

## Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** Samantha Taylor  
**Sent:** 14 October 2019 12:08  
**To:** DC Support  
**Subject:** FW: 19/01705/OUT - Land Adjoining And West Of Bloxham Recreation Ground, South Newington Road, Bloxham

---

**From:** Tim Screen  
**Sent:** 14 October 2019 12:00  
**To:** Samantha Taylor  
**Subject:** 19/01705/OUT - Land Adjoining And West Of Bloxham Recreation Ground, South Newington Road, Bloxham

Samantha

Having considered the development proposals I am unable to support this application because for the following reasons.

Paragraph 2.14 The CSA response is brief, it forward any justification for this development in respect of the Bloxham Neighbourhood Development Plan (BNDP). In what respect does CSA think that this document is actually relevant?

Consider Section C of the BNDP:

### ***Key Views and tranquillity***

*There will be particular concern to protect:*

- 1. Views identified in the Cherwell Bloxham Conservation Area Appraisal*
- 2. Views of the church*
- 3. Certain other key views and street scenes (see below)*
- 4. Views from, and tranquillity of, Public Rights of Way*
- 5. Certain areas earmarked for recreational / amenity use as part of recent planning approvals*

I have highlighted items 2 and 4. CSA Photo 2 from field entrance into Area A on public footpath 136/5/10, looking east is for me is a key view (a view that complies with section C Key Views and tranquillity policy in the BNDP). This is an attractive view of the church and the tree canopy backdrop to the skyline, a view worthy of protection from harmful development such as is proposed.

CSA: 4.10 states that *Views of the Site are possible from the public footpath which crosses the Site (136/5/10) and from the Recreation Ground. These are partially limited by the internal hedgerow within the Site and the small dome in the topography within Area B. Beyond the Site to the west, the unmanaged western boundary hedgerow prevents all but partial, filtered views, while further west, the successive field boundary hedgerows prevent views (**Photographs 02, 07, 09 and 26***

With reference to CSA's Visual Effects Spreadsheet. CSA have combined a representative receptor experience and analysis of the following viewpoints, which have skewed the results. VP 2, in light of the important BNDP policy concerning the protection of important views of the church should have been considered separately. This in my opinion is a highly sensitive view for visual receptors, and hence must be rated **High** (rather than Medium High); the magnitude of change is **substantial** due to the potentially drastic and harmful change to the current view and the increased roof ridge heights, and therefore dominance of the homes due to the 'domed' topography, resulting in a visual effect of **Substantial Adverse** at year 1

Also BNDP policy states:

**POLICY TO PROTECT IMPORTANT RECREATION SPACES**

*BL17b. Public rights of way will be protected and routes through green landscaped or open space areas will be kept free from nearby vehicular traffic as far as practicable.* It is obvious that the PRow will be harmed by vehicular traffic associated with this development.

Table SLE 1 Landscape/Townscape Effects

Hedgerows and hedgerow trees are deemed to have a Quality and Sensitivity score of Medium. However, when considering Agricultural Officer, Caroline Morrey's email of 24.09.2019 and the arboriculture report, there are Category A and B trees that are more sensitive than the Medium imposed by CSA. These valuable trees cause the sensitivity rating to be **High**.

CSA's quality and sensitivity rating is Medium for the Site and Surroundings. I would say that the site is an integral part of the attractive landscape of Ironstone Hills and Valleys (Cherwell District Landscape Character Assessment) and development of site, although influenced by the village edge to a lesser degree, the overriding influence and benefit of this attractive landscape is on the village edge itself. The additional residential development on this site will cause a **Substantial** magnitude of change that will result in a **Substantial Adverse** effect to the landscape receptor.

Landscape Designation

*3.14 Cherwell District Landscape Character Assessment was undertaken on behalf of Cherwell District Council by Cobham Resource Consultants in November 1995.*

*3.16 The document identifies four strategies for the District's landscapes: conservation, repair, restoration and reconstruction. The Site lies within an area identified for repair. Repair landscapes are described as areas where the landscape structure is still reasonably strong and worthy of conservation, but where some or all of the individual features or overall structure are showing noticeable decline. The report states that:*

*"Development in these areas must be sensitively sited, designed and integrated to ensure that the rural, unspoilt character of the landscape is maintained. However, precisely because their existing landscape structure is so strong, these landscapes should be able to absorb limited areas of sensitive development."*

A very marked change in character, from attractive landscape to residential development, which will not be 'absorbed' with the receiving landscape. This scale and massing of this development is too great.

VIEWPOINT SECTION

Views from public footpath 136/5/10 which runs through the Site and to the west (becoming 298/2/10) [Photographs 02, 07, 09 and 26] I have indicated why CSA's VP analysis is incorrect. VP 07, 09 and 26 and should be assessed separately, thus:

Visual receptors most susceptible to change are 'people who use PRow whose attention is focused on the landscape and on particular views' (page 113 Assessment of visual effects / GVLI3). I would therefore determine the sensitivity of VPs 2, 7 and 9 is **High**, VP 2 and 7 Magnitude of Change is **Substantial** to the increased impact and effect of the development being physically very close the receptor. As the visual receptor moves between VP 9 and VP7 the M o C increases and is **Substantial**. The visual effects will be **Substantial Adverse** at year 1 and with the establishing and landscape mitigation at year 15 the visual effect will be **Medium Adverse**.

VP 21

VP21 is combined with VP 22 and 24 are what appear to be a representative views for roadside receptors. VP 22 and 24 may well be judged as CSA states as Medium/Low sensitivity with a Magnitude of Change as Slight and a Slight Adverse visual effect at year 1, however VP21 reflects a view of the site from the highway footpath one can argue will be more sensitive for people using this route to the play area and playing field. VP21 must be removed from the analysis of VP22 and 24 and judged separately. VP21 receptor has **High** sensitivity; the Magnitude of Change is **Substantial** and therefore the Visual effect (the despoiling of an attractive view) is **Substantial Adverse**.

Residential Receptors

I agree with CSAs judgement of the sensitivity, the M o C and the subsequent Visual Effect (Substantial Adverse) of the residential receptors adjacent to the northern boundary of site on Colesbourn Road and Hyde Grove (VPs 6, 13, 14 and 15). I also agree with CSA that it will be Substantial Adverse for residential receptors on Orchard Road and Lubford Gardens adjacent to the northern boundary (VP14 and 15). There is agreement here between CSA and myself, and therefore confirms the harm to residential receptors, and just how inappropriate this development really is.

Regards

Tim

**Tim Screen CMLI**  
**Landscape Architect**

Cherwell District Council



01295 221862



01295 221878

<mailto:tim.screen@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

[www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

[www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Follow us on Twitter: @Cherwellcouncil

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..