

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 developed?			Summary
	Yes	Part of the site	No	
1 – Harwell Campus	x			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 (north)			x	Essential separation between Wantage, Grove and East Challow
2B – West of Wantage (south)			x	Essential separation between Wantage and East Challow
3 – North West of Grove	x			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.
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		x		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 Sutton Courtney			x	Essential separation between Sutton Courtney and Didcot. Locally valued landscape.
7A – Rowstock east			x	The site forms part of the setting to the AONB and the essential separation between Harwell village and Rowstock
7B – Rowstock west			x	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.
8A – Milton Heights - east	x	x		The northern 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.
8B – 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. 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 Botley			x	Open and rural landscape within the Green Belt. Separation between Botley and Cumnor.

16 – South of Cumnor			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.
18 – South of Radley			x	Green Belt, recreation 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.
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	x		Strong relationship to new development to west (within western fields). No development within ancient woodland. Development of the whole site would require extensive mitigation to the

				eastern and southern boundaries.
25B – North of Marcham -west			x	Parkland landscape. Setting to Denman College and Conservation Area.
26 – North of Steventon	x			The land north of the site is key to the separation between Steventon and Drayton. Potential for development south of the transmission line easement.
27 – East of Kingston Bagpuize	x			Part of the setting to the Conservation Area and forms the eastern approach to the village. Open views to the road would need addressing.
28 – South of Kingston Bagpuize		x		Parts of the site would be 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 Bagpuize		x		Site extends west beyond 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			x	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.

SURVEY REF

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

Plan Reference

Map A

LANDFORM

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	x	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		Sinuuous	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

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

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

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

VEWS	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	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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			✓ Unattractive industrial buildings	

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	x	No	
Comments: Security fencing and unused, unattractive commercial buildings. Sewage works adjacent to the Icknield Way				

What is the general condition of the site?

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

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?			
Yes	x	No	
Green Belt			
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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	

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
			x

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	To north-west	No	
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:			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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		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

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

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?	Medium / Low			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
<p>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.</p>				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	x
<p>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.</p>				

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

Plan Reference

Map B

LANDFORM

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Small	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large	<input type="checkbox"/>	Linear	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Irregular
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geometric	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sinuuous	<input type="checkbox"/>	Regular
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows	<input type="checkbox"/>	Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerow trees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditches	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fence – rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wall – urban
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clipped hedges	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ditches with tree line	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fence – urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	Open
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:						

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	River	<input type="checkbox"/>	Canal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reservoir	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marsh / reeds
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dry valley	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tidal mudflat
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ditch	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pond	<input type="checkbox"/>	Winterbourne	<input type="checkbox"/>	Salt march
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:						

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

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Town edge		Scattered		Church / chapel		Mineral workings – current
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Village		Isolated		Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet		Historic		Fortifications		Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular		Hill forts		Airfield
	Agricultural buildings		Modern		Ruins	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industrial
	Nucleated		Urban		Moats	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

VIEW	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			
		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.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Intact Good condition Occasional detractor.			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	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		x		
Flood Zone 2		x		

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	

What type of right of way? 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
			x

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Partially	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 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				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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):				
Comments:				

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	
Site number(s): 2A (this site) and 2B (West of Wantage – south)				
Comments: The development of both sites would have cumulative impacts on the perceived separation between Wantage, East Challow 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

IF YES

Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
What character area is the site in?	The edges of Crown Hill (1) and Canal Side (3)			
What capacity has been given?	Low			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

Comments (if no):

2014 CAPACITY STUDY

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

IF YES

Is the boundary the same?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
What capacity has been given?				

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

Comments:

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

Comments:

SUMMARY

Essential separation between Wantage, Grove and East Challow.

NOTES

23/09/2016
SURVEY REF

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

Plan Reference

Map B

LANDFORM

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	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	Sinuuous	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

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

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

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

VEWS	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)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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	x	No	
Comments: 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 area Intact Rare elements / features		Characteristic hedgerow features are in decline.		Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings		x		
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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	

What type of right of way? Public footpaths.

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Partially	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 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.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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)				
Comments: The development of both sites would have cumulative impacts on the perceived separation between Wantage, East Challow 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:

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

IF YES

Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
What character area is the site in?	Part of Stockham Park (5)			
What capacity has been given?	Low			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (if no):				

2014 CAPACITY STUDY

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

IF YES

Is the boundary the same?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
What capacity has been given?				

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:				

SUMMARY

Essential separation between Wantage and East Challow.

