

5 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 This landscape study has been prepared by MHP Design. MHP Design Ltd, Chartered landscape architects, were instructed by the Applicant to undertake a landscape and visual impact assessment for land located east of junction 11 on the M40, to the east of Banbury. This report has been prepared for the Applicant and its successors in title to the land. The assessment commenced in October 2021 identifying the landscape and visual constraints to inform an iterative design process, an iterative, consultation and design refinement. It was completed in April 2022 and updated in November 2023.

5.1.2 For the purposes of this report, the Proposed Development is referred to as the 'Application Site' and the areas around the Application Site with visual or character relationship is referred to as the 'study area'.

5.1.3 The landscape study has been commissioned as part of an Environmental Statement in preparation for an **"Outline planning application for the construction of up to 140,000 sqm of employment floorspace (use class B8 with ancillary offices and facilities) and servicing and infrastructure including new site accesses, internal roads and footpaths, landscaping including earthworks to create development platforms and bunds, drainage features and other associated works including demolition of the existing farmhouse. All matters of detail reserved."**

5.1.4 This technical chapter has been informed through the production of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Please refer to **Appendix 5.3** for the LVIA that informed this landscape chapter of the ES. The assessment was undertaken in two stages. The first stage comprised of an assessment of the baseline landscape and visual conditions and identified constraints and opportunities that were used to inform the design evolution of development proposals. The extent and nature of potential mitigation measures were also considered along with the potential for inherent mitigation through Site and contextual features and characteristics. The second stage was undertaken to assess development proposals based on the development parameter plans. These took into consideration inherent and proposed mitigation measures and confirmed the likely landscape and visual impacts of the development proposals.

5.1.5 The Application Site is located north east of Junction J.11 of the M40, to the east of Banbury, Oxfordshire.

5.1.6 The Application Site lies within the administration of Cherwell District Council.

5.1.7 Please refer to the following appendices for accompanying landscape and visual figures:

- **Appendix 5.1 Figure 5.1** for topography.
- **Appendix 5.1 Figures 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4** for Zones of Theoretical Visibility.
- **Appendix 5.1 Figure 5.5** for Landscape Constraints.
- **Appendix 5.1 Figure 5.6** for Site location, Designations, Context and Viewpoint Photograph Locations.

- **Appendix 5.1 Figures 5.7 to 5.35 and 5.36 to 5.41** for Viewpoint Photographs.

5.2 ASSESSMENT APPROACH

LVIA Methodology

5.2.1 For full landscape assessment methodology please refer to **Appendix 5.2**.

Landscape Character and Characterisation

5.2.2 Landscape Character Assessment Guidance defines 'landscape' as consisting of the following elements:

- Natural: Geology, landform, air and climate, soils, flora and fauna
- Cultural/Social: land use, settlement, enclosure
- Perceptual and Aesthetic: memories, associations, preferences, touch and feel, smells, sounds and sight

5.2.3 Landscape Character Assessment Guidance encourages assessment at different scales that fit together as a hierarchy of landscape character areas and types so that each level can provide more detail to the one above. Identifying the existing landscape character is part of establishing the baseline conditions of an Application Site and its study area.

National Character Assessment

Establishes broad pattern of the landscape of the wider countryside



District Character Assessment

Establishes pattern of the landscape of the district/county countryside



Local Character Assessment

Establishes pattern of the landscape at a local level



Site elements and features

Establishes to landscape resources on the Site such as trees, hedges etc.

Value of the landscape receptor

5.2.4 Value can apply to areas of landscape as a whole, or to the individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of the landscape. Value is determined by some or all the following aspects:

- Importance applied to landscape by designation or planning policy and the level of this importance in terms of local, regional or national importance
- The views of the local consultees including the local planning authority, members of the public, special interest groups such as Parish Council, wildlife or walking groups
- The rarity, importance and condition of the landscape resource as judged objectively by the landscape professional

5.2.5 International and Nationally designated landscapes tend to be of the highest value, locally designated landscapes are most likely to be of moderate value and undesignated landscapes can either be of lower to moderate value depending on an assessment taking into account the following factors:

- Condition of the local landscape
- Scenic quality
- Rarity
- Representativeness
- Conservation interests
- Recreation value
- Perceptual aspects
- Associations

5.2.6 The definitions of value used are as follows:

- **United Kingdom:** such as World Heritage Sites
- **Regional:** such as National Parks, AONB, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings
- **County:** such as Special Landscape Areas, Areas of Great Landscape Value, several protected features such as Tree Preservation Orders, Site may be mentioned in literature, art, tourism or in district/county landscape character assessments or sensitivity assessments.
- **Borough/District:** generally undesignated, may have value at a community level by tourism, literature, art, village greens or allotments, may have a small number of protected features
- **Local:** no designated features or landscape, limited value, no protected features

Susceptibility of the landscape receptor to the proposed change

5.2.7 This relates to the ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character or quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area, or an individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect) to accommodate the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of the of landscape planning policies.

5.2.8 The definitions of susceptibility of the proposed change to landscape used are as follows:

- **High:** Elements, features or whole landscapes that are susceptible to change, with limited opportunities to accommodate change based on the strength of the existing landform, pattern, land cover, settlement pattern, sense of enclosure, visual context, tranquillity
- **Medium:** Elements, features or whole landscapes that are partially susceptible to change, with some opportunities to accommodate change based on the strength of the existing landform, pattern, land cover, settlement pattern, sense of enclosure, visual context, tranquillity
- **Low:** Elements, features or whole landscapes that have limited susceptibility to change, with opportunities to accommodate change based on the strength of the existing landform, land use pattern, land cover, settlement pattern, sense of enclosure, visual context, tranquillity

- **Negligible:** Elements, features or whole landscapes that have very limited susceptibility to change, with opportunities to accommodate change based on the strength of the existing landform, land use pattern, land cover, settlement pattern, sense of enclosure, visual context, tranquillity

Definition of Landscape Sensitivity

5.2.9 Landscape **sensitivity** is determined by combining judgements of the **susceptibility** to the proposed change and the **value** of the receptor. Refer to **Table 5.1**.

