number(s):	Yes	No	

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOOLD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS
Site number(s):
Comments:

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?		·	
What capacity has been given?	1	-	
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):	<u> </u>		
2014 CAPACITY STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
, .			
IF YES		 	Ī
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?			
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
Comments:			
L			
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
	162	INU	
Comments:			

SUMMARY
The land north of the site is key to the separation between Steventon and Drayton. Potential for development south of the transmission line easement.
NOTES
Introduce Green Infrastructure to the north of the site, maintaining required easement to power lines.

SURVEY REF

Location Site 27 East of Kingston	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Bagpuize	28/09/2016 10.00 Sunny	2034 - 2046

PLAN REFERENCE

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
x	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach - sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:	•	•	

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks	Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	✓	Set-aside	Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green	Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation	Avenues		Open water
	Other:					

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Small		Large	Linear		Irregular
✓	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous	✓	Regular
	Other:		·			

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

✓	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
✓	Hedgerow trees	Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	Open
	Other:				

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

River	Canal	Res	ervoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream	Lake	Dry	valley	Tidal mudflat
Ditch	Pond	Wint	erbourne	Salt march
Other:				

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway		Rural lanes	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
✓	Dual carriageway		Sunken lanes	National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	< <	Track	Wide verges	✓	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads		Green lane	Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge		Scattered	Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village		Isolated	Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	✓	Historic	Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular	Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings		Modern	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated		Urban	Moats	Commercial
	Linear	✓	Manor/parkland	Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density		Landmark buildings	Earthworks - modern	
	Other:				

VIEWS

There are open views of the site from the A415 to the south through the frequent gaps in the southern boundary hedgerow. Views are of a large, flat, arable field contained by trees.

The site is visible from Woodhouse Fruit Farm, however there are no views of the site from the village.

The public rights of way running through the site is contained by hedgerows on both sides, with only occasional glimpses of the site available, either through the field gates, or through the vegetation in winter.

There are no views from the dual carriageway to the north.

PERCEPTION

I LICOLI IIOIC					
VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active To north-noise from road	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

	OLIANTITY	,	CONDITION				
FEATURE	QUANTITY	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor		
Tree belt (broadleaf)	To west of site		✓				
Tree belt (mixed / conifer)	To the east of the site		✓				
Hedgerow	On southern boundary				√		
Hedgerows	Along public right of way		✓				
Arable fields			✓				

Comments: Telephone wire running parallel to PROW - minor	

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character are	Generally intact and go condition Few detractors	ood		Degraded site Frequent detractors
Rare elements / features				Features in decline

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?					
Yes		No	x		
Green Belt					
Yes		No	x		

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

HERITAGE AG	Quantity					
	None	1	>1	>5		
Conservation Area		х				
Listed buildings	х					
Scheduled monuments	х					
Registered Park and Gardens	х					

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	THIN AT LOOP LONE						
		Quantity					
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site			
Flood Zone 3	х						
Flood Zone 2	х						

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site				
	Х							
What type of right of way? Other route with public access								

DEI	ATIONEL	ID TO	EXISTING	CETTI	CMENT
REL	AHONSH	טו או	EXISTING	SELIL	LEMENI

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
			х

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		Х	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes	Southern	No	
(Excludes permitted development sites)		area		
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Northern	No	
		Area		
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	х	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
		x Between Kingston Bagpuize and Fyfield	

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): 30 Fyfield				
Comments: Potential conflicts with Fyfield area of search. Development of both would significantly erode the s settlements.	eparation	betwee	en the tw	0

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): 28 South of Kingston Bagpuize and 29 West of Kingston Bagpuize				
Comments:				
Development of all three sites in their entirety would significantly increase the size of the village.				

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	X	No	
Site number(s): This site in combination with parts of 29 West of Kingston Bagpuize and 28 Sout	h of King	ston Ba	agpuize	
Comments: This site in combination with the western part of site 28 and the north-eastern part of site 29.				