NOTES

SURVEY REF

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

Plan Reference

Map B

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lowland		Dip slope		Dry valley		Cliff
	Other:						

LANDCOVER – tick all that apply: Occasional Evident Conspicuous

	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland		Tree belts / shaws
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear		Irregular
	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuous		Regular
	Other:						

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: Occasional Evident Conspicuous

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks		Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

VEWS	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			
		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	x	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 area Intact Rare elements / features		Key hedgerow features are in decline A number of detractors		Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

PUBLIC ACCESS

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

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?				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
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
			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: Distant views of the factories to the north of Wantage. Grove Airfield and Monks farm allocations are clearly visible.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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 4 East of Grove				
Comments: Grove is due to experience major growth. The development of this site would not cause significant adverse effects, however 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 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	x	No	
---	-----	---	----	--

IF YES

Is the whole site within the assessment?	Yes	x	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	x	No	
What character area is the site in?	Denchworth Road and Denchworth Field			
What capacity has been given?	High			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
---	-----	---	----	--

Comments (if no):

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?	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	High			

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

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

Plan Reference

Map B

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
x	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		Sinuuous		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

VEWS	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)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features	Features in Good condition Intact and varied landscape Very few detractors			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings		x		
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2		x		

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	

What type of right of way? Public footpath, bridleway and 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
		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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes		No	x

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	
<p>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.</p>				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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 significant adverse effects. 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 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?				

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
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 Village	Date / time / weather 26/09/2016 and 07/12/2016 12.30 Overcast	Photographs 1953 – 1982 2566 – 2660 .
--	--	---

Plan Reference

Map A

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain		Downland
	Plateau		Rolling		Steep valley side		Complex topography
	Plain		Undulating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gentle valley side slope		Artificial/man-made
	Steep		Gently undulating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Avenues		Open water
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Tree line						

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

	Small		Large		Linear		Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium		Geometric		Sinuuous		Regular
	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line			Fence – urban	Open
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Trees on bund						

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

	River		Canal		Reservoir		Marsh / reeds
	Stream		Lake		Dry valley		Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne		Salt march
	Other:						

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

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

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

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

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

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features	Generally intact Few detractors Part of the setting to the AONB			Degraded site Frequent detractors Features in decline

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?			
Yes		No	Setting
Green Belt			
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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

What type of right of way? Public footpath.

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	To the south	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	To the north	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	Only the northern part	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	x	No	
Comments: Rowstock is visible from the southern part of the site				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	No	
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 have adverse impacts on the setting of the AONB. Development of site 8A in conjunction with this site would erode the separation between Milton Heights and Harwell village.				

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): 8A Milton Heights - east, 8B Milton Heights – west, 5 West of Harwell Village and 7B Rowstock - 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)				
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 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

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	
<p>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.</p>				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	x
<p>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.</p>				

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

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation		Avenues		Open water
	Other:						

FIELD PATTERNS – tick all that apply: Occasional Evident Conspicuous

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Small		Large		Linear		Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuous		Regular
	Other:						

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: Occasional Evident Conspicuous

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks		Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerow trees		Ditches		Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fence – urban		Open
	Other:						

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: Occasional Evident Conspicuous

	River		Canal		Reservoir		Marsh / reeds
	Stream		Lake		Dry valley		Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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: 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

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

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 area Intact Rare elements / features		Generally good condition, some detractors. The landscape beyond the site to the east is in poor condition, so this is good by comparison.		Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	To south-west			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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 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 scheme to the north.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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		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

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

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?				

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

PLAN REFERENCE

Map A

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain		Downland
	Plateau		Rolling		Steep valley side		Complex topography
	Plain		Undulating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Orchards		Scrub
	Chalk grassland		Green		Scattered trees		Wetland / marsh
	Heath		Recreation		Avenues		Open water
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Tree line						

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

	Small		Large		Linear		Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous		Regular
	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne		Salt march
	Other:						

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

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

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

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

VEWS	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	CONDITION			
		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 Intact Rare elements / features	Bordering average Some features in good condition and others in decline. Setting to AONB			Degraded site Frequent detractors Features in decline

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?			
Yes		No	Setting
Green Belt			
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

PUBLIC ACCESS

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

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?				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	Partly	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	x	No	
Comments: The western edge of Harwell is visible from parts of the site.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	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.				

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 7B Rowstock west				
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.				

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

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
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 Site 7B Rowstock - west	Date / time / weather 26/09/2016 & 17/12/2016 14.00 & 11.50 Cloudy	Photographs 1983 – 2007 2666 – 2674
--	--	--

PLAN REFERENCE

Map A

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear		Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous		Regular
	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne		Salt march
	Other:						

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

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

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

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

VEWS	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			
		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?	Yes	x	No	
Comments: Pylons				

What is the general condition of the site?