Table 5.1: Definition of Landscape Sensitivity

| Sensitivity | Definition |
|-------------|--|
| High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High susceptibility to proposed change - May be a designated landscape valued at a regional or national level - Landscape characteristics are vulnerable and unable to accommodate change - Development may result in significant changes to landscape character |
| Medium-High | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medium or high susceptibility to proposed change - May be a designated landscape valued at a sub-regional or regional level - Landscape characteristics are vulnerable with limited ability to accommodate change - Development may result in moderate changes to landscape character |
| Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medium susceptibility to proposed change - Some designated features and/or valued at a sub-regional level - Landscape characteristics are able to accommodate some change - Development may not result in significant changes to landscape character |
| Medium-Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low or medium susceptibility to proposed change - Likely to be an undesignated landscape but possibly some designated features and/or valued at a sub-regional level - Landscape characteristics are resilient to accommodating change |

| Sensitivity | Definition |
|-------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development may not result in significant changes to landscape character |
| Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low susceptibility to proposed change - Undesignated landscape and/or valued at a district level - Landscape characteristics are robust and able to accommodate change - Development may not result in significant changes to landscape character |
| Negligible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No susceptibility to proposed change - Undesignated, valued at a local level - Landscape characteristics that are degraded or discordant with landscape character - Development may result in an improvement to landscape character |

Landscape Receptor – Overall Magnitude of Effect

5.2.10 The magnitude of the effect is determined by combining the professional judgements about the size or scale of the landscape effect, the geographical extent over the area which the effect occurs, its reversibility and its duration. Refer to **Table 5.2:**

- The scale of the effect – for example, whether there is complete loss of a particular element/feature/characteristic or partial loss or no loss; proportion of key elements or features of the baseline that will be lost, the value/importance of these elements to the landscape character and the degree of contrast between the development and the landscape character
- The geographical extent of the area affected relative to the receptor; this will range from the Site itself, a short distance comprising the immediate local area, a medium distance comprising the local and middle landscape and long distance comprising the wider landscape
- The duration of the effect; 0-1 year for the construction period is considered short term duration, 1-10 years for mitigation to establish is considered medium term duration, 10 years and beyond is considered long term duration
- Reversibility; the extent to which the development could be removed and the land reinstated. Reversible and temporary development would include solar farms and wind turbines. Other development such as housing would be considered irreversible and permanent

Table 5.2: Definition of Landscape Magnitude of Effect

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Magnitude of change: | Predicted landscape effects: |
|----------------------|------------------------------|

| Magnitude of change: | Predicted landscape effects: |
|----------------------|---|
| High | - Very substantial loss of landscape elements of the landscape, and/or the lost elements make a substantial contribution to landscape character, and/or change affects a large geographical area, and/or the development introduces a dominating and contrasting characteristic to the landscape |
| Medium-High | - Substantial loss of landscape elements of the landscape, and/or the lost elements make a large contribution to landscape character, and/or change affects a moderate to large geographical area, and/or the development introduces a prominent and partially uncharacteristic feature to the landscape |
| Medium | - Moderate loss of landscape elements of the landscape, and/or the lost elements make a moderate contribution to landscape character, and/or change affects a moderate geographical area, and/or the development becomes an identifiable feature but not wholly uncharacteristic to the landscape |
| Medium-Low | - Partial loss of landscape elements of the landscape, and/or the lost elements make a moderate to small contribution to landscape character, and/or change affects a small to moderate geographical area, and/or the development is perceptible but not wholly uncharacteristic to the landscape |
| Low | - Minor loss of landscape elements of the landscape, and/or the lost elements make a small contribution to landscape character, and/or change affects a small geographical area, and/or the development introduces elements not uncharacteristic to the landscape |
| Negligible | - Negligible or no loss of landscape elements of the landscape, and/or the lost elements make a limited contribution to landscape character, and/or change affects a very small geographical area, and/or the development introduces characteristics that are consistent with or enhance the landscape, and/or effects may be short term, temporary or reversible |

Assessment Criteria used to assess landscape effects

5.2.11 Landscape effects are judged by assessing the overall sensitivity (susceptibility to change and value of receptor) of the existing landscape and the overall magnitude of effect predicted as a result of the development (size/scale, geographical extent, duration and reversibility of effect). The diagram below (**Table 5.3**) is utilised to judge the effect.

Table 5.3 Significance Matrix

| Magnit ude of Change | Sensitivity of landscape Receptor | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----|------------|
| | High | Medium | Low | Negligible |
| | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| | High | Major | Major | Moderate | Negligible |
| | Medium | Major | Moderate | Minor to Moderate | Negligible |
| | Low | Moderate | Minor to Moderate | Minor | Negligible |
| | Negligible | Negligible | Negligible | Negligible | Negligible |

Method for Assessing Views

5.2.12 A Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is often produced as an initial desktop tool to inform the extent of the study area based on the theoretical visibility of the development. The (ZTV) illustrates the extent to which the Proposed Development Site as a whole is potentially visible from the surrounding area. ZTV’s are prepared using GIS software (Global Mapper) by carrying out an analysis of the visibility of the Site from the surrounding area up to 5km using a digital terrain model from OS Landform DTM profile and OS Panorama DTM data. Calculations are based on bare earth survey OS height data with a viewer height set at 1.7m. The digital terrain model and subsequent output are based on bare earth modelling and as such do not take into account any screening from land cover such as buildings, hedgerows and trees. ZTV mapping therefore represents a ‘worst case’ scenario assuming 100% visibility, where the actual extents of visibility are likely to be less extensive. ZTV’s are used to determine where there may be potential views of the development which are then further verified with Site visits. The ZTV is then used to identify potential key views of the development which are then verified by field work to further identify and visit visual receptors. Where a ZTV is not produced, the study area is determined by reviewing land use and landform shown on OS maps and aerial photos. Field work is then undertaken to refine the extent of views.

5.2.13 Viewpoints selected for inclusion in the assessment and for illustration of the visual effects fall broadly into three groups:

- **Representative viewpoints**, selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptor, where larger numbers of viewpoints cannot all be included individually and where the significant effects are unlikely to differ – for example, certain points may be chosen to represent the views of particular public footpaths and bridleways
- **Specific viewpoints**, chosen because they are key and sometimes promoted viewpoints within the landscape, including for example specific local visitor attractions, viewpoints in areas of particularly noteworthy visual and/or recreational amenity such as landscapes with statutory landscape designations, or viewpoints with particular cultural landscape associations
- **Illustrative viewpoints**, chosen specifically to demonstrate a particular effect or specific issues, which might, for example, be restricted visibility at certain locations

5.2.14 Visual effects are determined through a process of identifying which visual receptors are likely to experience significant visual effects. The process of identifying effects involves determining the **sensitivity** of each visual receptor and **magnitude of**

change experienced at each which leads to a professional judgement of the **visual effects**.

