

## Wayne Campbell

---

**From:** Tim Screen  
**Sent:** 08 June 2021 10:20  
**To:** Wayne Campbell  
**Subject:** 21/00500/OUT - Land North Of Railway House, Station Road , Hook Norton

Good morning Wayne

In consideration of the amended landscape response of 14th May from MHP

Item 1:

This statement does not provide reassurance that the 7.5 m planting buffer to its job in terms of screening the site from visual receptors identified in my previous response of 5<sup>th</sup> March.

In order to achieve screening of this development the establishment period for these trees (depending on species selected, maintenance, climate and soil) is approximately 25 years. For example the growth rates of feathered trees may achieve a height of 9.5 – 9.7 m at 20 years. This will mean the rooflines will still be clearly seen by the visual receptors at viewpoints 8 and 9 with prolong exposure to visual harm on the route between this viewpoints.

Furthermore there are factors that will prevent the successful establishment of this 7.5m buffer.

1. Lack of landscape maintenance where dead trees are not replaced at the correct time.
2. Poor maintenance access prevents appropriate arboricultural and landscape maintenance at the correct times
3. Area of woodland is not publicly accessible and therefore not subject to natural surveillance which may encourage residents to encroach on the woodland buffer in order to extend their gardens by cutting down trees and opening up harmful views of the development.
4. The woodland casts shade and generates leaf litter to gardens and homes and residents complain about this to the management body and expect trees to be removed.

Item 2:

The statement highlights the inter-visibility between the 'old' Church and the proposed 'new' incongruous development. As mentioned above the development could take up to 25 years to effectively screen it and the setting of the Church could effectively be harmed for that period.

Item 3:

When applied to visual receptors, in particular in respect of Council Hill PRoW and a walker's appreciation of a panoramic view that encompasses the Cotswolds AONB, its 'border lands' and the proposed development, will result in the walker/visual receptor experiencing harm from a spoiled panorama, and visual amenity harmed.

Item 4:

In response to this statement note that the application site was referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan as:

'The area between Iron Stone Hollow and the old railway evoked a close split between respondents (my emphasis) who thought it appropriate for housing and those who did not'.

The respondents would no doubt expect a comprehensive planning application where the landscape and visual implications are fully explored to enable viable evidence-based decisions to be made. If, indeed, a precedent has a been set with other similar developments outside the curtilage of the village, these developments have been rigorously tested through the planning process. Just because 'a precedent' has been set this does not make this development a fait accompli.

Item 5:

This proposed development does not respect or enhance the local landscape character and the development cannot be integrated successfully into the local landscape. I again stress that 'I judge the landscape on the northern edge of Hook Norton to be both distinctive and highly valued locally and therefore must be protected from this inappropriate development'.

Amended Landscape Note – Site Access. 26<sup>th</sup> May.

I support Parish Council's response and objection to the highway access.

There is a significant change in levels from Station Road to the site, meaning visually intrusive engineering works would be required to access the site, which would be out of keeping with the local character. The highway access would urbanise the approach from a characterful experience of Station Road with its gradual introduction to the built up village to a very harmful and abrupt urban impact where more of the hedgerow and trees will have to be removed to accommodate bank stabilisation and vis splay, culminating in visual harm not only from the access but the development itself.

Creation of the access would require a significant loss of established field boundary vegetation with significant harm to biodiversity, character and visual amenity. Agreed. Also it appears that the hedgerow to the eastern field was removed and this access/vis splay would compound the loss of biodiversity, character and visual amenity.

Best regards

Tim

**Tim Screen CMLI**

Landscape Architect  
Environmental Services  
Cherwell District Council

 Direct Dial 01295 221862 Mobile 07854 219751

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

**Follow us:**

**Facebook:** [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](https://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

**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..