

7. Landscape and Visual

Introduction

- 7.1 This Chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant environmental effects arising from the Proposed Scheme in relation to landscape character and visual amenity.
- 7.2 The Chapter describes the technical consultation that has been undertaken during the EIA, the scope of the assessment and assessment methodology, and a summary of the baseline information that has informed the assessment.
- 7.3 In line with **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**, the assessment reports on the likely significant environmental effects, the further mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects, or further enhance beneficial effects. The conclusions are provided both in terms of the residual effects and whether these are considered significant. The assessment of effects takes into consideration both primary and tertiary mitigation (see **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** for further details) and is informed by the EIA Scoping process (**Appendix 2.1** and **2.2**) and iterative scoping process where applicable.
- 7.4 This Chapter, and its associated **Figures 7.1 – 7.4** and **Appendices 7.1 – 7.4**, is intended to be read as part of the wider ES with particular reference to the introductory Chapters of this ES (**Chapters 1 – 5**), as well as **Chapter 6: Built Heritage and Archaeology**.
- 7.5 In addition, this Chapter should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 8: Assessment of Cumulative Effects**.

Summary of Consultation

- 7.6 **Table 7.1** provides an overview of the consultation that has been undertaken to inform the Proposed Scheme and EIA, including the consideration of likely significant effects and the methodology for assessment.

Table 7.1: Summary of consultation

Body / organisation	Contact	Date and form of consultation	Summary
CDC	Landscape Officer	Email, 4 th July 2022	No response received.
CDC	Principal Planning Officer	Email, 15 th December 2022	No comments made regarding Photoviewpoint locations. The response requested further detail regarding assessment, which has been provided within this ES Chapter.

Scope of the Assessment

7.7 An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to CDC on 2nd November 2022, as presented as **Appendix 2.1**. The EIA Scoping Opinion was received on 7th December 2022 (**Appendix 2.2**). This section provides confirmation on the scope of the assessment presented within this Chapter following submission of the EIA Scoping Report.

Effects Not Considered to be Significant

7.8 The following effects were not considered significant as part of the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**) and are not considered further in this Chapter:

- Changes to landscape character of landscape designations during construction and operation;
- Changes to landscape character of the Farmland Plateau Landscape Type during construction and operation; and
- Changes to the visual amenity of visual receptors beyond 1km from the Site during construction and operation.

7.9 As part of the EIA Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 2.2**) Natural England advised that '*the ES should assess the impacts of the proposal on any ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees and the scope to avoid and mitigate adverse impacts.*' The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (**Appendix 7.2**) identifies no areas of ancient woodland or ancient or veteran trees within the Site, and therefore effects upon such features have also been scoped out from further consideration.

Effects Considered Likely to be Significant

7.10 The following effects (**Table 7.2**) were considered likely to be significant at the EIA Scoping stage and have been assessed and reported within this Chapter:

Table 7.2: Effects considered likely to be significant

Likely significant effect	Receptors	Applicable development stage
Changes to landscape character	The character of the Site	Construction and Operation
	The character of the Site context, including relationship between Banbury and Hanwell	Construction and Operation
Changes to the visual amenity experienced by receptors	Visual receptors within 1km of the Site	Construction and Operation

Assessment Methodology

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

7.11 The assessment of Landscape and Visual effects in the ES will follow the guidelines set out in the third edition of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA)¹. This will be used as a basic approach and amended as necessary to cover specific Site issues. This

same methodology has been used to inform the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) completed in support of the Application, which is provided as **Appendix 7.1**.

7.12 The following legislation and policy have informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 7.1**:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)²;
- Cherwell Local Plan 2011 - 2031 Part 1 (adopted July 2015)³:
 - Policy ESD 13: ‘Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement’;
 - Policy ESD 15: ‘The Character of the Built and Historic Environment’; and
 - Policy ESD 17: ‘Green Infrastructure’.
- Cherwell Local Plan 1996 Saved Policies⁴:
 - Saved policy C7 Landscape conservation; and
 - Saved Policy C28 Layout, design and external appearance of new development.

7.13 The following guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 7.1**:

- Natural England’s National Character Areas⁵;
- Cherwell Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018)⁶;
- Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) 2004⁷;
- Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (Sept 2013)⁸;
- Cherwell Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (October 2017)⁹; and
- Conservation Area Appraisal for Hanwell (2007)¹⁰.

Defining the Study Area

7.14 In order to establish the baseline and the potential limit of notable effects, a broad study area was adopted as the initial search area. This enabled the geographical scope of the assessment to be defined and provided the wider geographical context of the study. Within this area, the search focused on identifying the local planning policy context, national and local landscape designations and other relevant designations, in addition to providing a general geographical understanding of the Site and its broader context (for example, in relation to landform, transport routes and the distribution and nature of settlement).

7.15 Following this initial analysis, subsequent field work and having an appreciation of the Proposed Scheme, the assessing landscape architect has used professional judgement to determine that, in order to focus on those areas and features that are likely to be affected by the Proposed Scheme, the study area need only extend to 2km from the Site boundary. However, occasional reference may be made to features beyond this area where appropriate. The study area is illustrated on **Figure 7.3**.

Establishing the Baseline

7.16 **Table 7.3** summarises all studies undertaken to inform the assessment presented within this Chapter.

Table 7.3: Background Studies to Inform the ES

Studies	Overview	Date of completion
Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) (Appendix 7.1)	An LVA has been completed for the Proposed Scheme, including consideration of night photography.	November 2022
Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Appendix 7.2)	Completed for the Proposed Scheme to establish the baseline arboriculture resource on-Site and the extent to which the Proposed Scheme may impact upon it.	October 2022
Zone of Theoretical Visibility (not included as part of the submission) and Site Visit	<p>Using landform data within a Geographical Information System (GIS), a broad Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was prepared using LiDAR 2m digital surface modelling (DSM) data as part of a desk-based assessment. While a ZTV provides a useful initial tool to establish, at a high level, the extent of potential intervisibility between the Site and its surrounding context, there is an appreciation that there is margin for error dependent upon the resolution of landscape components (e.g. hedgerows, trees, walls, buildings) within the DSM data.</p> <p>This ZTV has therefore not been submitted in support of the Application due to the difficulties to achieve accuracy within base data (the DSM), and the ZTV in turn. As recommended by GLVIA3, site surveys are <i>'essential to provide an accurate baseline assessment of visibility'</i> and as such areas identified by the ZTV have been visited through the walking and driving (as appropriate) of local roads, PRoWs and other publicly accessible viewpoints as part of a site visit. The Site visit was undertaken by a Chartered Landscape Architect, with appropriate experience of the relevant guidance and were undertaken in winter conditions when the leaves were absent from the majority of trees/vegetation and visibility was at its greatest.</p> <p>Through this exercise, the main visual receptors predicted to have actual visibility to the Site were identified, and a more accurate,</p>	February 2022

Studies	Overview	Date of completion
	ground-truthed Zone of Primary Visibility (ZPV) of the Site was established.	
Night-time Review (within Appendix 7.1)	Undertaken by a Chartered Landscape Architect during the hours of darkness (between 18:30 and 19:00) to consider potential effects of additional lighting upon the Hanwell Community Observatory located within Hanwell.	November 2022

Assessment Process

- 7.17 A general approach to EIA is presented in **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**. Provided within this section is an abridged methodology for the LVA. An unabridged version can be found at the rear of **Appendix 7.1**.
- 7.18 Site appraisals have already been undertaken to inform the LVA (**Appendix 7.1**), the purpose of which was to:
- Confirm the extent of study areas for the landscape and visual assessments respectively;
 - Confirm status of baseline conditions identified by the desktop assessment;
 - Confirm the landscape character areas within the study area and compare these to the actual baseline condition. This will also include consideration of the findings of the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 6.1**), Ecological Appraisal and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (**Appendix 7.2**) prepared in support of the Application and present findings on features within the study area; and
 - Identify the ZPV of the Site and record key viewpoints from within this, which will be used to inform the assessment of landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Scheme.
- 7.19 The visual baseline assessment has identified existing views and the ‘receptors’ likely to experience visual change, it has been conducted in three steps described in turn below:
- Step One: Defining Zones of Theoretical and Primary Visibility:
 - The starting point for an assessment of visual amenity is a computer-generated ZTV. The ZTV is derived using a digital surface model to give a prediction of the areas that, theoretically, may be able to experience visual change; it thus provides the basis for more detailed field assessment. The ZTV is used as a tool to gauge high level potential visibility and so does not accompany the ES;
 - The ZTV is then refined by walking and driving local roads, PRoWs and other publicly accessible viewpoints to arrive at a more accurate, ‘field-tested’ ZPV. The ZPV is where views of the Proposed Scheme will normally be close-ranging and open, whether in the public or private domain, on-foot, cycling or in a vehicle; and

- Beyond the ZPV lies a zone of visibility that is less open, being either partly-screened or filtered. Views from within this zone will include the Proposed Scheme – it may not be immediately noticeable, but once recognised could be a perceptible addition to the view.
- Step Two: Defining Receptor Groups:
 - Within the ZPV and wider area, the receptors likely to experience visual change have been identified and categorised into a number of discernible groups.
- Step Three: Defining Representative Viewpoints:
 - Within the ZPV, there are many individual points at which views towards the Site are gained. A number of viewpoints that are considered representative of the nature of the views have been selected from each of the receptor groups. The selection of the representative viewpoints is based on the principle that the assessment needs to test the ‘worst case’ scenario, and in selecting these viewpoints, the following will be included:
 - A range of viewpoints from all points of the compass, north, south, east and west;
 - A range of viewpoints from distances at close quarters at the Site boundary and up to distant viewpoints at 2km and more from the Site; and
 - Viewpoints from identified receptor groups.

7.20 The second stage of the landscape and visual assessment will seek to describe and make a judgement on:

- Effects on the Landscape Character: The effects which may arise as a result of the Proposed Scheme on discrete character areas and/or character types comprising features that may possess a particular quality or merit. In this case, the effects on the historic landscape will be considered and cross referenced with the **Chapter 6: Built Heritage and Archaeology**; and
- Visual Effects: Effects that may arise as a result of the Proposed Scheme on views from visual receptors, such as users of local PRoWs, and upon the amenity value of the views from surrounding uses.