Value attached to views

5.2.15 Visual sensitivity is partially determined by judgements made attributing value to views. Judgements take account of:

- Recognition of the value attached to particular views, for example in relation to heritage assets, or through planning designations
- Indicators of the value attached to views by visitors, for example through appearances in guidebooks or on tourist maps, provision of facilities for their enjoyment (such as parking places, sign boards and interpretive material) and reference to them in literature or art

5.2.16 The value of views is defined as follows:

- **Regional;** Recognition of the view by its relation to a heritage asset or national planning designation (AONB, National Park, National Trail). Appearance in guide books, tourist maps or featured in well-known art works. Provision of facilities such as interpretation panels, parking places & signage. Views enjoyed at a local or national level.
- **Borough/District;** Local planning designation (Country Park, AGLV) or valued locally by village design statement or sensitivity assessment. May be some detractor elements, views enjoyed at a local level.
- **Local;** No specific value placed by designation or publication, may be a large proportion of detractor elements within the view, views enjoyed at a community or Site level.

Susceptibility of visual receptors to change

5.2.17 Visual sensitivity is partly determined by the susceptibility to change of each visual receptor. The susceptibility of different visual receptors to changes in views and visual amenity is mainly a function of:

- The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and
- The extent to which their attention is focussed on the views and visual amenity they experience at particular locations

5.2.18 The susceptibility of visual receptors to change in views and visual amenity is defined broadly as follows:

- **High;** residents at home (generally rooms occupied during daylight hours), people engaged in outdoor recreation (public rights of way or where attention is focussed on the landscape or particular views), visitors to heritage assets or other attractions where the surroundings are important to the experience, communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents in the area
- **Medium;** travellers on road, rail or other transport modes such as cyclists
- **Low;** people engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not involve or depend upon appreciation of views, people at their place of work whose attention may be focused on their work or activity

5.2.19 Combining judgements regarding the susceptibility of change with the value attached to views leads to a professional judgement of sensitivity of each visual receptor.

Table 5.4: Definition of Visual Sensitivity

| Sensitivity rating: | Definition: |
|---------------------|---|
| High | Receptor may have high susceptibility to changes in view/visual amenity, views experienced may be of a regional value designated landscape or at a defined publicised viewing point/attraction, receptors may include residents at home (from rooms generally occupied in daylight hours), users of national or long distance trails or visitors to listed parks/gardens. |
| Medium-High | Receptor may have medium or high susceptibility to changes in view, views experienced may be of a regional or district value designated landscape, receptors may include travellers on scenic road routes, residents at home (from rooms not facing the development or generally not occupied in daylight hours), users of public rights of way. |
| Medium | Receptors may have medium susceptibility to changes in view/visual amenity, views experienced may be within district value locally designated landscape, receptors may include travellers on roads, pedestrians or cyclists. |
| Medium-Low | Receptors may have with low or medium susceptibility to changes in view/visual amenity, views experienced may be of a district or local value locally designated landscape where there maybe be some detractors, receptors may include commuters on busy roads such as motorways or urban roads, users may be involved in passive outdoor sport such as golf. |
| Low | Receptors may have low susceptibility to change in views/visual amenity, views experienced are likely to be of local value undesignated landscape with several detractors, receptors may include people at work, people engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not depend on landscape as a setting |
| Negligible | Receptors may have low or negligible susceptibility to change in views/visual amenity, views experienced are likely to be of local value undesignated landscape dominated by detractors where there are low numbers of receptors engaged in indoor active work |

Visual Receptor – Overall Magnitude of Effect

5.2.20 The magnitude of the effect is determined by combining the professional judgements about the size or scale of the visual effect, the geographical extent over the area which the effect occurs, its reversibility and its duration. Refer to **Table 5.5**:

Table 5.5: Definition of Visual Magnitude of Effect

| Magnitude of change: | Predicted visual effects: |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
|----------------------|---------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Magnitude of change: | Predicted visual effects: |
| High | Total loss or very substantial alteration of key views, and/or Site may form a very large proportion of the view, and/or all of the Site may be visible, and/or views of the Site may be experienced over a long distance by high numbers of receptors, and/or views may be permanent and irreversible |
| Medium-High | Substantial alteration of key views, and/or Site may form a medium to large proportion of the view, and/or most of the Site may be visible, and/or views of the Site may be experienced over a moderate to long distance by moderate to high numbers of receptors, and/or views may be permanent and irreversible |
| Medium | Moderate alteration of key views, and/or Site may form moderate proportion of the view, and/or around half of the Site may be visible, and/or views of the Site may be experienced over a moderate distance by moderate numbers of receptors, and/or views may be permanent and irreversible |
| Medium-Low | Moderate to minor alteration of key views, and/or Site may form moderate to minor proportion of the view, and/or partial views of the Site, and/or views of the Site may be experienced over a moderate to short distance by moderate to low numbers of receptors, and/or views may be permanent and irreversible |
| Low | Minor alteration of key views, and/or Site may form small proportion of the view, and/or partial or obscured views of the Site, and/or views of the Site may be experienced over a short/local distance by low numbers of receptors, and/or views may be permanent and irreversible |
| Negligible | Limited alteration of key views, and/or Site may form very small proportion of the view, and/or limited views of the Site, and/or views of the Site may be experienced over a very short distance by a limited number of receptors, and/or views may be temporary, reversible, permanent or irreversible |

Assessment criteria used to assess visual effects

5.2.21 Visual effects are judged by assessing the overall sensitivity (susceptibility to change and value of receptor) of the existing landscape and the overall magnitude of effect predicted as a result of the development (size/scale, geographical extent, duration and reversibility of effect). The diagram below (**Table 5.6**), is utilised to judge the effect.

Table 5.6 Significance Matrix

| of Magnitude Change | Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|----------|----------|------------|
| | | High | Medium | Low | Negligible |
| High | | Major | Major | Moderate | Negligible |
| Medium | | Major | Moderate | Minor to | Negligible |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | Moderate | |
| | Low | Moderate | Minor to Moderate | Minor | Negligible |
| | Negligible | Negligible | Negligible | Negligible | Negligible |

Assessment of Significance

5.2.22 Following identification of the sensitivity, extent and significance of the individual landscape and visual effects the overall effects are combined with each other. A judgement is then made by identifying the most significant effects, after mitigation, resulting in the likely effects of the Proposed Development. The definitions of the final statement of significance are shown in **Table 5.7**.