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

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?			
Yes		No	Setting
Green Belt			
Yes		No	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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? 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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	Eastern part	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	x	No	
Comments: 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.				

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 7A Rowstock - east				
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 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.				

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

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?	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	x
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

Location Site 8A Milton Heights (east)	Date / time / weather 26/09/2016 12.00 Overcast	Photographs 1920 - 1940
---	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map A

LANDFORM

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Small	<input type="checkbox"/>	Large	<input type="checkbox"/>	Linear	<input type="checkbox"/>	Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geometric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sinuuous	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regular
Other:							

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows	<input type="checkbox"/>	Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerow trees	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fence – rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wall – urban
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clipped hedges	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ditches with tree line	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fence – urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	Open
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Tree line						

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	River	<input type="checkbox"/>	Canal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reservoir	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marsh / reeds
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dry valley	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pond	<input type="checkbox"/>	Winterbourne	<input type="checkbox"/>	Salt march
Other:							

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

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

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

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

VEWS	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			
		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 is visible from much of the site.				

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	x

HERITAGE ASSETS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

	Quantity			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

PUBLIC ACCESS

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

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?				

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

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 8B Milton Heights - west				
Comments: Development of both sites in their entirety would constitute major urbanisation of a 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.				
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)				
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 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

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			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
<p>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.</p>				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	x
<p>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.</p>				

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 (west)	Date / time / weather 26/09/2016 11.30 Overcast but clear	Photographs 1908 - 1919
---	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map A

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain		Downland
	Plateau		Rolling		Steep valley side		Complex topography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing		Set-aside		Hanging woodland		Coppice
	Meadow		Common	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Orchards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regular
	Other:						

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

	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches		Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban		Open
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

VEWS	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			
		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	x
Comments:				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Intact landscape Rare elements / features (orchards)			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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? Restricted byway to the south of the 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 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
		x	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes		No	x
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:				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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): 8A Milton Heights - east				
Comments: Development of both sites in their entirety would constitute major urbanisation of 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.				

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

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 extends further south than within the capacity study	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	High			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
<p>Comments: Agree with the commentary on character. Agree that the site is well contained, however the quality and condition of the landscape within the site is high and working orchards are becoming rare in this area – where they were once commonplace. In addition the enclosed nature of the site means that the site will never have a strong relationship to settlement, whether site 8A is developed or not.</p>				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
<p>Comments: Within the boundary shown within the capacity study. The land to the south is more sensitive to development.</p>				

SUMMARY

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

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

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear		Irregular
Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous		Regular
Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hedgerows		Banks		Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne		Salt march
Other:						

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

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

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

	Town edge		Scattered		Church / chapel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – current
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Village		Isolated		Graveyard		Mineral workings – disused
	Hamlet		Historic		Fortifications		Military
	Farmsteads		Vernacular		Hill forts		Airfield
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

VEWS	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			
		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	x	Poor
Typical of the character area		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	x			
Listed buildings		x		
Scheduled monuments		Within site and to east		
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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? 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
			x

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	✓ To the east and south	No	
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 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: There could be views of the proposed South Oxfordshire Housing allocation, located to the north of Didcot and south-east of the site.			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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				
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.

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

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 boundary is different as the site follows the existing hedgerow line.	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	Medium / High			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
<p>Comments: 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.</p>				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	x
<p>Comments: 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.</p>				

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

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree belts / shaws
Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
Mixed farmland		Paddocks	Conifer plantation	Carr
Rough grass / grazing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large	Linear	Irregular
Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric	Sinuuous	Regular
Other:				

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hedgerows		Banks	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
Hedgerow trees		Ditches	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clipped hedges	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditches with tree line	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fence – urban	Open
Other:				

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

River		Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream		Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ditch		Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:				

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

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

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

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

VEWS	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			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2		x Northern 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
		x		x

What type of right of way? Footpath within northern part of the site, Bridleway to south

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

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
			x

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
		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: 			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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): 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:				

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 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

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 study.	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	High and Medium / High			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
<p>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.</p>				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	x
<p>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.</p>				

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 25/09/2016 18.00 Sunny	Photographs 1878 - 1907
---	--	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map D

LANDFORM

Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain	Downland
Plateau	x	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

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

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

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

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

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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	x	No	
Comments: Pylons cross northern field. Disused Nursery and contractors yard to the north-west				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	x	Good	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features				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			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings			X Site is part of setting to Radley College	
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	X Is part of a designed landscape			