7.21 A detailed methodology for the assessment of effects is included at **Appendix 7.1**. The tables within the accompanying methodology, reproduced below for ease of reference, offer templates for assessing overall sensitivity of any landscape or visual receptor, and magnitude of change.

7.22 As part of the Proposed Scheme, measures to mitigate any visual impacts and enhance the landscape value and visual quality of the Site are integral to architectural and landscape design work and particularly pertinent to the Proposed Scheme. The Proposed Scheme will be of high architectural and landscape quality and design, taking full account of the setting of the Site, particularly the Site’s relationship with the wider rural landscape to the east. If any adverse visual effects are identified through the assessment, mitigation measures will be

considered such as through choice of scale, massing, materials and finishes; landscape strategy; and screening construction.

- 7.23 Finally, an assessment of any residual effects following the application of mitigation measures will be undertaken. The evaluation of residual effects will be considered for Year 1 and Year 15, which allows for the consideration of the screening effects of screen planting that will be incorporated as mitigation for the Proposed Scheme.

Reporting of the Environmental Effect and Significance Criteria

- 7.24 The assessment of likely significant environmental effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme has taken into account the construction and operational stages of development. The following sections define the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity (or value / importance), magnitude of change, the level of effect and significance.

Determining Sensitivity of Receptor

- 7.25 The sensitivity of affected receptors has been considered on a scale of **very high, high, medium, low** or **very low**.
- 7.26 A number of factors influence professional judgement when assessing the degree to which a particular landscape or visual receptor can accommodate change arising from a particular development:
- Sensitivity is made up of judgements about the ‘value’ attached to the receptor, which is determined at baseline stage, and the ‘susceptibility’ of the receptor, which is determined at the assessment stage when the nature of the Proposed Scheme, and therefore the susceptibility of the landscape and visual resource to change, is better understood; and
 - Susceptibility indicates *“the ability of a defined landscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific proposed development without undue negative consequences”*¹¹. Susceptibility of visual receptors is primarily a function of the expectations and occupation or activity of the receptor.
- 7.27 **Table 7.4** provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of a landscape receptor is judged within this assessment and considers both value and susceptibility independently.

Table 7.4: Defining the sensitivity of the landscape baseline

Landscape Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Value: Nationally/internationally designated/valued countryside and landscape features; strong/distinctive landscape characteristics; absence of landscape detractors.</p> <hr/> <p>Susceptibility: Strong/distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; absence of landscape detractors; landscape receptors in excellent condition. Landscapes with clear and widely recognised cultural value. Landscapes with a high level of tranquillity.</p>

Landscape Sensitivity	Criteria
High	<p>Value: Locally designated/valued countryside (e.g. Areas of High Landscape Value, Regional Scenic Areas) and landscape features; many distinctive landscape characteristics; very few landscape detractors</p> <hr/> <p>Susceptibility: Many distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; very few landscape detractors; landscape receptors in good condition. The landscape has a low capacity for change as a result of potential changes to defining character.</p>
Medium	<p>Value: Undesignated countryside and landscape features; some distinctive landscape characteristics; few landscape detractors.</p> <hr/> <p>Susceptibility: Some distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; few landscape detractors; landscape receptors in fair condition. Landscape is able to accommodate some change as a result.</p>
Low	<p>Value: Undesignated countryside and landscape features; few distinctive landscape characteristics; presence of landscape detractors.</p> <hr/> <p>Susceptibility: Few distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; presence of landscape detractors; landscape receptors in poor condition. Landscape is able to accommodate large amounts of change without changing these characteristics fundamentally.</p>
Very Low	<p>Value: Undesignated countryside and landscape features; absence of distinctive landscape characteristics; despoiled/degraded by the presence of many landscape detractors.</p> <hr/> <p>Susceptibility: Absence of distinctive landscape elements/aesthetic/perceptual aspects; presence of many landscape detractors; landscape receptors in very poor condition. As such landscape is able to accommodate considerable change</p>

7.28 For visual receptors, judgements of susceptibility and value are closely interlinked considerations. For example, the most valued views are those which people go and visit because of the available view – and it is at those viewpoints that their expectations will be highest and thus most susceptible to change.

7.29 **Table 7.5** provides an indication of the criteria by which the overall sensitivity of a visual receptor is judged within this assessment and considers both value and susceptibility together.

Table 7.5: Defining the sensitivity of the visual baseline

Visual Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	<p>Value/Susceptibility: View is: designed/has intentional association with surroundings; recorded in published material; from a publicly accessible heritage asset/designated/promoted viewpoint; nationally/internationally designated right of way; protected/recognised in planning policy designation.</p>

Visual Sensitivity	Criteria
	<p>Examples: May include views from residential properties; National Trails; promoted holiday road routes; designated countryside/landscape features with public access; visitors to heritage assets of national importance; open Access Land.</p>
High	<p>Value/Susceptibility: View of clear value but may not be formally recognised e.g. framed view of scenic value or destination/summit views; inferred that it may have value for local residents; locally promoted route or PRoW.</p>
	<p>Examples: May include from recreational locations where there is some appreciation of the visual context/landscape e.g. golf, fishing; themed rights of way with a local association; National Trust land; panoramic viewpoints marked on OS maps; road routes promoted in tourist guides and/or for their scenic value</p>
Medium	<p>Value/Susceptibility: View is not widely promoted or recorded in published sources; may be typical of those experienced by an identified receptor; minor road routes through rural/scenic areas.</p>
	<p>Examples: May include people engaged in outdoor sport not especially influenced by an appreciation of the wider landscape e.g. pitch sports; views from minor road routes passing through rural or scenic areas.</p>
Low	<p>Value/Susceptibility: View of clearly lesser value than similar views from nearby visual receptors that may be more accessible.</p>
	<p>Examples: May include major road routes; rail routes; receptor is at a place of work but visual surroundings have limited relevance</p>
Very Low	<p>Value/Susceptibility: View may be affected by many landscape detractors and unlikely to be valued.</p>
	<p>Examples: May include people at their place of work, indoor recreational or leisure facilities or other locations where views of the wider landscape have little or no importance.</p>

Determining the Magnitude of Change

7.30 The magnitude of change has been considered as the change experienced from the current baseline conditions at the sensitive receptor and has been considered on a scale of **very high, high, medium, low, very low** or **imperceptible**.

7.31 The magnitude of any landscape or visual change is determined through a range of considerations particular to each receptor. The three attributes considered in defining the magnitude are:

- Scale of Change;
- Geographical Extent; and
- Duration and reversibility/Proportion.

7.32 **Table 7.6** below provides an indication of the criteria by which the geographical extent of the area will be affected within this assessment.

Table 7.6: Geographical Extent Criteria

Landscape Receptors	Visual Receptor Criteria
Large scale effects influencing several landscape types or character areas.	Direct views at close range with changes over a wide horizontal and vertical extent.
Effects at the scale of the landscape type or character areas within which the proposal lies.	Direct or oblique views at close range with changes over a notable horizontal and/or vertical extent.
Effects within the immediate landscape setting of the Site.	Direct or oblique views at medium range with a moderate horizontal and/or vertical extent of the view affected.
Effects at the Site level (within the Site itself).	Oblique views at medium or long range with a small horizontal/vertical extent of the view affected.
Effects only experienced on parts of the Site at a very localised level.	Long range views with a negligible part of the view affected.

7.33 The third, and final, factor, in determining the predicted magnitude of change is duration and reversibility. Duration and reversibility are separate but linked considerations. Duration is judged according to the defined terms set out below, whereas reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and practicality of the particular effect being reversed in, for example, a generation. The categories used in this assessment are set out in **Tables 7.7** and **7.8** below.

Table 7.7: Factors influencing judgements on magnitude of change

Duration	Reversibility
Long Term (20+ years)	Permanent with unlikely restoration to original state e.g. major road corridor, power station, urban extension, hydrocarbons.
Medium to long term (10 to 20 years)	Permanent with possible conversion to original state e.g. agricultural buildings, retail units.
Medium term (5 to 10 years)	Partially reversible to a different state e.g. mineral workings.
Short term (1 to 5 years)	Reversible after decommissioning to a similar original state e.g. renewable energy development.

Table 7.8: Defining the magnitude of change to the landscape and visual baseline

Magnitude of Change ^a	Criteria
Very High	Landscape: Total loss/major alteration to key receptors/characteristics of the baseline; addition of elements that strongly conflict or fails to integrate with the baseline.
	Visual: Substantial change to the baseline, forming a new, defining focus and having a defining influence on the view.
High	Landscape: Notable loss/alteration/addition to one or more key receptor(s)/characteristic(s) of the baseline; or addition of prominent conflicting elements.
	Visual: Additions are clearly noticeable, and part of the view would be fundamentally altered.
Medium	Landscape: Partial loss/alteration to one or more key receptors/characteristics; addition of elements that are evident but do not necessarily conflict with the key characteristics of the existing landscape.
	Visual: The Proposed Scheme would form a new and recognisable element within the view which is likely to be recognised by the receptor.
Low	Landscape: Minor loss or alteration to one or more key landscape receptors/ characteristics; additional elements may not be uncharacteristic within existing landscape.
	Visual: The Proposed Scheme would form a minor constituent of the view being partially visible or at sufficient distance to be a small component.
Very Low	Landscape: Barely discernible loss or alteration to key components; addition of elements not uncharacteristic within the existing landscape.
	Visual: The Proposed Scheme would form a barely noticeable component of the view, and the view whilst slightly altered would be similar to the baseline.
Imperceptible ^b	In some circumstances, changes at representative viewpoints or receptors may be lower than 'Very Low' and changes will be described as 'Imperceptible'. This would lead to negligible effects.

Determining the Level of Effect

7.34 The level of effect has been informed by the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Scheme and the evaluation of the sensitivity of the affected receptor. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement and **Table 7.9** has been a tool which has assisted with this process.