Table 5.7: Definition of Significance

| Significance of impact: | Definition of predicted effects: |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Major beneficial (positive) effect | The proposals would result in: the scheme causing a significant improvement to the existing view successful mitigation providing significant improvements to landscape quality and character fitting in very well with the scale, landform and pattern of the existing landscape |
| Moderate beneficial (positive) effect | The proposals would result in: the scheme causing a noticeable improvement to the existing view successful mitigation providing noticeable improvements to landscape quality and character fitting in well with the scale, landform and pattern of the existing landscape |
| Minor beneficial (positive) effect | The proposals would result in: the scheme causing perceptible improvement in the existing view successful mitigation providing slight improvements to landscape quality and character fitting in with the scale, landform and pattern of the existing landscape |
| Neutral/not significant | The proposals would result in: the scheme causing no discernible deterioration or improvement to the existing view mitigation that neither deteriorates or improves landscape the scale, landform and pattern of the current landscape is broadly retained |
| Minor adverse | The proposals would result in: |

| Significance of impact: | Definition of predicted effects: |
|------------------------------------|---|
| (negative) effect | the scheme causing a slight perceptible deterioration to the existing view almost wholly success in mitigating adverse effects not quite fitting the landform and scale of the landscape |
| Moderate adverse (negative) effect | The proposals would result in: the scheme causing a noticeable deterioration to the existing view only partial mitigation of adverse effects variance to the existing landscape, out of scale or at odds with the local pattern and landform |
| Major adverse (negative) effect | The proposals would result in: the scheme being immediately apparent causing significant deterioration to the existing view no way of fully mitigating adverse effects considerable variance to the existing landscape, degrading the integrity of its overall character |

Legislative and Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Framework

5.2.23 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) sets out the governments planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied for future development. At the heart of the NPPF is 'a presumption in favour of sustainable development'.

5.2.24 The Site is not within a nationally protected landscape and has not been recognised as a 'valued landscape'.

5.2.25 The NPPF paragraph 174 requires policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

'recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.'

Adopted Cherwell Local Plan

5.2.26 **Policy ESD 10** – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment - Protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment will be achieved by the following:

- In considering proposals for development, a net gain in biodiversity will be sought by protecting, managing, enhancing and extending existing resources, and by creating new resources

- The protection of trees will be encouraged, with an aim to increase the number of trees in the District
- The reuse of soils will be sought
- If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative Site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, then development will not be permitted.
- Development which would result in damage to or loss of a Site of international value will be subject to the Habitats Regulations Assessment process and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no likely significant effects on the international Site or that effects can be mitigated
- Development which would result in damage to or loss of a Site of biodiversity or geological value of national importance will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm it would cause to the Site and the wider national network of SSSIs, and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in biodiversity/geodiversity
- Development which would result in damage to or loss of a Site of biodiversity or geological value of regional or local importance including habitats of species of principal importance for biodiversity will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm it would cause to the Site, and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in biodiversity/geodiversity
- Development proposals will be expected to incorporate features to encourage biodiversity, and retain and where possible enhance existing features of nature conservation value within the Site. Existing ecological networks should be identified and maintained to avoid habitat fragmentation, and ecological corridors should form an essential component of green infrastructure provision in association with new development to ensure habitat connectivity
- Relevant habitat and species surveys and associated reports will be required to accompany planning applications which may affect a Site, habitat or species of known or potential ecological value
- Air quality assessments will also be required for development proposals that would be likely to have a significantly adverse impact on biodiversity by generating an increase in air pollution
- Planning conditions/obligations will be used to secure net gains in biodiversity by helping to deliver Biodiversity Action Plan targets and/or

meeting the aims of Conservation Target Areas. Developments for which these are the principal aims will be viewed favourably

- A monitoring and management plan will be required for biodiversity features on Site to ensure their long term suitable management.

5.2.27 **Policy ESD 13:** Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement – Opportunities will be sought to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations, through the restoration, management or enhancement of existing landscapes, features, or habitats and where appropriate the creation of new ones, including the planting of woodlands, trees and hedgerows.

5.2.28 Development will be expected to respect and enhance local landscape character, securing appropriate mitigation where damage to local landscape character cannot be avoided. Proposals will not be permitted if they would:

- Cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside
- Cause undue harm to important natural landscape features and topography
- Be inconsistent with local character
- Impact on areas judged to have a high level of tranquillity
- Harm the setting of settlements, buildings, structures or other landmark features, or
- Harm the historic value of the landscape. Development proposals should have regard to the information and advice contained in the Council's Countryside Design Summary Supplementary Planning Guidance, and the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) and be accompanied by a landscape assessment where appropriate.

5.2.29 **Policy ESD 15:** The Character of the Built and Historic Environment - Successful design is founded upon an understanding and respect for an area's unique built, natural and cultural context. New development will be expected to complement and enhance the character of its context through sensitive siting, layout and high quality design. All new development will be required to meet high design standards. Where development is in the vicinity of any of the District's distinctive natural or historic assets, delivering high quality design that complements the asset will be essential.

5.2.30 **Policy ESD 17:** Green Infrastructure - The District's green infrastructure network will be maintained and enhanced through the following measures:

- Pursuing opportunities for joint working to maintain and improve the green infrastructure network, whilst protecting Sites of importance for nature conservation
- Protecting and enhancing existing Sites and features forming part of the green infrastructure network and improving sustainable connectivity between Sites in accordance with policies on supporting a modal shift in transport (Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections), open space, sport and recreation (Policy BSC 10: Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision), adapting to climate change (Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change), SuDS (Policy ESD 7: Sustainable

Drainage Systems (SuDS)), biodiversity and the natural environment (Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment), Conservation Target Areas (Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas), heritage assets (Policy ESD 15) and the Oxford Canal (Policy ESD 16)

- Ensuring that green infrastructure network considerations are integral to the planning of new development. Proposals should maximise the opportunity to maintain and extend green infrastructure links to form a multi-functional network of open space, providing opportunities for walking and cycling, and connecting the towns to the urban fringe and the wider countryside beyond
- All strategic development Sites (Section C: 'Policies for Cherwell's Places') will be required to incorporate green infrastructure provision and proposals should include details for future management and maintenance.