WILDLIFE DESIGNATIONS THAT COULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SITE

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

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			

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 footpath/ national trail. Also a permissive footpath 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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes		No	x

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 proposed housing allocations at North Abingdon and North-west Radley could be visible from the site.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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		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

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

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY

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

NOTES

SURVEY REF

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

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

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	x	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

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	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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: Pylons cross the site Noise from the A34				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	x	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Generally good condition. The southern part has links to the wider landscape to the west. Urban influence increases to the north.			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments		X Within eastern part of site		
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2		X Northern 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
x				

What type of right of way? 1 byway and 2 bridleways. 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

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	To SW	No	To North
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	To North	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	If reduced in area.	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 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: The permitted (half built) development at North Drayton is visible from the southern edge of the site, particularly to the south – western part.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	No	
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 Drayton Potential intervisibility with both sides.				

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 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	x	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant?	Yes	x	No	
What character area is the site in?	2, 3, 5 and a small part of 4.			
What capacity has been given?	Moderate – areas 1-6			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes	X	No	X
Comments (if no):				
<p>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.</p>				

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?	Yes	x	No	
What capacity has been given?	Medium			

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
Comments:				
<p>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.</p>				

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 Monument (to the east) and its setting.

SURVEY REF

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

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

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	x	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

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

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

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

VEWS	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			
		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 the adjacent quarry.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	x	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Generally good condition. An intimate pastoral landscape with close associations to Stonehill Farm.			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings		X Within site		
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
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
	x			

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
		x	

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
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 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 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:

The permitted (half built) development to the immediate north can be glimpsed through the tree belt 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 Drayton Potential intervisibility with both sides.				

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 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. 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 north-western part of this site (11B) could be considered.

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	x	No	
Are the character judgements still relevant? The northern part of area 7 is being developed for housing.	Yes	X (8)	No	X (7)
What character area is the site in?	The southern part of 7 and the northern part of 8			
What capacity has been given?	Low – areas 7-9			

Should the character and capacity judgements be upheld?	Yes		No	x
Comments (if no): The northern-most field is currently under development. The capacity of the remaining 2 fields to the north-west of the bridgeway is slightly higher than suggested in this study. The capacity of the rest of the site is in line with this study				

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 site is area B in the study	Yes	x	No	
What capacity has been given?	Medium			

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

Small field in northern part of site has highest capacity. Southern part is important 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

Location Site 12 North East of Drayton	Date / time / weather 15/09/2016 2.30 Sunny	Photographs 1709 - 1734
---	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear		Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium		Geometric		Sinuuous		Regular
	Other:						

BOUNDARIES – tick all that apply: Occasional Evident Conspicuous

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open
	Other: Tree line						

DRAINAGE – tick all that apply: Occasional Evident Conspicuous

	River		Canal		Reservoir		Marsh / reeds
	Stream		Lake		Dry valley		Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 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

VEWS	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	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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	x	No	
Comments: Haul road to east – for quarry. Intermittent traffic. Southern field has large barns. There are also telephone lines crossing the southern field.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	x	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Higher quality than landscape beyond the site to the east. The southern field has more detractors.			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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		x		
Listed buildings			X (no intervisibility)	
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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

What type of right of way? 3 footpaths and 1 bridleway within the site, 1 bridleway 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
			x

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

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

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	x	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?	Yes	x	No	
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?	Yes	x	No	
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?				

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY

Open landscape with numerous rights of way. Higher 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 Site 13 West of Drayton	Date / time / weather 15/09/2016 3.30 Sunny	Photographs 1680 – 1701 1734 – 1750
--	---	--

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

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

✓	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 (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

VEWS	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	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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

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

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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
What type of right of way? 3 bridleways				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x N	No	x S
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	x S	No	x N
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 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				
Comments: Potential for intervisibility between the northern edge of this site and southern edge of 11A (South of Abingdon).				