^a Considers Scale of Proposal/Geographical Extent/Duration and Reversibility/Proportion

^b A receptor experiencing a magnitude of change of 'imperceptible' would in no instance result in a significant level of effect when combined with an associated sensitivity and, as such, this magnitude of change is not considered further within Table 7.9.

7.35 Whilst **Table 7.9** provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement. For each effect, it has been concluded whether the effect is '*beneficial*' or '*adverse*'.

Table 7.9: Matrix to support determining the level of effect

		Overall Sensitivity				
		Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Overall Magnitude of Change	Very High	Substantial ^c	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor to Moderate
	High	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Minor
	Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor
	Low	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible
	Very Low	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible	Negligible/None

7.36 The following terms have been used to define the level of the effects identified and these can be '*beneficial*' or '*adverse*':

- **Substantial:** Effects that are in complete variance to the baseline landscape resource or visual amenity;
- **Major or Moderate to Major:** Effects that result in noticeable alterations to much (Major effect) or some (Moderate/Major effect) of the key characteristics of the landscape resource or aspects of visual amenity;
- **Moderate:** Effects that result in noticeable alterations to a few of the key characteristics of the baseline landscape resource or aspects of visual amenity;
- **Minor or Negligible to Minor:** Effects that result in slight alterations to some (Minor effect) or a few (Minor/Negligible) of the key characteristics of the landscape resource or aspects of visual amenity; and
- **Negligible or Negligible/None:** Effects that result in barely perceptible alterations to a few (Negligible effect) or some (Negligible/None effect) of the key characteristics of the landscape resource or aspects of visual amenity.

7.37 Effects can be adverse (negative), beneficial (positive) or neutral. The landscape effects will be considered against the landscape baseline, which includes published landscape strategies or policies if they exist. Changes involving the addition of large-scale man-made objects are

^c This additional level of significance of effect (above that set out in **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**, to ensure reporting of extreme effects is allowed for).

typically considered to be adverse, unless otherwise stated, as they are not usually actively promoted as part of published landscape strategies.

- 7.38 Visual effects are more subjective as peoples' perception of development varies through the spectrum of negative, neutral and positive attitudes. In the assessment of visual effects, the assessor will exercise objective professional judgement in assessing the level of effects and, unless otherwise stated, will assume that all effects are adverse, thus representing the worst-case scenario. Effects can be moderated by maturation of landscape strategies.
- 7.39 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either 'short-term', 'medium-term' or 'long-term'. Short-term is considered to be up to 1 year, medium-term is considered to be between 1 and 10 years and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.

Determining Significance

- 7.40 For each residual effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is 'Significant' or 'Not Significant'. This determination has been based on professional judgement and / or relevant guidance/legislation where applicable.
- 7.41 Significance has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e. following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Baseline Conditions

- 7.42 Landscape and visual assessment comprises a study of two separate but inter-linked issues; landscape character and visual amenity. A detailed description of the landscape and visual baseline at, and around the Site is set out in the LVA (**Appendix 7.1**), with a summary provided below.

Baseline Landscape Resource

- 7.43 This section considers baseline landscape character matters and identifies other landscape resource receptors that are relevant to the assessment. Baseline conditions in respect of the published local landscape character assessments are summarised below, followed by a summary of EDP's own assessment of the character of the Site and local context.
- 7.44 The Site does not lie within, or in close proximity to, any nationally or locally designated landscapes. The Site used to be located within the Ironstone Downs Area of High Landscape Value defined by the Cherwell Local Plan (1996), however, this designation and associated policy was not retained within the Cherwell Local Plan (2011 – 2031) adopted in July 2015. From review of the Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment, Parcel B of the site is included within the westernmost extent of 'Site A', the land of which forms a buffer to the northern edge of Banbury comprising "*arable land with strong hedgerow field boundaries that are well established*" and a unified field pattern with intervisibility to the wider landscape to the north-east.
- 7.45 Informed by field assessments, the Site itself is divided into two character areas by the old farm track of Gullicote Lane; Parcel A to the west and Parcel B to the east. Both Parcels, and their associated features are undesignated, however, they both contain features which are characteristic of the local area. In the case of Parcel A, these representative features (predominantly the hedgerows and associated tree cover) are focused at the boundaries, providing containment to the Site in turn alongside its position atop the local ridgeline and

contributing to the vegetated appearance of the landscape between Banbury and Hanwell. The presence of PRow 191/6/30 at the south-eastern extent also promotes a local recreation value upon this Parcel as well as providing value for the separation that the Parcel provides between Banbury and Hanwell. The interior of Parcel B provides little in the way of recreational value compared to Parcel A, but does have PRow 239/7/20 passing alongside its eastern boundary and therefore presents a relationship with the wider PRow network. Again, the main physical landscape features (hedgerows and hedgerow trees) are focused to the Parcel's boundaries however, unlike Parcel A, Parcel B experiences expansive views east and a greater relationship to the rolling agricultural landscape which extends in this direction. The Site does not represent, in a perceptual or physical sense, a landscape of any great importance or distinct character. Indeed, it is for the most part representative of the wider agricultural landscape and in this sense is an entirely 'ordinary' Parcel of agricultural land in land use, topographical and hydrological terms. It is adversely affected, in a sensory manner, by its proximity to both the existing development within Banbury to the south and also to Warwick Road (B4100) which bounds the Site to the west.

Baseline Visual Resource

7.46 The visual appraisal identified that landform, settlement and vegetation provide an effective containment of Site visibility for the scale of development proposed. **Figure 7.4** illustrates the ZPV for the Site and its main determinants. The ZPV extends as follows:

- Circa 320m to the north, filtered over distance by the presence of intervening field boundary and road-side trees and hedgerows of Main Street;
- To the north-east the presence of Hanwell and associated woodland at the south-eastern extent of the settlement curtails the extent of clear views available to within 300m. To the east views are further limited by the woodland copse so associated with the adjacent field Parcel. The variation in topography in this direction as a result of the valley system means that filtered longer distance views of the Site are potentially available from land on the opposite valley side circa 1.6km to the east and north-east;
- To the south-east the greatest views from the Site extend in this direction and as such are anticipated in return. Clear views are retained within 520m of the Site boundary as a result of variation of topography into the valley landform, however longer, glimpsed views are also anticipated near the business park (where publicly accessible locations are present) circa 2m to the east;
- Views from the south are curtailed to the Site's immediate edge by the woodland belt which skirts the northern extent of Hanwell Close. This woodland in turn limits the extent of intervisibility between the properties of Hanwell Close and the Site's interior to only heavily filtered glimpsed views despite their close proximity; and
- To the west clear views into the Site are limited to Warwick Road (B4100) as it runs adjacent, with further local views limited by a tree belt located on the opposite side of the road to the Site. Given the Site's location upon the peak of a local ridgeline and the presence of a valley system to the west, potential for distant views from this direction will be limited to high ground of the opposite valley side circa 1.3km to the west.

7.47 The publicly accessible locations and routes within the ZPV are set out below under the sub-title '*Visual Receptors*', below.

Visual Receptors

7.48 As discussed above, the opportunity for views of the Site from publicly accessible locations is limited in extent. However, users of the following locations and routes, and residents of the following properties, within a 1km radius of the Site have been identified as potentially able to perceive a change in visual amenity because of the Proposed Scheme. These receptor locations are described in more detail within the LVA (**Appendix 7.1**).

- Users of PRowS:
 - PRow 120/116/10;
 - PRow 191/6/30;
 - Gullicote Lane;
 - PRow 239/7/20;
 - PRow 239/7/10;
 - PRow 239/8/20;
 - PRowS 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10; and
 - PRow 239/9/10.
- Users of Transport Routes:
 - Warwick Road (B4100); and
 - Main Street.

7.49 The LVA (**Appendix 7.1**) also considers a number of visual receptors beyond the 1km radius of the Site boundary. Effects anticipated upon these wider receptors are not deemed to be significant and are therefore discounted from further consideration within this ES Chapter.

7.50 This assessment has focused on the assessment of views from publicly accessible locations. As the Site is positioned in close proximity to residential development, it follows that neighbouring dwellings have views into the Site, but these tend to be from first floor level above the domestic curtilage treatment and surrounding mature landscape features. Notwithstanding, any proposed development will need to be sensitive to the residential visual amenity of these dwellings.

7.51 Views from private residential properties are not protected by national planning guidance or local planning policy. The visual amenity of residential receptors is considered to be of very high sensitivity. Residential receptors considered as part of the LVA (**Appendix 7.1**) are as follows:

- Properties along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields;
- Residential property of Park Farm; and
- Properties at the western extent of Hanwell.

Representative Viewpoint Selection

- 7.52 Based on fieldwork observations, and the findings of the desk-based review a number of representative viewpoints, or Photoviewpoints (PVPs), have been selected, the locations of which are shown on **Figure 7.4**, while the views themselves are shown within Photoviewpoints 1 to 15 of **Appendix 7.3**.
- 7.53 The GLVIA3 states a preference that the ‘worst case’ scenario is used for visual assessment. The actual visibility of a Site is normally greater in winter (when trees and hedgerows have no leaves). On this basis, the assessment was carried out on 17th February 2022.
- 7.54 Details of each view, and the reason for its selection as a ‘representative viewpoint’, are provided in **Table 7.10** below.