Summary of landscape policy and designations

5.2.31 The landscape of the Site and its context is undesignated and is not recognised as a valued landscape at district or local level through the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

5.2.32 Both at national and local level, landscape policy and guidance generally seeks to conserve local distinctiveness and appearance. Landscape policy is not nil harm but allows for residual landscape and visual harm and would require 'significant' landscape and visual adverse effects to exceed the threshold of unacceptable harm. Any landscape and visual harm arising from development should be weighed in the overall planning balance.

Scoping Criteria

5.2.33 A Screening Opinion Application (R22/00385/SO) was submitted to Cherwell District Council and West Northamptonshire Council on 10th February 2022. Their response confirmed the Proposed Development does constitute EIA Development and that an Environmental Statement will be required.

5.2.34 A Scoping Opinion has not been undertaken with the Local Planning Authorities therefore the potential effects considered below are based on professional judgement.

5.2.35 Accordingly, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment considers the following potential effects:

- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the National Character Area 95 Northamptonshire Uplands;
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the Upstanding Village Farmlands Landscape Character Type;
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the Clay Vale Landscape Character Type;
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the local landscape character;
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the wider contextual agricultural landscape character;

- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the urban employment zone,
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the motorway corridor and junction;
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the wider Banbury settlement;
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on the Site;
- Construction Phase – Landscape effects on Site features;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of the M40 motorway;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of the A361 highway;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of the A422 highway;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of the Banbury Road;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of motorway junction J.11;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of PRow AD22;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of PRow AD11;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of PRow to Seale’s Farm;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of PRow AU29;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of Frontier Park;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of the industrial park off Hennef Way;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on road and footpath users at Nethercote and Overthorpe;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of Banbury Country Park;
- Construction Phase – Visual effects on users of the Oxfordshire Canal north west of the Site;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the National Character Area 95 Northamptonshire Uplands;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the Upstanding Village Farmlands Landscape Character Type;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the Clay Vale Landscape Character Type;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the local landscape character;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the wider contextual agricultural landscape character;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the urban employment zone,

- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the motorway corridor and junction;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the wider Banbury settlement;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on the Site;
- Operational Phase – Landscape effects on Site features;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of the M40 motorway;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of the A361 highway;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of the A422 highway;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of the Banbury Road;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of motorway junction J.11;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of PRoW AD22;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of PRoW AD11;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of PRoW to Seale’s Farm;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of PRoW AU29;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of Frontier Park;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of the industrial park off Hennef Way;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on road and footpath users at Nethercote and Overthorpe;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of Banbury Country Park;
- Operational Phase – Visual effects on users of the Oxfordshire Canal north west of the Site;

Limitations to the Assessment

5.2.36 Although almost all of the assessment was undertaken during winter conditions, additional assessment was undertaken along the Oxford Canal footpath and Banbury Country Park during April when leaving out had occurred. The assessment has used professional judgement in consideration of winter views from the canal and country park.

5.2.37 Due to legal and safety requirements, viewpoint photographs have not been taken on the M40 motorway or the motorway junction. Representative photographs have been taken from Google. Where these have been used these have been credited to Google.

5.3 LANDSCAPE BASELINE CONDITIONS

5.3.1 The Site is located in agricultural land to the east of Banbury. The Site is located within a single national character area but falls into two landscape character types which influence the baseline conditions. The baseline was established through a combination of desktop research, production of digital ZTV's (zones of theoretical visibility) and Site survey work undertaken in February, March and April 2022. A +/- 1.5m margin of variation in height was considered in the landscape and visual assessment to allow for ground level changes to accommodate potential engineering requirements.

National Landscape Character 95: Area Northamptonshire Uplands

5.3.2 For the key characteristics please refer to **Appendix 5.3 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** Section 4.2.

5.3.3 For the published landscape opportunities please refer to **Appendix 5.3 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** paragraph 4.2.2

5.3.4 In summary, the NCA is an area of rolling, limestone hills and valleys capped by ironstone- clay Lias, with many long, low ridgelines. Rivers flow out from the NCA in all directions. While there are areas of differing character, there are strong unifying landscape features across the Northamptonshire Uplands, most importantly the extensive areas of open field systems with ridge and furrow and the earthworks of deserted and shrunken settlements which occur throughout. Land is in mixed agricultural use, mostly pasture and arable, and reservoirs are a significant feature. Woodland is sparse, with many scattered, small, broadleaved coverts and copses. Around the townscapes there is extensive development. Some of the key statistics that help attribute levels of sensitivity to the NCA are listed below:

- 1% of the NCA comprises Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Less than 1% of the NCA comprises Ancient Woodland
- 0.6% of the NCA is publicly accessible

The settlement pattern of the Northamptonshire Uplands is described as follows: "Many of the villages are small, clustered around an ironstone church, some with the earthworks of abandoned dwellings at their edges. Some are on prominent hilltop Sites while others lie in sheltered situations at the heads of minor valleys. Around the edges of the NCA, along the Cherwell valley and to the north between Rugby and Daventry, the villages have become significantly enlarged by 20th century development. Settlements close to the urban areas of Daventry and Rugby and along strategic routes such as the M1, the A14 and the A425 have significant commuter development. There has been pressure for sand and gravel extraction along the area of the M1 corridor." Quote from NCA 95 profile.

Upstanding Village Uplands LCT (OWLS)

5.3.5 The local landscape character types are described fully in **Appendix 5.3 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** Section 4.3 and 4.4 with the Site falling into two character types which reflects the change in landform. These are the Clay Vales and Upstanding Village Farmlands.

5.3.6 The Upstanding Village Farmlands landscape character type forms a smaller area which borders the eastern margin and has a strong correlation with the change in landform as it ascends steeply from the vale landscape.

Clay Vales LCT (OWLS)

5.3.7 The main area of the Site falls with the Clay Vales LCT which reflects the vale landscape over clay which contrasts with the more steeply ascending Upstanding Village farmlands LCT. The key characteristics include:

- A flat and low lying landform
- Mixed land uses, dominated by pastureland, with small to medium sized hedged fields
- Many mature oak, ash and willow hedgerow trees
- Dense, tree lined streams and ditches dominated by pollarded willows and poplars
- Small to medium sized nucleated villages

Published Site level landscape and visual assessment

5.3.8 At Site level, the Cherwell District Council, Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (Assessment Addendum) 18.08.2014 (CDBLSCA) is helpful although to some measure outdated due to the extent of local development that has been constructed or approved in the 8 years since first prepared.