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 12 and 14				
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	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

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

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

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

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:			

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

	Small	Large	Linear	Irregular
✓	Medium	✓✓ Geometric	Sinuuous	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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Town edge	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scattered	<input type="checkbox"/>	Church / chapel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – current
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Village	<input type="checkbox"/>	Isolated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Graveyard	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – disused
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hamlet	<input type="checkbox"/>	Historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fortifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	Military
<input type="checkbox"/>	Farmsteads	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vernacular	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hill forts	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airfield
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ruins	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industrial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nucleated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	Moats	<input type="checkbox"/>	Commercial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Linear	<input type="checkbox"/>	Manor/parkland	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Golf course
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low density	<input type="checkbox"/>	Landmark buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Hedgerows	To north		✓		
Remnant hedgerow	To east				✓
Arable field			✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes		No	x
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	x	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features		The northern boundary hedgerow is in good condition and the field is typical of the local landscape, however the eastern hedgerow is in decline and the western boundary has urban influences from the adjacent housing.		Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
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	x	No	
Comments: Glimpses of permitted development to north.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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): 12 and 13				
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): 12 and 11 (A and B)				
Comments: Site 13 and the northern parts of site 11 could be developed in combination with this site without significant adverse 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	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

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY

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 Botley	Date / time / weather 15/09/2016 5pm Sunny	Photographs IMG1610 - 1618
--	--	--------------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map E

LANDFORM

	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		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

✓	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		Sinuuous	✓	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

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Town edge (suburban)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scattered	<input type="checkbox"/>	Church / chapel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – current
<input type="checkbox"/>	Village	<input type="checkbox"/>	Isolated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Graveyard	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – disused
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hamlet	<input type="checkbox"/>	Historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fortifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	Military
<input type="checkbox"/>	Farmsteads	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vernacular	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hill forts	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airfield
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ruins	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industrial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nucleated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	Moats	<input type="checkbox"/>	Commercial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Linear	<input type="checkbox"/>	Manor/parkland	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Golf course
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low density	<input type="checkbox"/>	Landmark buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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

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

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features				Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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

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

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? Bridleway crosses south-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
			x

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	✓	No	
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	
<p>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.</p>				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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		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

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

Is the site within one of the areas covered by the study?	Yes	x	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:				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY

Open landscape within the Green Belt. Should not be developed.

NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location Site 16 South of Cumnor	Date / time / weather 15/09/2016 4.30pm Sunny	Photographs 1593 - 1612
--	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map E

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Small		Large		Linear		Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regular
Other:								

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerow trees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditches		Fence – rural	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		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	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	xPeaceful	Active	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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	x
Comments:				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Generally good condition but management of boundary features and fields could be improved. Slightly scruffy appearance. The site represents an example of the historic field pattern surrounding the village.			Degraded site Frequent detractors Features in decline

DESIGNATIONS

AONB?			
Yes		No	x
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		x		
Listed buildings		x		
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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? Two footpaths crossing through centre 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 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
			x

RELATIONSHIP TO WIDER LANDSCAPE

Is the site open to the wider landscape? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes		No	✓
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	x
--	-----	--	----	---

Comments:

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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		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

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

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

IF YES

Is the boundary the same? The boundary is the same for Site A in the capacity study. Site B has been excluded.	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	Low			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
Comments: 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 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 Site 17 North of Radley	Date / time / weather 25/09/2016 4.30pm Sunny	Photographs 1855 - 1866
--	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map D

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arable		Parkland	Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree belts / shaws
Pasture		Horticulture	Mixed woodland	Gill / riparian woodland
Mixed farmland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small		Large	Linear	Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium		Geometric	Sinuuous	Regular
Other:				

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
Hedgerow trees		Ditches	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fence – urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Railway				

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

River		Canal	Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream		Lake	Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ditch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pond	Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:				

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

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

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

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

VEWS	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	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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: Noise from railway. Minor.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features				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			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings			x	
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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 footpath/ National trail				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	X (southern part)	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:				

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in the same settlement?	Yes		No	x
Site number(s):				
Comments: Niether of the Radley sites are suitable for development.				

Could more than one site be developed without significant cumulative impacts?	Yes		No	x
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:				

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

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	x
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 Site 18 South of Radley	Date / time / weather 25/09/2016 5.30pm Sunny	Photographs 1867 - 1877
--	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map D

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Small	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear	Irregular
	Medium		Geometric		Sinuuous	Regular
	Other:					

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

	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fence – rural	Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

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

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

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

VEWS	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)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features				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			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

PUBLIC ACCESS

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

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?

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	X only the northern part	No	x
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	Partly	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:				

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: Neither of the Radley sites are 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?				

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
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 Site 19 South of Wootton	Date / time / weather 28/09/2016 2.15 Sunny	Photographs 2152 - 2165
---	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map E

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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		Sinuuous		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

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

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

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

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			
		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	x	Average	x	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	At site boundaries		Within the site		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			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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

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

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	

What type of right of way? Footpath within the site and bridleway, footpath and byway at perimeter

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes		No	x
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 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:				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	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	x	No	
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 Wooton.				