Table 7.10: Representative Photoviewpoints

PVP No.	Location	Grid Reference	Distance* and Direction of View	Visual Receptor(s) and Sensitivity
1	PRoW 120/116/10 passing through Hanwell Fields Public Open Space	443334, 242841	125m; looking north	PRoW users (medium sensitivity)
2	PRoW 191/6/30	443367, 242964	20m; looking north	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
3	Gullicote Lane	443437, 243292	7m; looking southwest	Footpath users (medium sensitivity)
4	View from Main Street in Hanwell	443334, 243604	330m; looking south	Minor road users (medium sensitivity)
5	PRoW 239/7/10	443599, 243409	206m; looking southwest	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
6	PRoW 239/8/20	443798, 243452	315m; looking southwest	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
7	PRoW 239/9/10	444232, 242852	475m; looking west	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
8	Warwick Road (B4100) at the Site’s north-western corner	443109, 243204	13m, looking east	Minor Road users (medium sensitivity)
9	Warwick Road (B4100) junction with Main Street	443034, 243474	295m; looking southeast	Minor Road users (medium sensitivity)
10	PRoW 239/3/10	443251, 244011	745m; looking south	PRoW users (high sensitivity)
11	PRoW 138/6/10	445490, 244165	2.1km; looking southwest	PRoW users (high sensitivity)

PVP No.	Location	Grid Reference	Distance* and Direction of View	Visual Receptor(s) and Sensitivity
12	View from Banbury Cemetery	445347, 243330	1.6km; looking west	Cemetery users (medium sensitivity)
13	A423 near Hardwick Business Park	445550, 243005	1.8km; looking west	Main Road users (low sensitivity)
14	Junction of A422 Stratford Road and PRoW 418/1/20	441927, 242026	1.6km; looking northeast	Main Road users (low sensitivity)
15	PRoW 418/1/20	441987, 242531	1.3km; looking northeast	PRoW users (high sensitivity)

* Distance is from the PVP to the Site boundary along the line of the view.

Future Baseline

7.55 If implementation of the Proposed Scheme did not go ahead it is assumed that the Site would continue to be managed as arable farmland and the management of field boundary features utilising the same regime as is currently employed. Whilst vegetation would continue to mature, marked changes to the Site are not anticipated.

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

7.56 An understanding of the mitigation measures embedded in the Proposed Scheme is fundamental to an assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects. The design in terms of layout, built form height, orientation, and biodiversity enhancements has been informed by the LVA (**Appendix 7.1**) in order to mitigate potential impacts. A key principle of landscape assessment is that the assessment should take account of the effect of any proposed mitigation (GLVIA3, paragraph 6.45).

Construction Stage

7.57 The following primary and tertiary mitigation, which has been evaluated as part of the construction stage assessment is outlined below and will be included within a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP):

- Phasing of development to reduce the prominence of construction works on the local skyline;
- Lighting will be controlled through the implementation of best practice measures, informed by the ILP 'Guidance Note 1 for the reduction of obtrusive light'¹², including the use of sufficient lighting units for the task in hand to avoid the need for tall, wide beam lighting units and the reduction of fixed lighting outside working hours;
- Measures such as avoiding any artificial lighting, unless absolutely critical and the use of hoods, cowls and timers to restrict light spill only to where it is required and for as long as it is required; and
- Construction activities (including the movement of site traffic, lighting, noise and sounds) will be carefully controlled by a conditioned CEMP, as detailed in **Chapter 4:**

Development Specification and Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan of this ES.

Operational Stage

7.58 The following primary and tertiary mitigation, which has been evaluated as part of the operational stage assessment is outlined below (the principles committed to are also shown on **Figure 4.2: Illustrative Masterplan**):

- Provision of new residential built form will be focused entirely within the extents of Parcel A. Parcel B will be set aside as public open space (POS) provision, to include play features (NEAP or LEAP) with a naturalistic character, 0.23ha of attenuation basin and scattered parkland tree planting;
- To set back proposals from the course of Warwick Road (B4100) and maintain a physical gap between Banbury and Hanwell a belt of open space will be maintained around the western and northern extents of Parcel A, including 0.45ha of informal sports provision;
- The existing tree belt at the northern Site boundary will be retained and enhanced with native woodland copse and shrub planting across both Parcels, with the densest area of woodland created at the north-eastern corner of Parcel A to emphasise the separation between the new settlement edge of Banbury and Hanwell. Woodland copes areas will also be created within the green corridor along the western Site boundary with Warwick Road (B4100), with narrow gaps in planting located in line with the northern extent of the northern development zone and to allow for the proposed vehicular access point;
- PRoW Footpath 191/6/30 and Gullicote Lane retained in their current alignment. Vegetation along Gullicote Lane will be retained and enhanced as part of the Proposed Scheme, reinforced with native woodland copse and shrub planting along its western interface with Parcel A;
- Dwellings will be up to 11.5m in height (above finished floor level (FFL)) (equivalent to a maximum of 2.5 storeys), as defined on the Parameter Plan (**Figure 4.1**);
- New habitat including 4.94ha of wildflower meadow and parkland across both Parcels A and B; and
- Play provision (0.15ha in total) across both Parcel A (LAP) and Parcel B (NEAP or LEAP).

7.59 As described above, and in line with the assessment included within the LVA (**Appendix 7.1**), primary mitigation has been considered as an integral part of the overall design strategy. There are no 'add-on' measures to ameliorate the significant environmental effects described below. This positive and pro-active approach means that mitigation has been assessed and considered at all stages of the Proposed Scheme to prevent or reduce the occurrence of environmental effects.

Assessment of Effects, Secondary Mitigation and Residual Effects

Construction Stage

Changes to landscape character of the Site

- 7.60 During construction, the principal effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme will be the transition of the Site from an agricultural landscape to a predominantly urban development, in an undesignated landscape, and prior to the maturation of mitigation planting. Activities that could cause landscape and visual effects include:
- Clearance of vegetation within the construction zone, where appropriate;
 - Earthworks and temporary storage of topsoil;
 - Removal of unwanted waste from the Site;
 - Erection of site hoarding and fencing around vegetation (tree protection scheme);
 - Erection of temporary structures within the main contractor's construction compound, plus materials stockpiling and lay-down areas;
 - Potential lighting of the works (particularly during winter months);
 - Erection of scaffold structures;
 - Movement of construction vehicles, including mobile cranes;
 - Partially completed built form;
 - Works associated with the implementation of the landscape scheme; and
 - Removal of temporary construction facilities.
- 7.61 Within the Site, construction activity will inevitably result in a very high magnitude of change on the existing nature of the agricultural fields, Gullicote Lane and Warwick Road (B4100) as a discrete geographical unit of the wider landscape. The existing field boundary vegetation will be retained with the exception of those sections removed to accommodate the proposed new access point off Warwick Road (B4100). Given the presence of construction activities (including movement of site traffic, lighting, noise and sounds, and the gradual conversion of the Site from agricultural to residential, a noticeable adverse change upon the 'Perceptual and Sensory' dimension of the Site's character is not surprising during the construction stage.
- 7.62 The sensitivity of the landscape character of the Site is considered to be medium to high for Parcel A and high for Parcel B. The magnitude of change is considered to be very high. Therefore, there are likely to be direct, temporary, short-term, adverse effects which are considered to be Moderate to Major, to Major for Parcel A and Major for Parcel B.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.63 No secondary mitigation or enhancement is required/has been identified.

Residual Effect

In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual effect upon the Site's landscape character during the construction stage is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

This effect is considered to be **Significant**.

Changes to Landscape Character of the Site Context, Including Relationship Between Banbury and Hanwell

- 7.64 For the localised context of the Site, encompassing the settlement edges of Banbury, Hanwell and the intervening land, construction activities (including movement of site traffic, lighting, noise and sounds) will be ever-present during the construction process. This is not unusual and will be carefully controlled by a conditioned construction method statement as part of tertiary mitigation.
- 7.65 Geographically, these changes will generally be experienced at the Site level and its immediate context only, with effects upon the wider context benefitting from visual screening afforded by existing mature trees and hedgerow which bound the Site and exist within the local context - although longer, filtered views from within some areas of the Farmland Plateau LT may be possible during winter months. During construction, the Proposed Scheme will not directly affect the wider landscape context as the physical effects of construction (i.e. changes to fabric and character) will be contained within the Site.
- 7.66 There will be localised excavation of land, ground remodelling and the storage of topsoil, and slight alteration to local features of the Site. Additionally, movement and machinery associated with the site operations will introduce additional localised activity. In the wider context, higher-level construction activities may be visible.
- 7.67 The sensitivity of the landscape character of the immediate Site context, encompassing the settlement edges of Banbury, Hanwell and the intervening land, is considered to be medium to high. The magnitude of change is considered to be very high. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate to Major, to Major and will extend for only the duration of the construction stage.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.68 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.69 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon the landscape character of the Site context, including the relationship between Banbury and Hanwell, is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.70 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Changes to Visual Amenity experienced by Receptors within 1km of the Site

7.71 Geographically, effects upon visual receptors as a result of the construction stage will generally be experienced at the Site level and within its immediate context only, with effects upon the wider context benefitting from visual screening afforded by existing mature trees and hedgerows, which bound the Site and exist within the local context – although longer,

filtered views from within the wider landscape context may be possible during winter months (but are scoped out from further consideration within this Chapter).

- 7.72 In close proximity, construction activities (including movement of site traffic, lighting, noise and sounds) will be ever-present during the construction process. Movement and machinery associated with the Site operations will introduce additional localised activity, and higher-level construction activities may be visible from a wider context due to the extension of influence above the surrounding tree canopy. Such localised influences are not unusual and will be carefully controlled by a conditioned construction method statement as part of tertiary mitigation.

Users of PRow 120/116/10

- 7.73 For those receptors travelling along PRow 120/116/10 within the existing Hanwell Fields development to the south of the Site (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 1, **Appendix 7.3**), visibility of construction activities will be limited to heavily filtered construction movement upon the ground within Parcel A, and the movement of cranes, which will be visible above the canopy of the foreground intervening tree belt. The sensitivity of PRows within Hanwell Fields is medium. Construction activities will result in a medium magnitude of change. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.74 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 7.75 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along PRow 120/116/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 7.76 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be not Significant.