5.3.9 The published landscape character types (Clay Vales & Upstanding Village Farmlands) provide details of the desirable and representative landscape characteristics. The CDLSCA identified the Site falling within Site 101. The published assessment identifies that:

- The sensitivity of the natural Site factors is considered to be Medium.
- The sensitivity of the cultural factors that influence the landscape character is considered to be Medium
- The Site is considered to have a Medium sensitivity to aesthetic factors (NOTE: the assessment was produced before the development of Frontier Park which has changed the landscape and visual baseline)

5.3.10 The assessment draws a conclusion in 4.1.13 that the Site has a combined Landscape Sensitivity of Medium to High. As High sensitivity is not recorded in any of the subcategories and Frontier Park has now changed the landscape baseline it is assessment that the overall landscape sensitivity does not exceed Medium.

5.3.11 With regard to visual sensitivity, the CDBLSCA identifies the following visual sensitivity which does not take into consideration changes to the visual baseline through the development of Frontier Park:

- The Site is identified to have a high sensitivity to general sensitivity. This is based on the combination of receptors which generally comprise primary road users passing on the M40, A631, A422 and rail users. The assessment considers these surrounding visual receptors to be Medium sensitivity.
- The assessment confirms that there is potential to provide mitigation along the lower slopes providing screening from the adjacent fast moving vehicles without impacting on the overall landscape character of the area. It is recognised that mitigation on the higher ground would not fit the field

pattern and existing valley sides characteristics. Overall, the Site is identified to have Medium sensitivity to mitigation.

5.3.12 The assessment draws a conclusion in 4.1.17 that the Site has a combined Visual Sensitivity of Medium to High. Frontier Park has now changed the landscape baseline to this assessment through both introduction of urbanising features and creating notable screening from the motorway corridor. Taking those changes to the baseline into consideration it is assessed that the overall landscape sensitivity does not exceed Medium.

5.3.13 The assessment goes on to combine landscape sensitivity with visual sensitivity to achieve a landscape character sensitivity of Medium – High. When adjusted to account for the effects of Frontier Park on landscape character and Visual Sensitivity this is reduced to an overall Medium Landscape Character Sensitivity.

5.3.14 The assessment identifies that the Site has Medium sensitivity to designations (heritage or natural resource value) but this should not be confused with landscape policy designations at either national or local level as the Site is without landscape designations. Value is put on the higher ground and a scenic value of Medium to High sensitivity identified. However, this must be qualified in that views are not accessible to the public or identified as having known value. As such the assessment identifies that the perceived scenic value to local groups (receptors) is assessed to be Medium to Low.

5.3.15 In terms of landscape capacity for employment development the assessment states:

'There is potential for limited commercial/ light industrial development located on the lower lying land adjacent to the A361, forming an extension to existing allocation to the west of the road. It would however, be beneficial in landscape and visual terms if this was prevented from encroaching on the valley sides. The capacity for commercial and light industry is considered to be Medium.'

5.3.16 Future management and maintenance is considered in the assessment and states:

'Re-implementation of the Site boundaries along the roads should be a priority within the Site area to provide a buffer to the fast moving road corridors.'

The Site and wider landscape and urban contextual area

5.3.17 The Site presently forms part of the wider rural agricultural landscape that lies east of the M40 motorway corridor. The published landscape character assessments are representative of this landscape but do not reflect the urban and highway characteristics of the landscape that lies immediately to the west of the Site.

5.3.18 The settlement pattern of Banbury has seen employment land develop along the western side of the M40 motorway corridor and to the north of the town. This has recently been extended east of the motorway north of J.11 with the allocation and construction of the Frontier Park employment area. This expansion has logically used J.11 to create an extension to the established employment land to the north of Hennef Way and south along the western edge of the motorway.

5.3.19 The existing established employment land and areas under construction have a strong correlation with the motorway corridor and junction J.11. The geographical extent of the employment land creates robust separation between the motorway and the main

civic areas of the town. It is therefore a character area in its own right which does influence the character and setting of the Site.

5.3.20 Closely associated with the employment areas and wider urban area are the highway corridors which permeate both through the urban and rural areas to the east and north of Banbury. The formal engineering and architecture of the motorway corridor, junction J.11 and the A422 dual carriageway form distinctive communication routes through the countryside to the east of Banbury. These have a direct link to the urban area and notably influence the character and appearance of the landscape immediately adjoining. The A361 contributes but has a slightly less urban character north of the Site and Frontier Park. Recent employment land development has now urbanised this highway corridor immediately west of the Site.

5.3.21 The agricultural vale landscape that extends north is equally large in geographical extent and informs the wider rural setting of the town although it will have very limited visual connectivity with the town. The ascending landscape of the Upstanding Village Farmlands has a greater visual prominence which will be seen above the urban area and local employment land structures. It also prevents deeper views to the rural settlement landscape east of the clay vales which creates separation between the elevated landscape east of the Site with Banbury and the lower lying clay vales.

5.3.22 The numerous small settlements within the wider rural landscape to the north and east of the Site have limited influence on the landscape character as they are separated from Banbury and the Site by distance and topography. These are not assessed to be potential landscape or visual receptors.

Site Landscape Resources

5.3.23 Landform; The Site has two distinct topographical characters which together influence the character of the Site and the wider landscape context. The main area of the Site falls gently to the west and north west with local undulations. This land lies at approximately 100m AOD to 110m AOD. To the east the Site ascends quickly to form a local ridge which extends up to 160m AOD beyond the eastern boundary of the Site. This ridge is a distinct feature that identifies a change between the settled clay vale like landscape to the west and a less settled and more rural landscape over limestone to the east. The topography is illustrated in **Figure 5.1 Appendix 5.1**

5.3.24 The topography has a strong influence on local landscape character and visual amenity. The landform visually separates the landscape of the Site with the less settled landscape to the east and at the same time creates stronger visual connectivity with the urban landscape of Banbury and the motorway corridor. The position of the M40 motorway corridor appears to have been informed by a combination of the landform and settlement pattern in this location. As such the landform has had and continues to have an influence on local settlement pattern.

5.3.25 Hydrology; There are a number of small ponds located within the Site which are likely to have originated for the watering of livestock. These are generally dispersed and have a limited effect on the landscape character of the Site.

5.3.26 Landcover; The dominant landcover is of improved pasture, set within a number of irregular shaped fields of varying size. The field pattern has been disturbed within the western and southern margins of the Site through the evolution of the A421 and A361, the major motorway junction (11) and the motorway corridor, its slip roads and associated architecture and earthworks.