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 merge and both settlements would significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.

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

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	
Comments: The recommendations for this site should be upheld if there is a future Green Belt review, however there is currently insufficient 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 Site 20 East of Wootton	Date / time / weather 28/09/2016 13.00 Sunny	Photographs 2134 – 2151 2166 – 2169 2190
--	--	--

PLAN REFERENCE

Map E

LANDFORM

<input type="checkbox"/>	Flat	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly rolling	<input type="checkbox"/>	Valley floor/floodplain	<input type="checkbox"/>	Downland
<input type="checkbox"/>	Plateau	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rolling	<input type="checkbox"/>	Steep valley side	<input type="checkbox"/>	Complex topography
<input type="checkbox"/>	Plain	<input type="checkbox"/>	Undulating	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gentle valley side slope	<input type="checkbox"/>	Artificial/man-made
<input type="checkbox"/>	Steep	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gently undulating	<input type="checkbox"/>	Broad valley	<input type="checkbox"/>	Beach – pebble
<input type="checkbox"/>	Upland	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scarp	<input type="checkbox"/>	Narrow valley	<input type="checkbox"/>	Beach – sand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lowland	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dip slope	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dry valley	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cliff
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Gentle south-east facing slope						

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

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Small	<input type="checkbox"/>	Large	<input type="checkbox"/>	Linear	<input type="checkbox"/>	Irregular
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geometric	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sinuuous	<input type="checkbox"/>	Regular
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows	<input type="checkbox"/>	Banks	<input type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerow trees	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fence – rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wall – urban
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clipped hedges	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ditches with tree line	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fence – urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	Open
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:						

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	River	<input type="checkbox"/>	Canal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reservoir	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marsh / reeds
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stream	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dry valley	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pond	<input type="checkbox"/>	Winterbourne	<input type="checkbox"/>	Salt march
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:						

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

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

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

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

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

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features	The northern part is in better condition the southern part			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			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings			x	
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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 Footpath.

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Partly	No	
Could the site be contained with mitigation planting without damaging local character?	Yes	Partly	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	x	No	
Comments: Properties on Boars Hill				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	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	x	No	
Site number(s): 19 South of Wooton and 21 North of Wooton				
Comments: If all three sites are developed in their entirety, they would significantly increase the settlement of Wooton.				

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 merge and both settlements would significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.

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

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

IF YES

Is the boundary the same? Site extends further north	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	Medium			

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
<p>Comments: The recommendations for this site should be upheld if there is a future Green Belt review, however there is currently insufficient justification for removal of this site from the Green Belt.</p>				

SUMMARY

Open part of the Green Belt. No landscape capacity for development.

NOTES

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 form 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 28/09/2019 15.30 Sunny	Photographs 2170 - 2184
---	--	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map E

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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		Sinuuous		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

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

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

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

VEWS	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			
		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)				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features		Internal features in decline. Rest of site is in good condition		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			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings			x	
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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.

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

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				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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): 20 East of Wooton and 19 South of Wooton				
Comments: If all three sites are developed in their entirety, they would significantly increase the settlement of Wooton.				

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 merge and both settlements would significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.

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

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

IF YES

Is the boundary the same? This site is larger	Yes		No	x
What capacity has been given?	Medium / Low			

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes	x	No	
<p>Comments: The recommendations for this site should be upheld if there is a future Green Belt review, however there is currently insufficient justification for removal of this site from the Green Belt.</p>				

SUMMARY

Open part of the Green Belt separating Wooton and Henwood. Setting to listed buildings.

NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location Site 22 Dalton Barracks (Shippon)	Date / time / weather 28/09/2019 16.00 Sunny	Photographs 2185 - 2189
---	--	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map F

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
	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		Sinuuous		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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Motorway	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rural lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public footpath/bridleway	<input type="checkbox"/>	Railway line
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dual carriageway	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunken lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	National Trail	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pylons / power lines
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major roads	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Track	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wide verges	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Phone poles / lines
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rural roads	<input type="checkbox"/>	Green lane	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Telecom mast
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Runway						

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

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

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

VEWS	<u>Distant</u>	Framed	Intermittent	<u>Panoramic</u>	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	<u>Large</u>	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open	<u>Exposed</u>
VARIETY	Complex	<u>Mosaic</u> At edges	Varied	Simple	<u>Uniform</u> Most of the site
TEXTURE	<u>Smooth</u>	Textured	Rough	Very rough	
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish	
MOVEMENT	<u>Remote</u> At runways	Vacant	Peaceful	<u>Active</u> Within settlement	Busy

LANDSCAPE FEATURES (CONDITION)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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	x	No	
Comments: Large industrial buildings are clearly visible.				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	✓	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Individual features and boundary vegetation		Majority of the site. Not typical of the character area 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			
	None	1	>1	>5
Conservation Area	x			
Listed buildings			X To south-east of site	
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	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

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

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Are there conflicts with proposed sites in other settlements?	Yes	x	No	
Site number(s): 19 South of Wooton and 20 East of Wooton				
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	x
Site number(s):				
Comments:				

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 developed 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 merge and both settlements would significantly increase in size. The purpose of the Green Belt would be nullified.