Users of PRow 191/6/30

- 7.77 Given their crossing through the interior of Parcel A, receptors travelling along PRow 191/6/30 (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 2, **Appendix 7.3**) are likely to experience a noticeable change as a result of the construction process, with close ranging and clear views of construction activity relating to new residential built form within Parcel A along both sides of the route. The sensitivity of receptors using PRow 191/6/30 is assessed to be high. The magnitude of change upon PRow 91/6/30 during the construction stage is considered to be very high. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience a direct, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.78 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 7.79 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along PRow 191/6/30 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 7.80 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of Gullicote Lane

7.81 Receptors travelling along Gullicote Lane (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 3, **Appendix 7.3**) are likely to experience close ranging and clear views of construction activity relating to the erection of residential built form within Parcel A and the implementation of POS features within Parcel B. Receptors using Gullicote Lane are assessed to have a sensitivity of medium. Considering the close ranging influence of construction, the magnitude of change upon these receptors is considered to be very high. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience a direct, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.82 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.83 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along Gullicote Lane is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.84 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of PRow 239/7/20

7.85 Receptors travelling along PRow 239/7/20 will experience visibility of construction works relating to the installation of the proposed natural play equipment and tree planting within Parcel B, and the excavation of the SuDS attenuation feature at its eastern extent. Crane movements associated with construction within Parcel A may also be visible above existing vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane. The sensitivity of these PRow receptors is considered to be high. The magnitude of change is considered to be high. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.86 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.87 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along PRow 239/7/20 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.88 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of PRow 239/7/10

7.89 Receptors travelling along PRow 239/7/10 (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 5, **Appendix 7.3**) will experience visibility of construction works to the south-west, relating to the installation of natural play equipment and tree planting within Parcel B, and the excavation of the SuDS attenuation feature at its eastern extent. Crane movements associated with construction within Parcel A may also be visible above existing vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane. The sensitivity of users of PRow 239/7/10 is considered to be high. The magnitude of change is considered to be high. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.90 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.91 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along PRoW 239/7/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.92 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of PRoW 239/8/20

7.93 As for PRoW 239/7/10, receptors travelling along PRoW 239/8/20 (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 6, **Appendix 7.3**) will experience visibility of construction works to the south-west, relating to the installation of natural play equipment and tree planting within Parcel B, and the excavation of the SuDS attenuation feature at its eastern extent. Crane movements associated with construction within Parcel A may also be visible above existing vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane. The sensitivity of these PRoW receptors is considered to be high. Construction activities are anticipated to result in a high magnitude of change. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.94 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.95 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along PRoW 239/8/20 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.96 This residual effect at the construction phase is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of PRoWs 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10

7.97 Receptors travelling along PRoW 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10 to the north (represented by Photoviewpoint 10, **Appendix 7.3**) are likely to experience glimpsed views of construction activity on the ground within Parcel A through intervening tree belts as well as associated crane movement above intervening canopy cover. Construction within Parcel B will not be visible for these receptors, screened by the change in topography and presence of existing built form of Hanwell. The sensitivity of these PRoW receptors is considered to be high. Construction activities identified will result in a medium magnitude of change for these receptors. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.98 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.99 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along PRoW 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.100 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of PRow 239/9/10

7.101 Receptors travelling along PRow 239/9/10 (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 7, **Appendix 7.3**) to the east of the Site will experience visibility of construction works relating to the installation of natural play equipment and tree planting within Parcel B, and the excavation of the SuDS attenuation feature at its eastern extent. Crane movements associated with construction within Parcel A may also be visible above existing vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane. The sensitivity of these PRow receptors is considered to be high. Construction activities identified will result in a medium magnitude of change. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.102 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.103 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along PRow 239/9/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.104 This residual effect at the construction phase is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of Warwick Road (B4100)

7.105 Those receptors travelling along Warwick Road (B4100), directly adjacent to the Site will experience close ranging and clear views of construction activity relating the erection of residential built form and associated infrastructure within Parcel A. As the main point of access, this road will also accommodate construction traffic into and out of the Site. While existing built form and vegetation will partially screen ground-based construction activities for those receptors upon Warwick Road (B4100) beyond the Site boundary, the movement of tall vehicles such as cranes will also be experienced by those receptors approaching the Site from the north and south. The sensitivity of Warwick Road (B4100) is considered to be medium. Construction activities will incur a very high magnitude of change upon these receptors. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience a direct, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.106 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.107 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along B4100 is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.108 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of Main Street

7.109 Road receptors travelling along Main Street to the north (represented by Photoviewpoint 4, **Appendix 7.3**) are likely to experience glimpsed views of construction activity on the ground within Parcel A through intervening tree belts as well as associated crane movement above

intervening canopy cover. Construction within Parcel B will not be visible for these receptors, screened by the change in topography and presence of existing built form of Hanwell. The sensitivity of these road receptors is considered to be medium. Construction activities identified will result in a medium magnitude of change for these receptors. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.110 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.111 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon visual receptors along Main Street is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.112 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Properties along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields

7.113 From within Hanwell Fields, visibility of construction activities will be limited to heavily filtered construction movement upon the ground within Parcel A and the movement of cranes which will be visible above the canopy of the foreground intervening tree belt. The sensitivity of residencies within Hanwell Fields is considered to be very high. Construction activity within the Site is anticipated to incur a medium magnitude of change. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect temporary short-term adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.114 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.115 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon residential receptors along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.116 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Residential property of Park Farm

7.117 Views from the residential property of Park Farm to the north of the Site are generally focussed to the south-east towards Parcel B, with mature vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane screening the majority of views towards Parcel A and the associated proposed residential built form. Visibility of construction activities within Parcel A will be limited to heavily filtered construction movement upon the ground and the movement of cranes which will be visible above the canopy of the foreground intervening tree belt. Within Parcel B receptors will likely experience visibility of construction works relating to the installation of natural play equipment and tree planting within Parcel B and the excavation of the SuDS attenuation feature at its eastern extent. The sensitivity of the residence of Park Farm is considered to be very high. Construction activity within the Site is anticipated to incur a medium magnitude of change. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.118 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.119 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon residential receptors at Park Farm is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.120 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Properties at the western extent of Hanwell

7.121 Properties at the western extent of Hanwell are likely to experience glimpsed views of construction activity on the ground within Parcel A through intervening tree belts as well as associated crane movement. Construction within Parcel B will not be visible for these receptors, screened by the change in topography and presence of existing built form and vegetation of the wider Hanwell settlement. The sensitivity of these residential receptors is assessed to be very high. The construction activities identified are considered to incur a medium magnitude of change for these receptors. Overall, such receptors are anticipated to experience an indirect, temporary, short-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.122 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.123 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual construction effect upon residential receptors at the western extent of Hanwell is the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.124 This residual effect at the construction stage is considered to be **Significant**.

Operational Stage

Changes to Landscape Character of the Site

7.125 The Proposed Scheme will result in the Site's permanent change of use from agricultural land to built form. The localised landscape character of the Site, particularly its interior, and its immediate surroundings will be altered by the Proposed Scheme, albeit where possible and appropriate existing landscape features are to be retained and enhanced within landscape corridors. A change of landscape character is inevitable following a change in land use, but it should not be seen as a detriment to the enjoyment and appreciation of the wider landscape.

7.126 Parcel A will be changed from an open arable field to become part of the built settlement, adopting similar characteristics of built form within the Site's immediate context to the south. Careful street alignment and the considered siting of new POS and no built development within Parcel B will maintain a strong visual and sensual link with the wider context to the north of Banbury. As part of the Proposed Scheme a variety of new native, valuable soft landscape elements and features will be provided, including new tree, hedgerow, shrub and meadow planting, footpath links and natural green spaces, all of which will contribute to the new character of the Proposed Scheme, provide an increase in the

variety of landscape features within the Site with beneficial effects, and reinforce characteristic features already present within the Site.

- 7.127 In the short-term, it is unlikely that the proposed landscape mitigation such as new tree planting along the western, northern and eastern Site boundaries, will provide notable addition to the character of the Site, or visual screening to proposed built form due to its immaturity within the early years. Retention of the open character of Parcel B as new POS provides the Proposed Scheme and Site itself with greater connectivity to existing PRowWs, continued opportunities for visual connections to the wider setting and maintains a strong visual and cultural link to the surrounding context. The Proposed Scheme will not require the closure or realignment of any PRowWs and those that do cross the Site will be retained within a green corridor.
- 7.128 The sensitivity of the landscape character of the Site is considered to be medium-high for Parcel A and high for Parcel B. The magnitude of change is considered to be high at Year 1. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate, to Moderate to Major at Year 1.
- 7.129 Primary mitigation measures including the reinforcement of existing vegetation along existing boundaries of the site and the route of Gullicote Lane, new woodland copse and shrub planting within proposed areas of POS and green corridor along the western, northern and eastern boundaries of Parcel A, street tree planting within the proposed development parcels and parkland tree planting around new features within Parcel B. Over time the retention and enhancement of green infrastructure will strengthen existing landscape features of the Site and aid the Proposed Scheme assimilation into its landscape context, reducing the perceived magnitude of change to medium and effect to direct, permanent, long-term, adverse and Moderate, to Minor to Moderate by Year 15.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.130 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.131 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon the landscape character of the site is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.132 This effect is considered to be **Significant** at both Years 1 and 15, with the greatest perceived change being focused upon the addition of development within Parcel A.

Operational Effects upon Landscape Character of the Site Context, Including Relationship Between Banbury and Hanwell

7.133 The area immediately surrounding the Site will be subject to the greatest change as a result of the Proposed Scheme, with perceived change predicted to diminish due to distance and intervening landform and features. The Site adjoins the settlement edge of Banbury, with proposed dwellings within the Site being enclosed by mature boundaries which will serve to reduce the effect of the Proposed Scheme on the wider landscape context. The Proposed Scheme incorporates a 'green ribbon' of open space alongside proposed additional landscape measures within the northern extents of Parcel A and also within Parcel B. It is considered that this will give rise to a combination of both beneficial and adverse effects upon the wider setting as, although the Proposed Scheme will extend the settlement edge of Banbury

marginally further north towards Hanwell, the proposals will contribute to and reinforce the well-treed character of the Site boundaries, albeit this reinforcement will not be immediately present at Year 1 due to such primary mitigation measures requiring time to mature.