5.3.27 Vegetation; The established field boundaries vary in height and condition. The Site has a number of established hedgerow trees in similar mixed conditions. An

arboricultural survey has been undertaken to inform on species, conditions, constraints and opportunity. Where practical to do so, mature trees in good conditions will be retained within green corridors maintained through the Site so that they can continue to contribute to visual amenity, landscape character and ecosystem services.

5.3.28 Hedges are of mixed native species and trees include ash, oak and willow. Grassland generally consists of improved pasture.

5.3.29 Established trees and hedges along the southern boundary are the result of planting undertaken as part of the highway development so offer some screening between the Site and the A421. The trimmed hedge along the boundary with the A361 is much more open.

Cultural and Social Aspects

5.3.30 The Site has been managed as pastoral farmland associated with Huscote Farm, the farmhouse of which is excluded from the Site. Small, dispersed farms are a characteristic of the local agricultural landscape which are considered to be in general decline.

5.3.31 There is very limited public access as the Site is not crossed by any public rights of way. The local public rights of way network is notably dispersed in this location. The Jurassic Way is a long distance trail which predominately lies to the east of the Site.

5.3.32 The village settlements of Chacombe, Overthorpe and Middleton Cheney are located to the east, south east and north east of the Site but have limited association with the Site being well separated by open countryside and landform. The Site has a much stronger correlation with the expanded settlement of Banbury through the established and expanding industrial and commercial development to the immediate west and south west of the Site.

5.3.33 The M40 motorway and its junction 11 is a prominent and dominating feature within the immediate landscape that also has a strong association with the wider settlement of Banbury. Commercial development has extended up to the western edge of the motorway to the south west of the Site but extends to the east of the motorway immediately west of the Site. These developments in association with the evolved and now large scale highway network are a key and prominent characteristic of the local landscape.

5.3.34 The rural features of the Site have a sense of time depth but in the context of the prominent urbanising features the landscape appears transitional between the wider rural landscape to the north and east and the urban landscape to the west and south west.

Aesthetic and Perceptual

5.3.35 The Site and immediate contextual landscape reflect the interface of the urban with the rural landscape, reflecting both characteristics where strong visual connectivity exists. It is an active and audible landscape due to the density and dispersal of the local highway networks. These highway networks create strong separation between the landscapes adjoining them creating a damaged and incidental landscape although retaining distinct rural characteristics albeit at a smaller scale than the prominent urban and highway features.

5.3.36 The landscape is perceived as an edge of settlement location which forms a transition between the contrasting urban and rural features. The highways contribute to the scale of the urbanising features which contrasts with the scale and simplicity of the

rural landscape. The openness of the immediate landscape contributes to this sense of transition where both distinctive characteristics are seen in views from the local highway network.

Condition of the Landscape

5.3.37 The Site is in a moderate condition generally. The historic southern and western margins have been damaged by highway evolution works but where disturbed the landscape is generally re-established.

5.3.38 Trees and hedges throughout the Site are of mixed condition with a number of older trees now in natural decline but still contributing to wider landscape character. Please refer to the arboricultural assessment submitted within the planning application documentation.

Summary of Landscape Baseline

5.3.39 The landscape of the Site falls within two landscape character types in response to the change in landform that is seen between the western and eastern areas of the Site. The landscape characteristics of the Site reflect the general characteristics associated with the two character types. It is a predominately rural landscape in moderate condition with hedgerows and field trees defining medium scale fields in pastoral land use. Trees and hedges do make a contribution to the character of the landscape of the Site and it is experienced as part of the wider agricultural landscape that extends northwards to the east of the M40 motorway corridor.

5.3.40 The ascending eastern margin of the Site is representative of the Upstanding Village Farmlands landscape character type which continues beyond the eastern margin of the Site. This landscape is less influenced by the urban edge and communication corridors found to the west and south of the Site. The landscape has a stronger rural quality and is assessed to have greater sensitivity than the western and southern areas of the Site.

5.3.41 The belt of employment land that extends along the western margin of the M40 motorway and now extends north of junction J.11 through the construction of Frontier Park has a notable urbanising effect on the Site which are exacerbated by the layout, scale and character of the highway corridors adjoining the Site.

5.3.42 When considered in the context of Banbury, the Site forms an area of transition from urban to rural which contributes to the broader setting of the settlement. This is reflected in the medium landscape sensitivity assessed for the Site generally. However, it is clear that the western and southern margins of the Site have lower landscape sensitivity than the northern and eastern areas which adjoin the undeveloped agricultural landscape.

Confirmation of Landscape Receptors

5.3.43 Conformation of visual receptors is provided in **Table 5.8** below:

Table 5.8 Visual Receptors

| Landscape Sensitivity | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|--------|---------------------|
| Landscape receptor | Susceptibility | Value | Overall sensitivity |
| NCA 95 Northamptonshire Uplands | Medium | Medium | Medium |

| | | | |
|---|--------|--------|-------------|
| Clay Vales LCT (OWLS) | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Upstanding Village Farmlands LCT (OWLS) | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Local landscape character | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Wider contextual agricultural landscape | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Urban employment zone | Low | Low | Low |
| Motorway corridor and junction | Low | Low | Low |
| Wider Banbury settlement | Low | Low | Low |
| Site | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Site features (trees and hedgerows) | High | Medium | Medium High |

5.4 VISUAL BASELINE

Scope of Study Area

5.4.1 An approximate visual envelope has been established from desktop studies and Site work. Desktop studies included the preparation of ZTV’s based on a range of potential building heights. These were checked during the Site survey which identified that screening from built form and established vegetation was not fully represented within the areas digitally identified to have potential views. The survey did confirm potential visual receptors from which representative views have been recorded.

Visual Receptors, Viewpoints and Views

5.4.2 Visual receptors were identified from maps, aerial photos, designations and Site work. The broad categories of visual receptors identified are as follows:

- Road users of the M40, A361, A422 Banbury Road and motorway junction J.11
- Footpath users of Public Right of Ways AD22, AD11 AU29 and PROW to Seale’s Farm
- Visitors and employees at Frontier Park
- Road and footpath users in the vicinity of Nethercote and Overthorpe
- Users of the Oxfordshire Canal
- Users of Banbury Country Park

5.4.3 Descriptions of these potential visual receptors and potential views is provided below.

Road Users

5.4.4 Users of the M40 (Representative viewpoints VP14, VP15 and VP16) experience transient views towards the Site when approaching from the north. Views are limited by adjoining established vegetation but open views become available approaching junction 11. Frontier Park employment land now forms a prominent focal point that obscures views towards the mid and southern area of the Site. The rising eastern margin of the Site forms a distinct skyline which the built form of Frontier Park is seen to sit below.