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

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
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 Site 23 East of East Hanney	Date / time / weather 23/09/2016 1pm Sunny	Photographs 1794 - 1813
--	--	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map G

LANDFORM

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arable		Parkland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Broadleaved woodland		Tree belts / shaws
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Biomass crop - Miscanthus						

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

	Small	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear		Irregular
	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous		Regular
	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks		Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerow trees		Ditches		Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

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

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

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

VEWS	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	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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	x	No	
Comments: Pylons Noise from the road to the west. Intermittent noise from the railway				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Some features in decline			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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		x		
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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? Footpath				

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

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:				

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
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:				

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

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	x
What capacity has been given?	Medium			

Are there any discrepancies between the study and the 2016 fieldwork?	Yes	x	No	
Comments: New development to the north of the site.				

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	x
Comments: 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.				

SUMMARY

The site is open to the wider landscape and disconnected from the village.

NOTES

SURVEY REF

Location Site 24 South of East Hanney	Date / time / weather 23/09/2016 2.30pm Sunny	Photographs 1814 - 1822
--	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map G

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain		Downland
	Plateau		Rolling		Steep valley side		Complex topography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Small	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear		Irregular
	Medium		Geometric		Sinuuous		Regular
	Other:						

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

	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fence – rural		Wall – urban
	Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Open
	Other:						

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

	River		Canal		Reservoir		Marsh / reeds
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stream		Lake		Dry valley		Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne		Salt march
	Other:						

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

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

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

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

VEWS	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			
		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?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Varies across the site. The eastern side is more typical of the character area.			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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		x		
Listed buildings		x		
Scheduled monuments	x			
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 X Adjacent to the west				
Flood Zone 2 X Adjacent to the west				

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? Footpath along Letcombe Brook				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x	No	
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 character?	Yes	partially	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:				

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.				

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?				

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

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 Site 25A North of Marcham (east)	Date / time / weather 26/09/2016 Overcast 15.30	Photographs 2021 - 2026
--	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map F

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tree belts / shaws
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Linear		Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regular
	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks		Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne		Salt march
	Other:						

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Town edge	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scattered	<input type="checkbox"/>	Church / chapel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – current
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Village	<input type="checkbox"/>	Isolated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Graveyard	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – disused
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hamlet	<input type="checkbox"/>	Historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fortifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	Military
<input type="checkbox"/>	Farmsteads	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vernacular	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hill forts	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airfield
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ruins	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industrial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nucleated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	Moats	<input type="checkbox"/>	Commercial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Linear	<input type="checkbox"/>	Manor/parkland	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Golf course
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low density	<input type="checkbox"/>	Landmark buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Allotments to north-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 south-west 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

VEWS	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			
		Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Ancient woodland	Copse in south-west corner of the site		✓		
Hedgerows	Field boundaries	✓			✓ One of the hedgerow boundaries is defunct
Field in pasture			✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x
Comments:				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Consistent character No detractors Generally good condition			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments		X To north-east of 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	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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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? Bridleway to the north				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes		No	✓
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:			

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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): 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	x
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?				

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?				

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

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 (west)	Date / time / weather 26/09/2016 Overcast 16.00	Photographs 2027 - 2033
--	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map F

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain		Downland
	Plateau		Rolling		Steep valley side		Complex topography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	✓	Sinuuous		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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Motorway	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rural lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public footpath/bridleway	<input type="checkbox"/>	Railway line
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dual carriageway	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunken lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	National Trail	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pylons / power lines
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major roads	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Track	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wide verges	<input type="checkbox"/>	Phone poles / lines
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rural roads	<input type="checkbox"/>	Green lane	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Telecom mast
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Through Denman College						

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Town edge	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scattered	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Church / chapel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – current
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Village	<input type="checkbox"/>	Isolated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Graveyard	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral workings – disused
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hamlet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fortifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	Military
<input type="checkbox"/>	Farmsteads	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vernacular	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hill forts	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airfield
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agricultural buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ruins	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industrial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nucleated	<input type="checkbox"/>	Urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	Moats	<input type="checkbox"/>	Commercial
<input type="checkbox"/>	Linear	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Manor/parkland	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - historic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Golf course
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low density	<input type="checkbox"/>	Landmark buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	Earthworks - modern	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	CONDITION			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features	Atypical character Good condition Much of the internal planting is semi-mature			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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		x		
Listed buildings			x	
Scheduled monuments	x			
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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

PUBLIC ACCESS

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

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?				

RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING SETTLEMENT

Strong (2 sides or more)	Medium (1-2 sides)	Weak (1 side and soft edge to settlement)	None
		✓ 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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes		No	✓
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:				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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): 25A North of Marcham (east)				
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	x
Site number(s):				
Comments: This site 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?				

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

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 Site 26 North of Steventon	Date / time / weather 26/09/2016 14.00 Overcast but clear	Photographs 2008 - 2020
---	---	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map C

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flat		Strongly rolling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	Tree belts / shaws
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Large		Linear	Irregular
Medium		Geometric		Sinuuous	Regular
Other:					

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hedgerows		Banks		Shelter belt	Wall – rural eg dry stone
Hedgerow trees		Ditches		Fence – rural	Wall – urban
Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open
Other:					

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

River		Canal		Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
Stream		Lake		Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne	Salt march
Other:					

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

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

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

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

VEWS	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			
		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: Pylons				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	Average	✓	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features				Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

PUBLIC ACCESS

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

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?				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	x To the north	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes		No	x
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	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.				

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

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		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

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

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
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 Bagpuize	Date / time / weather 28/09/2016 10.00 Sunny	Photographs 2034 - 2046
---	--	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map H

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Flat		Strongly rolling		Valley floor/floodplain		Downland
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arable		Parkland		Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tree belts / shaws
	Pasture		Horticulture		Mixed woodland		Gill / riparian woodland
	Mixed farmland		Paddocks		Conifer plantation		Carr
	Rough grass / grazing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuuous	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regular
	Other:						

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt		Wall – rural eg dry stone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 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

VEWS	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)

FEATURE	QUANTITY	CONDITION			
		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			✓		

Are there any detractors within the site?	Yes	x	No	
Comments: Telephone wire running parallel to PROW - minor				

What is the general condition of the site?

Outstanding	Good	✓	Average	Poor
Typical of the character area Intact Rare elements / features	Generally intact and good condition Few detractors			Degraded site Frequent detractors 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		x		
Listed buildings	x			
Scheduled monuments	x			
Registered Park and Gardens	x			

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	x			
Flood Zone 2	x			

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? Other route with public access

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes	Southern area	No	
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Northern Area	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 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 separation between the two settlements.				

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 South of Kingston Bagpuize				
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?				

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?				

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

Should the recommendations be upheld?	Yes		No	
Comments:				

SUMMARY

Part of the setting to the Conservation Area and forms the eastern approach to the village. Open views to the road would need addressing.

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 Bagpuize	Date / time / weather 28/09/2016 11.00 Sunny	Photographs 2047 - 2080
--	--	-----------------------------------

PLAN REFERENCE

Map H

LANDFORM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Arable		Parkland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Broadleaved woodland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree belts / shaws
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small		Large		Linear	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Irregular
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geometric		Sinuous	Regular
	Other:				

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hedgerows		Banks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shelter belt / Woodland	Wall – rural eg dry stone
	Hedgerow trees		Ditches	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fence – rural	Wall – urban
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clipped hedges		Ditches with tree line		Fence – urban	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other: Line of Poplar				

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

	River		Canal		Reservoir	Marsh / reeds
	Stream		Lake		Dry valley	Tidal mudflat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ditch		Pond		Winterbourne	Salt march
	Other:					

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

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

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

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

VEWS	Distant	Framed	Intermittent	Panoramic	Corridor
SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large	Vast
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Semi-enclosed	Open South-eastern fields	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			
		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 area Intact Rare elements / features	Varies across site		Varies across site		Degraded site Frequent detractors 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	x			
Listed buildings				X Located to east of Hanney Road
Scheduled monuments	X			
Registered Park and Gardens	X			

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	X			
Flood Zone 2	X			

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 To north-east			
What type of right of way? Footpath				

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? (Excludes permitted development sites)	Yes		No	x
Is the site contained from the wider landscape?	Yes	Majority of site	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:				

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 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.				

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.				