- 7.134 Due to the well-treed character of Gullicote Lane, and the Site's location largely being on higher ground above the surrounding landscape, the provision of new landscape features is not considered to result in the loss of available views noted by the Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment, nor change the open character of land further east from the Site.
- 7.135 Upon completion, at Year 1, due to the retention of the existing mature landscape fabric and the proposals for any built form to be located within the well-contained field parcel of Parcel A only, it is not considered that the local landscape character will be dramatically altered by the Proposed Scheme, however the perceived separation between the settlement edge of Banbury and the outlying settlement of Hanwell will be reduced compared to the baseline condition locally altering the character between these two settlements. The Proposed Scheme will not obscure views of the wider landscape and, although views of the Site are very limited, where any viewing opportunities are available looking towards the Site from the wider setting, the Proposed Scheme will largely be seen with the backdrop of, or a relationship with, existing development within Banbury.
- 7.136 The quality of the proposed dwellings and the public realm will be high, reflecting that of the wider area, and will not adversely affect the quality of the natural and built environment, nor its visual attractiveness. Wildlife and ecological features of value will be retained and improved. Similarly, quiet enjoyment of the countryside will remain possible from PRoWs within the local context due to very little intervisibility with the Proposed Scheme.
- 7.137 The sensitivity of the landscape character of the Site Context, including the relationship between Banbury and Hanwell, is considered to be medium-high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 is considered to be high. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, temporary, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate, to Moderate to Major at Year 1.
- 7.138 Maturation of primary mitigation measures (including native woodland copse and shrub planting proposed within the northern POS area of Parcel A, with a woodland block provided at the Parcel's north-eastern corner) aims to strengthen the feeling of separation between new built form and Hanwell and provide a strong wooded settlement edge to new built form, similar to that experienced along the interface of the Site and Hanwell Fields. While retaining a feeling of separation between these two settlements, the character of this separating landscape will be changed from that of open arable farmland to more enclosed woodland planting which, while not uncharacteristic within the local area, will differ notably from the baseline condition. By Year 15 the magnitude of change will be marginally reduced to medium resulting in a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor to Moderate, to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.139 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.140 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon the landscape character of the Site Context, including the relationship between Banbury and Hanwell, is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.141 This effect is considered to be **Significant** at both Year 1 and Year 15.

Operational Effects upon Visual Receptors within 1km of the Site

Users of PRow 120/116/10

7.142 Photoviewpoint EDP 1 (**Appendix 7.3**) demonstrates how the tree belt along the northern extent of the existing POS area and settlement of Hanwell Fields filters views into the Site from along this route.

7.143 In terms of primary mitigation, dwellings proposed close to the southern Site boundary have been orientated to side-onto the southern boundary to limit the scale of built form against this green edge. If visible beyond the existing foreground tree belt, most likely during winter months when minimal leaf cover is present, the proposed dwellings will be seen as no more than a glimpsed roofline silhouette and will not rise above the existing canopy extents to become notable new features upon the skyline. Despite the addition of the third-party off-Site tree planting along the Site's southern extent, and primary mitigation planting provided within the Site, it is anticipated that Year 15 effects upon users of PRow 120/116/10 during operation will continue to be as that reported at Year 1.

7.144 The sensitivity of users of PRow 120/116/10, is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be low. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.145 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.146 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along PRow 120/116/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.147 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Users of PRow 191/6/30

7.148 Receptors traveling along PRow 191/6/30 will experience a close-ranging wholesale change of the Site from an open arable field, as seen within Photoviewpoint EDP 2 (**Appendix 7.3**), to a PRow route contained on both sides by new residential development. In addition, such receptors will experience the movement of Banbury's settlement edge northwards towards Hanwell, although continued separation is provided through the provision of a landscaped buffer along Parcel A's eastern and northern boundaries and around the north-eastern corner. New tree and woodland planting is proposed within these landscape buffers to reinforce that which presently exists along Gullicote Lane and Parcel A's northern edge, however at Year 1 the immaturity of such new planting will provide little in the way of screening or separation benefits. Despite being newly contained amongst built form the

route is maintained within a green corridor, identified as a 'neighbourhood green' with new tree and shrub planting, to give receptors a feeling of set-back from development and retention within a semi-green context.

- 7.149 The sensitivity of users of PRoW 191/6/30 is considered to be high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 is considered to be high. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major. Maturation of primary mitigation (provision of native tree and shrub planting within the green corridor containing this footpath route) will soften the appearance of the setback of built form and associated private driveways either side. The footpath will run parallel with the new SuDS swale feature which leads into Parcel B, which again will be planted and landscaped to provide visual interest to PRoW users. Despite the addition of such mitigation planting, the scale of change to the route's character means long term (Year 15) effects upon users of PRoW 191/6/30 during operation will continue to be as that reported at Year 1.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.150 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 7.151 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along PRoW 191/6/30 is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 7.152 This residual effect is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of Gullicote Lane

- 7.153 As part of primary mitigation, the proposed dwellings will be set back from the eastern boundary of Parcel A (particularly the north-eastern corner) and provided a green corridor to allow the retention of existing vegetation which currently contains the route of Gullicote Lane. As the route enters the Site from the north (at the location of Photoviewpoint EDP 3 (**Appendix 7.3**)) receptors will continue to experience partial views across an area of open space retained at the Site's northern edge, however, receptors will also experience the settlement edge of Banbury extend northwards towards Hanwell (particularly during early years when mitigation planting has not had sufficient time to mature), however the proposed northern POS will continue to provide an undeveloped buffer between the two settlements to prevent their coalescence, albeit narrower in extent than that presently and no longer of arable character. Views from the route into Parcel B will remain open and a result of maintaining this area as POS. New features such as natural play elements, the SuDS attenuation basin and new meadow grassland (once matured) will change the perception of Parcel A from arable land to public greenspace for recreation, however extended views to the landscape to the east will be retained as a result of the Proposed Scheme. As receptors travel south along Gullicote Lane towards Banbury, views become more contained by existing route-side vegetation which aids with screening of views to new built form within Parcels A and recreational/SuDS features within Parcel B.
- 7.154 The sensitivity of users of Gullicote Lane, is medium. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be high. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate.

7.155 Primary mitigation proposals look to strengthen the vegetation associated with this old agricultural track through new tree and shrub planting along the western edge of the route, and woodland planting at Parcel A's north-eastern corner, reducing the availability of views into Parcel A and towards new residential built form for those travelling along the route. The addition of new vegetation, once mature, will focus views along the course of Gullicote Lane and strengthen the screening of views of new residential built form to the west and natural play features to the east. In turn proposed woodland copses within the northern POS will, over time, contribute towards the filtering of views between and perceived separation of the new settlement edge of Banbury and the outlying village of Hanwell when travelling along the footpath route. By Year 15 the anticipated magnitude of change following maturation of primary mitigation will be reduced to medium. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.156 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.157 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along Gullicote Lane is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.158 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Users of PRow 239/7/20

7.159 For those receptors travelling along PRow 239/7/20, along the eastern extent of the Site, the main changes to views will be focussed within Parcel B. These will include the addition of an attenuation feature at the Parcel's eastern extent, a natural play area at the western high point and new tree, shrub and meadow planting. The addition of these features will alter the appearance of this Parcel from one of arable agricultural use to one of greater recreational purpose with new habitat areas, but will retain the open character that receptors experience at present. With the addition of residential built form within Parcel A only, existing vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane will screen the majority of views for users of this footpath. At most glimpsed views of rooflines may be visible beyond this intervening tree belt (during winter months predominantly) but this will not be unlike baseline views of the existing housing of Hanwell Fields to the south, albeit extended marginally further towards the village of Hanwell.

7.160 The sensitivity of users of PRow 239/7/20, is identified as high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate.

7.161 Mitigation planting provided along the western edge of Gullicote Lane will reinforce the existing tree belt which separates the two Parcels and, once mature, provide further screening of the proposed built form and rooflines within Parcel A. This reduction in visibility will ensure that the perceived separation between Banbury and Hanwell will continue to be maintained when viewed from this PRow and direction. New tree planting within Parcel B will over time also mature to create small glades to filter views of play features and create a parkland character. The magnitude of change following maturation of primary mitigation will

continue to be medium. Therefore by Year 15 there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.162 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.163 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along PRow 239/7/20 is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.164 This residual effect is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of PRow 239/7/10

- 7.165 Receptors travelling along PRow 239/7/10 towards the Site (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 5, **Appendix 7.3**) have potential to experience glimpsed views of the rooflines of the proposed dwellings along the eastern edge of Parcel A amongst the existing canopy extent of vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane, similar to the extent to which recent properties of Hanwell Fields are glimpsed beyond their associated tree belt. Despite initial views of new rooflines during the early years of establishment, the screening influence of vegetation along Gullicote Lane ensures that the perceived separation between the northern edge of Banbury (just glimpsed beyond tree belt planting) and Hanwell will be maintained when viewed from the east and as such will prevent the appearance of coalescence between them despite the northward shift of Banbury's settlement edge.
- 7.166 Within Parcel B, receptors will experience glimpsed views of the new SuDS attenuation basin at the Parcel's eastern extent, natural play features at the western high point and new tree, shrub and meadow planting across the Parcel's interior through gaps in the northern boundary hedgerow. The addition of these features will partially alter the appearance of this Parcel from one of arable agricultural use to one of recreational parkland, but will retain the open character that receptors experience at present.
- 7.167 The sensitivity of users of PRow 239/7/10, is identified as high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate.
- 7.168 Primary mitigation will reinforce vegetation along the western extent of Gullicote Lane to provide further strengthening to the screening effect it provides, however, this contribution to softening and filtering of new built form will not be notable until this mitigation planting has had time to mature (circa 15 years). The maturation of mitigation planting will ensure that the perceived separation between the northern edge of Banbury (just glimpsed beyond tree belt planting) and Hanwell will be maintained when viewed from the east and as such, will prevent the appearance of coalescence between them despite the northward shift of Banbury's settlement edge. Mitigation planting has been proposed along the northern extent of Parcel B to strengthen this field boundary vegetation and in turn provide additional screening and strengthening of Green Infrastructure connectivity that it provides. Given the well tree'd character of the view at present (seen within Photoviewpoint EDP 5, **Appendix 7.3**) the addition and maturation of new tree group planting within Parcel B will not be considered out of character with the baseline view. Despite the addition of this primary

mitigation planting, it is anticipated that Year 15 effects upon users of PRow 239/7/10 during operation will continue to be as that reported at Year 1; indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.169 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.170 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along PRow 239/7/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.171 This residual effect is considered to be **Significant**.