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Development of all sites (27 - 30) in their entirety

Comments:

Development of all sites would significantly erode the separation between Kingston Bagpuize and Fyfield and would significantly increase the size of the village.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): This site in combination with parts of 29 West of Kingston Bagpuize and 28 South of Kingston Bagpuize

Comments:

This site in combination with the western part of site 28 and the north-eastern part of site 29.

2008 LANDSCAPE STUDY			
Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	X
IF YES Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	No	
What character area is the site in?	'		
What capacity has been given?			
	1		
Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments (if no):			
			ļ
SALL CARACITY OTHER			
2014 CAPACITY STUDY Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	No	х
15 the Site Within One of the group covered by the state.			
IF YES			
Is the boundary the same?	Yes	No	
What capacity has been given?	1		
Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	No	
	169	140	
Comments:			
			•
Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	No	
Comments:	<u> </u>		

SUMMARY

Part of the setting to the Conservation Area and addressing.	forms the eastern approach to the village. Open views to the road would need

NOTES

Retain high quality landscape features where possible. Introduce new planting along the southern boundary adjacent to the Abingdon Road.

SURVEY REF

Location Site 28 South of Kingston	Date / time / weather	Photographs
Bagpuize	28/09/2016 11.00 Sunny	2047 - 2080

PLAN REFERENCE

Мар Н			

LANDFORM

x	Flat	Strongly rolling	Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
	Plateau	Rolling	Steep valley side	Complex topography
	Plain	Undulating	Gentle valley side slope	Artificial/man-made
	Steep	Gently undulating	Broad valley	Beach – pebble
	Upland	Scarp	Narrow valley	Beach – sand
	Lowland	Dip slope	Dry valley	Cliff
	Other:	·	<u>. </u>	

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

_						
✓	Arable	Parkland	~	Broadleaved woodland	✓	Tree belts / shaws
✓	Pasture	Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland	Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow	Common		Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland	Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath	Recreation		Avenues		Open water
	Other:					

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	✓	Small		Large	Linear	✓	Irregular
	< <	Medium	✓	Geometric	Sinuous		Regular
Ī		Other:					

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

,	Hedgerows	Banks	✓	Shelter belt / Woodland		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	Ditches	✓	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
,	Clipped hedges	Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	✓	Open
,	Other: Line of Poplar					

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	River	Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream	Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
✓	Ditch	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:			

ACCESS / COMMUNICATIONS – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Motorway	Rural lanes	✓	Public footpath/bridleway		Railway line
	Dual carriageway	Sunken lanes		National Trail		Pylons / power lines
	Major roads	Track		Wide verges	✓	Phone poles / lines
✓	Rural roads	Green lane		Lighting		Telecom mast
	Other:					

SETTLEMENT / OTHER FEATURES – tick all that apply: ✓ Occasional ✓✓ Evident ✓✓✓ Conspicuous

	Town edge	Scattered		Church / chapel	Mineral workings – current
✓	Village	Isolated		Graveyard	Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet	Historic		Fortifications	Military
	Farmsteads	Vernacular		Hill forts	Airfield
	Agricultural buildings	Modern	✓	Ruins	Industrial
	Nucleated	Urban		Moats	Commercial
	Linear	Manor/parkland		Earthworks - historic	Golf course
	Low density	Landmark buildings		Earthworks - modern	
	Other:				

VIEWS

The different fields within the site have varying degrees of visibility, but are generally well contained from publicly accessible viewpoints.

There are open views of part of the north-eastern field from the footpath that runs through it from Stonehill Lane. There are also clear views of the site from the properties to the immediate north of the site on Stonehill Lane, many of which front onto the site, with a post and rail fence as the boundary treatment.