Users of PRow 239/8/20

7.172 For receptors travelling along PRow 239/8/20, the change in topography in comparison to those receptors travelling along PRow 239/7/10 results in views of properties of Parcel A being screened from view entirely.

7.173 Views from this public footpath will be focused upon changes made predominantly within Parcel B, albeit such changes will already be heavily filtered by a combination of change in topography and the presence of intervening boundary vegetation (to be retained). Glimpsed views may be visible of new play features to be incorporated at the high ground of Parcel B, directly lining up with the view through the hedgerow gap of the Site's north-eastern corner seen directly ahead in Photoviewpoint EDP 6 (**Appendix 7.3**), and new tree, shrub and meadow planting across the Parcel's interior. The addition of these features will partially alter the appearance of this Parcel from one of arable agricultural use to one of recreational parkland, but will retain the open character that receptors experience at present.

7.174 The sensitivity of users of PRow 239/8/20, is identified as high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate.

7.175 Primary mitigation planting proposed along Gullicote Lane will, once mature, provide strengthening of existing screening and ensure that the perceived separation between the northern edge of Banbury (just glimpsed beyond tree belt planting) and Hanwell will be maintained when viewed from the east and as such, will prevent the appearance of coalescence between them despite the northward shift of Banbury's settlement edge.

7.176 The Proposed Scheme will also retain and provide enhancement planting to the existing vegetation along Parcel B's northern boundary, strengthening its form to provide additional screening of proposals. By Year 15 new tree and shrub planting proposed within Parcel B will also have had time to mature and create a parkland character. Given the well tree'd character of the view at present (seen within Photoviewpoint EDP 6, **Appendix 7.3**) the addition and maturation of new tree group planting within Parcel B will not be considered out of character with the baseline view. By Year 15 the anticipated magnitude of change following maturation of primary mitigation is considered to be reduced to low, resulting in an overall indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.177 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.178 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along PRow 239/8/20 is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.179 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Users of PRowS 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10

7.180 As seen within Photoviewpoint EDP 10 (**Appendix 7.3**), the existing tree belt alongside Main Street provides an element of screening of new proposals when travelling along these local northern PRow routes, however it is likely that the outline of the northern extent of new built form will be glimpsed beyond the canopy of this tree belt (particularly during winter months and in the early years of the Proposed Scheme's establishment) and the new settlement edge created will be seen to extend north towards Hanwell and the receptor. Provision of POS along the northern edge of Parcel A will continue to provide an undeveloped physical green buffer between the two settlements. Parcel B and the POS/SuDS features within are screened entirely from the views of these receptors.

7.181 The sensitivity of users of PRow 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10, is identified as high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be low. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.

7.182 New woodland block planting is proposed within the northern POS area of Parcel A to strengthen the screening effects of the existing northern boundary vegetation. Once mature at Year 15, this proposed planting will soften and screen available views of the proposed dwellings, resulting in views not being dissimilar to those seen presently from these PRowS. The magnitude of change following maturation of primary mitigation at Year 15 will reduce to very low. Therefore, by Year 15 there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.183 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.184 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along PRow 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.185 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Users of PRow 239/9/10

7.186 For receptors travelling along PRow 239/9/10 to the east of the Site (represented by Photoviewpoint EDP 7, **Appendix 7.3**) views of the Proposed Scheme will be focused predominantly upon those changes occurring within Parcel B. Vegetation alongside Gullicote Lane will be retained as part of the Proposed Scheme, providing instant screening of the dwellings proposed within Parcel A. During early years of the operational Proposed Scheme,

glimpsed views of the eastern-most proposed dwellings may be experienced amongst the canopy extent of existing vegetation, however this will be similar in appearance to the extent to which recent properties of Hanwell Fields are glimpsed beyond their associated tree belt. Despite these initial glimpsed views during the early years of establishment, the screening influence of vegetation along Gullicote Lane ensures that the perceived separation between the northern edge of Banbury (just glimpsed beyond tree belt planting) and Hanwell will be maintained when viewed from this direction and the landscape beyond.

- 7.187 Receptors will clearly see a change within Parcel B from arable farmland to wildflower grassland covered POS with natural play features upon its high ground and the SuDS attenuation basin at its eastern extent. While there will be a slight change in Parcel appearance within the view from this PRoW, Parcel B will continue to be green and open in character.
- 7.188 Primary mitigation planting proposed along Gullicote Lane will, once mature, provide strengthening of existing screening of the proposed dwellings within Parcel A and ensure that the perceived separation between the northern edge of Banbury (just glimpsed beyond tree belt planting) and Hanwell will be maintained when viewed from the east, and as such, will prevent the appearance of coalescence between them despite the northward shift of Banbury's settlement edge.
- 7.189 By Year 15 new tree and shrub planting proposed within Parcel B will also have had time to mature and create a parkland character. Given the well tree'd character of the view at present the addition and maturation of new tree group planting within Parcel B will not be considered out of character with the baseline view and will provide softening of views of natural play features.
- 7.190 The sensitivity of users of PRoW 239/9/10, is identified as high. The magnitude of change at Years 1 and 15 will be low. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.191 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 7.192 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along PRoW 239/9/10 is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 7.193 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Users of Warwick Road (B4100)

- 7.194 Road receptors anticipated to experience the greatest change as a result of proposals are those travelling directly adjacent to the Site's western boundary along Warwick Road (B4100). Addition of proposed dwellings within Parcel A will convert currently open views over an adjacent arable field to close ranging views of new residential properties, separated from Warwick Road (B4100) by a green corridor with new tree and copse planting. It is anticipated that only a short length (circa 600m) of this overall route will experience visual change as a result of the Proposed Scheme. Receptors will experience a northward extension

of Banbury's settlement edge when travelling towards and out of Banbury along this route. The green corridor along Parcel A's western boundary and the POS area wrapping around the north of Parcel A maintains some separation, albeit narrower in scale, between these settlements for those travelling along Warwick Road (B4100).

- 7.195 Primary mitigation planting is incorporated within the green corridor and POS which wraps around the western and northern extent of Parcel A, including areas of native mixed woodland copse and understorey shrub. At Year 1 this planting will provide little in the way of visual mitigation effects, having had minimal time to mature sufficiently, resulting in the scheme forming a clear extension to built form when approaching or leaving Banbury along this route. Over time, however, this planting and structure aims to replicate the well wooded Banbury settlement edge currently present along the Site's southern boundary and provide softening and screening of new built form for road users in such close proximity. In addition, the maturation of this mitigation planting will contribute towards the creation of a tree lined settlement edge and emphasising the settlement separation between the new settlement edge of Banbury and Hanwell to prevent perceived and physical coalescence for such receptors.
- 7.196 When travelling south towards the Site along this route the new tree-lined settlement edge will appear similar to that experienced at present within Photoviewpoint EDP 9 (**Appendix 7.3**), albeit slightly extended northward along the road route's course.
- 7.197 The sensitivity of users of Warwick Road (B4100) is identified as medium. The magnitude of change at Years 1 and 15 will be high for the 600m stretch of the overall route when passing adjacent to the Site's boundary and approaching from the junction with Main Street, but very low beyond this extent. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate for the 600m stretch adjacent to the Site's boundary and Negligible to Minor beyond this extent.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.198 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 7.199 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along Warwick Road (B4100) is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 7.200 This residual effect is considered to be **Significant** upon 600m of the route as it passes directly adjacent to the Site, but **Not Significant** beyond that extent.

Users of Main Street

- 7.201 Views from this minor road route are limited by the presence of road-side vegetation and as such the majority of intervisibility between receptors travelling along it and the Proposed Scheme will be heavily filtered. The proposed dwellings within Parcel A will therefore on the most part be screened from view, however where a narrow window of visibility is available between the painted house and the shelter belt at the western extent of the settlement, new built form within Parcel A will be clearly visible during Year 1 against a backdrop of the Site's vegetated southern edge. These clear views, where available, will be fleeting and oblique and represent only a very small section of the overall route.

- 7.202 The sensitivity of users of Main Street, is identified as medium. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.
- 7.203 Primary mitigation planting is incorporated within a green corridor and POS wrapping around the western and northern edges of Parcel A respectively, including the provision of areas of native mixed woodland copse to replicate that currently present along the Site's southern boundary. At Year 1, new planting will provide little in the way of visual mitigation effects, having had minimal time to mature and grow sufficiently, however, over time this woodland copse vegetation will mature and combine to provide softening of new built form and create a tree-lined settlement edge similar to that experienced at present. By Year 15 the magnitude of change will reduce to very low. Therefore, at Year 15 there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Negligible to Minor.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 7.204 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 7.205 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon visual receptors travelling along Main Street is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

- 7.206 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Properties along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields

- 7.207 Existing vegetation along the northern edge of the existing Hanwell Fields development provides heavy screening of the Site's interior at present, and will continue to have a similar influence in relation to the proposed dwellings within Parcel A and the POS proposals of Parcel B. Further mixed woodland planting is proposed (outside of the Site and its proposals, connected with Hanwell Fields development to the south) along the southern Site boundary which will deepen and further strengthen the screening influence of the existing tree belt once implemented and allowed to mature. It is anticipated that those properties of Hanwell Fields adjacent to Parcel A will initially experience heavily filtered silhouettes of new (maximum) 2.5-storey dwellings upon the opposite side of this tree belt, particularly during winter months when leaf cover is minimal, however during summer months is likely that the proposed dwellings will be barely discernible from these residences. Proposed dwellings along this southern edge of development are to be orientated in such a way to reduce the expanse of close ranging silhouettes experienced, retaining some of the edge of settlement character currently perceived by residents here.
- 7.208 The sensitivity of residences along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields is identified as very high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be low. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate.
- 7.209 As new tree and shrub planting proposed within the open space along the southern boundary of Parcel A is allowed to mature over time (by circa Year 15) winter views will benefit from additional canopy depth which will provide further filtering of views of new built form, becoming barely discernible despite the close proximity of these receptors. The magnitude of change following maturation of primary mitigation will therefore reduce to

very low, resulting in an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Minor to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.210 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.211 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon properties along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.212 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Residential property of Park Farm

7.213 Views from the residential property of Park Farm to the north of the Site are generally focussed to the south-east towards Parcel B, with mature vegetation associated with Gullicote Lane screening the majority of views towards Parcel A and the associated proposed dwellings. There is potential that at Year 1 the outline of new (maximum) 2.5 storey residential properties along the eastern extent of Parcel A may be glimpsed through intervening vegetation (particularly during winter months) while mitigation measures remain immature.

7.214 In relation to Parcel B, existing vegetation along the Parcel's northern edge provides an element of screening of the Parcel's current interior. Given that Parcel B is to be retained as an open field parcel (albeit converted from arable farmland to recreational parkland) with only low-level recreational features, residential receptors of Park Farm are unlikely to perceive any change as a result of such proposals.

7.215 The sensitivity of the residency of Park Farm is identified as very high. The magnitude of change at year 1 will be low. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate.

7.216 Further reinforcement of vegetation along Gullicote Lane (the addition of mixed woodland copse planting) forms primary mitigation of the Proposed Scheme. Once matured at circa Year 15 this will provide further filtering of proposed dwellings within Parcel A to the point of views being similar to those experienced presently from this property. Within Parcel B existing vegetation will be reinforced with new woodland copse planting to strengthen this green connection between Gullicote Lane and the woodland to the east, which will further screen available intervisibility with Parcel B by Year 15. The magnitude of change following maturation of primary mitigation at Year 15 will reduce to very low, and therefore an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect is anticipated and considered to be Minor to Moderate.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.217 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.218 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon properties of Park Farm is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.219 This residual effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Properties at the western extent of Hanwell

7.220 For a few properties at the western extent of Hanwell, south-west of the junction between Main Street and Gullicote Lane, receptors may experience clear views of the northern edge of the proposed dwellings within Parcel A from upper-storey rear windows. Within such views, the proposed dwelling will be seen, against a backdrop of the Site's vegetated southern edge and beyond existing northern boundary trees. The POS area wrapping around the northern edge of Parcel A is designed to provide some continued separation, albeit narrower in scale, between these properties and the new settlement edge of Banbury, albeit during early years of the Proposed Scheme's operation, new planting proposed within this POS area will have had minimal time to mature to soften or green the appearance of built form. No views will be available towards Parcel B.

7.221 The sensitivity of the residencies at the western extent of Hanwell is identified as very high. The magnitude of change at Year 1 will be high. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Major.

7.222 Primary mitigation planting is to be incorporated within the POS wrapping around the northern extent of Parcel A, including the provision of areas of native mixed woodland copse to replicate that currently present along the Site's southern boundary. At Year 1 this new planting will provide little in the way of visual mitigation effects, having had minimal time to mature and grow sufficiently, however, over time this woodland copse vegetation within the northern green corridor will mature and combine to provide softening and, in parts, screening of new built form to create a tree-lined settlement edge similar to that experienced at present, albeit closer in proximity.

7.223 With the maturation of this mitigation the magnitude of change is anticipated to reduce to medium. Therefore, at Year 15 there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect, which is considered to be Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

7.224 No secondary mitigation or enhancement has been identified.

Residual Effect

7.225 In the absence of secondary mitigation the residual operational effect upon properties at the western extent of Hanwell is the same as that reported in the pre-secondary mitigation scenario.

Significance

7.226 This residual effect is considered to be **Significant**.

Limitations and Assumptions

7.227 To ensure transparency within the EIA process, the following limitations and assumptions have been identified:

- Baseline conditions have been established using published documents and field assessment; it is important to note that this information may change before, or during, the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme;

- The assessment is undertaken in consideration of the ‘worst case’ scenario for the Proposed Scheme, i.e. those potential outcomes, situations or locations which will result in the most profound effect on landscape and visual receptors, unless stated to the contrary. It, therefore, identifies the greatest degree of change likely to accrue and may be subject to mitigating factors or alternative conditions which might reduce those effects;
- As defined above, the assessment of likely significant effects applies a pre-determined methodology to arrive at its conclusions. This procedure brings a degree of objective, procedural rigour into what otherwise might be judged to be ‘personal opinion’. Certainly, professional judgement still plays its part, but the purpose of adopting a methodology is to make the process as clear and logical as possible; and
- Whilst details are provided in relation to most elements of the proposal through the accompanying **Figure 4.1: Parameter Plan** and principles illustrated on **Figure 4.2: Illustrative Landscape Strategy**, as an outline planning application, a certain level of assumption is made with regard to the Proposed Scheme’s appearance. It is assumed that a high quality of design, in terms of new dwellings and open spaces, will be implemented across the whole Site, and the above assessment is considered as such.

Summary

7.228 **Table 7.11** provides a summary of the effects, receptors, residual effects and conclusions of significance considered within the Chapter.

7.229 The table only provides a summary of the residual effects identified within the assessment and details of all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation that has been taken into account is set out in detail within the Chapter and summarised within the Environmental Management Plan included within **Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan**.

Table 7.11: Summary of residual and significant effects

Effect	Receptor	Residual effect	Is the effect significant?
Construction Stage			
Changes to landscape character	The Site	Moderate to Major, to Major adverse	Yes
	The Site context, including relationship between Banbury and Hanwell	Moderate to Major, to Major adverse	Yes
Changes to the visual amenity of visual receptors within 1km of the Site	Users of PRoW 120/116/10	Minor to Moderate adverse	No
	Users of PRoW 191/6/30	Major adverse	Yes

Effect	Receptor	Residual effect	Is the effect significant?
	Users of Gullicote Lane	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Users of PRow 239/7/20	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Users of PRow 239/7/10	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Users of PRow 239/8/20	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Users of PRow 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10	Moderate adverse	Yes
	Users of PRow 239/9/10	Moderate adverse	Yes
	Users of Warwick Road (B4100)	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Users of Main Street	Minor to Moderate adverse	No
	Properties along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Residential property of Park Farm	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Properties at the western extent of Hanwell	Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
Operational Stage			
Changes to landscape character	The Site	Year 1: Moderate, to Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
		Year 15: Minor to Moderate, to Moderate adverse	Yes
Changes to the visual amenity of visual	The Site context, including relationship between Banbury and Hanwell	Year 1: Moderate to Major, to Major adverse	Yes
		Year 15: Minor to Moderate, to Moderate adverse	Yes
Changes to the visual amenity of visual	Users of PRow 120/116/10	Year 1 and Year 15: Minor adverse	No

Effect	Receptor	Residual effect	Is the effect significant?
receptors within 1km of the Site	Users of PRow 191/6/30	Year 1 and Year 15: Moderate to Major adverse	Yes
	Users of Gullicote Lane	Year 1: Moderate adverse	Yes
		Year 15: Minor to Moderate adverse	No
	Users of PRow 239/7/20	Year 1 and Year 15: Moderate adverse	Yes
	Users of PRow 239/7/10	Year 1 and Year 15: Moderate adverse	Yes
	Users of PRow 239/8/20	Year 1: Moderate adverse	Yes
		Year 15: Minor to Moderate adverse	No
	Users of PRow 239/4/10, 239/5/10 and 239/3/10	Year 1: Minor to Moderate adverse	No
		Year 15: Minor adverse	No
	Users of PRow 239/9/10	Year 1 and Year 15: Minor to Moderate adverse	No
	Users of Warwick Road (B4100)	Year 1 and Year 15 within the 600m stretch adjacent to the Site: Moderate adverse	Yes
		Year 1 and Year 15 outside of the 600m stretch adjacent to the Site: Negligible to Minor adverse	No
	Users of Main Street	Year 1: Minor to Moderate adverse	No
		Year 15: Negligible to Minor adverse	No
Properties along the northern edge of Hanwell Fields	Year 1: Moderate adverse	Yes	
	Year 15: Minor to Moderate adverse	No	
Residential property of Park Farm	Year 1: Moderate adverse	Yes	
	Year 15: Minor to Moderate adverse	No	

Effect	Receptor	Residual effect	Is the effect significant?
	Properties at the western extent of Hanwell	Year 1: Major adverse	Yes
		Year 15: Moderate to Major adverse	Yes

References

- ¹ Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition. Available in print.
- ² Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021) National Planning Policy Framework. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ³ Cherwell District Council (2015). Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1. Available at: <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/downloads/download/45/adopted-cherwell-local-plan-2011-2031-part-1-incorporating-policy-bicester-13-re-adopted-on-19-december-2016> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ⁴ Cherwell District Council (1996) Cherwell Local Plan. Available at: <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/83/local-plans/373/adopted-local-plan-1996-november-1996> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ⁵ Natural England (2014) NCA Profile: 95 Northamptonshire Uplands (NE565) Available at: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5007752023769088?category=587130> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ⁶ Cherwell District Council (2018) Cherwell Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. Available at: <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/downloads/file/8106/cherwell-residential-design-spd-adopted-july-2018> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ⁷ Oxfordshire County Council (2004) Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS). Available at: <https://owls.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/OWLS/Home/> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ⁸ WYG on behalf of Cherwell District Council(2013) Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment. Available at: <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/downloads/file/4253/banbury-landscape-sensitivity-and-capacity-assessment---final-draft-report-march-2013> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ⁹ Cherwell District Council (2017) Cherwell Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Draft). Available at: <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/downloads/file/4415/cherwell-design-guide-spd-november-2017> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022].
- ¹⁰ Cherwell District Council 2007 Conservation Area Appraisal for Hanwell. Available at: <https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/directory-record/1803/hanwell> [Date accessed: 18 November 2022]
- ¹¹ Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition Page 158
- ¹² Institution of Lighting Professionals (2021) Guidance Note 01/21 The Reduction of Obtrusive Light. Available at: <https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-1-for-the-reduction-of-obtrusive-light-2021/> [Date Accessed 18 November 2022]