The properties on Norwood Avenue, Town Pond Lane and Cherry Tree Close back onto the site and have varying degrees of visibility, depending on the boundary treatment between the property and the site. Views from these properties are of the small fields in pasture to the north of the site, with glimpses of the arable fields to the south over / through gaps in the hedgerow boundary vegetation that divide the two.

The only views from local roads are at the access points into the site from Hanney Road, where there are gaps in the hedgerows lining the road.

PERCEPTION

VIEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	mall Medium		Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	closed Semi-enclosed		Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Mosaic	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	•	CC	ONDITION	
FEATURE	QUANTITI	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Woodland	At the eastern and western site boundaries		✓		
Tree belt	At some boundaries		✓		
Line of poplar	Along parts of the southern boundary			✓	
Individual trees	Small groups to north-west		√		
Hedgerows	Lining road and surrounding fields in pasture		√	Some are in decline	
Arable fields			✓		
Fields in pasture				Ruderal vegetation present	
New hedgerow / woodland planting	Along parts of the southern boundary			Yet to establish	
					_

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	x	No	
Comments:				
Telephone lines cross site - Minor				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	✓	Poor	
Typical of the character are	Varies across site	·	Varies across site	·	Degraded site	
Intact					Frequent detractors	
Rare elements / features					Features in decline	

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?				
Yes		No	x	
Green Belt				
Yes		No	x	

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity				
	None	1	>1	>5	
Conservation Area	х				
Listed buildings				X Located to east of Hanney Road	
Scheduled monuments	Х				
Registered Park and Gardens	Х				

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

SAC	None
SSSI	None
National Nature Reserve	None
Local Nature Reserve	None
Ancient Woodland	None

IS THE SITE WITHIN A FLOOD ZONE

	TIME AT LOOP LON				
	Quantity				
	None	Part of site	Majority of site	Whole site	
Flood Zone 3	Х				
Flood Zone 2	Х				

PUBLIC ACCESS

Are there any public rights of way associated with the site?	Yes	X	No	
			ı	

If yes:

>1 within site / crossing site	1 crossing site	1 on edge of site	>1 adjacent to site	1 adjacent to site
	X To north-east			
What type of right of wa	y? Footpath			

DEL	ATIONICHID	TO EXISTIN	IC CETTI	CMCNIT
REL	AHONSHIP	IO EXISTIN	IG SELIL	EWENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
	Х		

RELATIONSHIP TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		x	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape?	Yes		No	х
(Excludes permitted development sites)				
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Majority of site	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local	Yes	х	No	
character?				

DOES THE SITE FORM PART OF THE SEPARATION BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS?

Critical Part (settlements would join as a result)	Major part (Would substantially reduce existing separation)	Partial (contributes to separation between settlement)	None
			x

Note: Permitted development has been included as existing settlement

Are any other settlements / permitted development sites visible from the site?	Yes	No	X
Comments:			

	1 ATI\/C	FFFFCTS
C . C J IVI C J		FFFF(.I.S

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	No	Х
Site number(s):			
Comments:			

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	X	No
Site number(s): 27 East of Kingston Bagpuize & 29 West of Kingston Bagpuize			
Comments:			
Development of all three sites would significantly increase the size of the village.			

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes	X	No
Site number(s): 27 East of Kingston Bagpuize in combination with parts of this site and 29 West of	f Kingsto	n Bagp	ouize
Comments: Site 27 East of Kingston Bagpuize in combination with the western part of this site and the north-ea	astern pa	rt of sit	e 29.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE HIGHEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): Development of all sites (27 – 30) in their entirety

Comments:

Development of all sites would significantly erode the separation between Kingston Bagpuize and Fyfield and would significantly increase the size of the village.

WHICH COMBINATIONS OF SITES WOULD HAVE THE LOWEST POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Site number(s): 27 East of Kingston Bagpuize in combination with parts of this site and 29 West of Kingston Bagpuize

Comments:

Site 27 East of Kingston Bagpuize in combination with the western part of this site and the north-eastern part of site 29.