5.4.5 Motorway users are assessed to have medium susceptibility and experience medium low value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium - medium low sensitivity.

5.4.6 Road users of the A361 (Representative viewpoints VP1 and VP2) have transient but clear views into the Site as they pass adjacent and approach from the north. The Site is seen as part of the wider rural landscape but immediately adjoining the urban edge and employment land. The highway in this location is approaching the motorway junction J.11 and the gateway to Banbury from the motorway and the east.

5.4.7 Road users are assessed to have medium susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium sensitivity.

5.4.8 Users of the A422 (Representative viewpoint VP9) also have transient views into the Site from the dual carriageway. Views are partly screened and partly open according to the extent of roadside vegetation. The focus of travellers is generally contained within an east west corridor and when approaching from the east is focused towards the Banbury and the motorway junction. On travelling east views quickly diminish past and become obscured.

5.4.9 Road users are assessed to have medium susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium sensitivity.

5.4.10 Users of the Banbury Road (Representative viewpoint VP4) between Chacombe and the A361 generally experience rural views. On approaching the A361 the new built form of Frontier Park becomes identifiable within views to the south west. The overall setting remains rural but the sense of approach to the main urban area increases, the closer to the A361 road users travel. Road users have generally quite clear views to the south and the Site over local hedges. Although established vegetation does create some localised screening views are generally open over the Site.

5.4.11 Road users are assessed to have medium susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium sensitivity.

5.4.12 Users of the motorway junction J.11 (Representative viewpoints VP17) are generally focused on direction of travel. A partly clear view into the Site is obtained leaving the roundabout onto the A361. The roundabout forms a gateway between urban Banbury and the present open countryside but is now influenced by the close proximity of the Frontier Park employment land.

5.4.13 Road users are assessed to have medium susceptibility and experience medium low value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium, medium low sensitivity.

Users of Public Rights of Way

5.4.14 Users of PRow AD22 (Representative viewpoints VP3). Views into the Site from public right of way AD22 are generally well screened by foreground vegetation and the engineering of the motorway. Views are generally rural in character but influenced by the audible activity associated with the motorway. Slight glimpses through vegetation of the Frontier Park employment buildings are seen from the footpath.

5.4.15 Footpath users are assessed to have high susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium high sensitivity.

5.4.16 Users of PRow AD11 (Representative viewpoints VP5) generally experience rural views with occasional glimpses of the taller part of the Frontier Park employment structures seen through and over foreground vegetation.

5.4.17 Footpath users are assessed to have high susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium high sensitivity.

5.4.18 Users of PRow AU29 (Representative viewpoint VP7) experience rural views but because of the topography do not obtain views into the Site.

5.4.19 Footpath users are assessed to have high susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium high sensitivity.

5.4.20 Users of PRow to Seale's Farm (Representative viewpoint VP6) generally have views into the Site that are screened by topography. On reaching the farm there is an elevated view of the northern margin of the Site, seen in the context of Banbury.

5.4.21 Footpath users are assessed to have high susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium high sensitivity.

Other visual receptors within the urban context

5.4.22 Users of the Frontier Park employment land (Representative viewpoints VP1 and VP2) will have limited views from employment land buildings but a clear and direct view into the Site from the park entrance.

5.4.23 Users are assessed to have low susceptibility and experience low value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have low sensitivity.

5.4.24 Users of the industrial estate north of Hennef Way (Representative viewpoint VP12) have limited potential views into part of the Site seen between foreground buildings and the structures of Frontier Park. There is no strong sense of the rural edge and users will be focused on the immediate land use.

5.4.25 Users are assessed to have low susceptibility and experience low value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have low sensitivity.

Other visual receptors within the rural context

Road and footpath users at Nethercote and Overthorpe (Representative viewpoints VP10 and VP11). These potential receptors are representative of the small scale settlement area south of the A421. Local views are generally rural in nature and seen to be limited by foreground vegetation and built form. There is a limited potential for views towards

the Site over foreground vegetation but generally there are limited opportunities for clear views towards the Site.

5.4.26 Local road and footpath users are assessed to have high susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium high sensitivity.

5.4.27 Rail users have a potential visual sensitivity to views from the train north of the Site. These views are likely to be limited due to potential alignment of the track through cutting east of the motorway. If views are available they will be transient and fleeting as the train approaches the urban area of Banbury.

5.4.28 Rail users are assessed to have medium susceptibility and experience medium value views in this location. Overall, they are assessed to have medium sensitivity.

Summary of Visual Baseline Analysis

5.4.29 As confirmed in the CDLSCA potential visual receptors with clear views into or towards the Site are predominately limited to road users to the north, west and south of the Site. All receptors will be transient and generally focused on the direction of travel. Potential views are available from some areas on local public rights of way but these are screened in places by foreground vegetation. The topography of the land and limited visual receptors limits views into the Site from within the Site and from the higher land to the east of the Site.

5.4.30 Views from south of the A422 are almost all screened by intervening vegetation and built form.

5.4.31 From the local highway corridors, there are clear but transient views from the motorway heading southbound but limited potential when travelling northbound due to landform including highway engineering and established vegetation.

5.4.32 From west of the motorway and the main civic areas of Banbury, views are almost all screened by the larger scale built form associated with the employment land to the west of the Site.

5.4.33 The sensitivity of potential visual receptors is assessed by considering their susceptibility and the value of views experienced. The sensitivity of the confirmed visual receptors are given in **Table 5.9** below:

Table 5.9 Visual Sensitivity

| Visual Sensitivity | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Visual receptor | Susceptibility | Value | Overall sensitivity |
| Road users | | | |
| M40 motorway users | Medium | Medium low | Medium medium low |
| A361 users | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| A422 users | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Banbury Road users | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Junction J.11 users | Medium | Medium low | Medium medium low |

| | | | |
|---|--------|--------|-------------|
| Footpath users | | | |
| PRoW users footpath AD22 | High | Medium | Medium high |
| PRoW users footpath AD11 | High | Medium | Medium high |
| PRoW to Seale’s Farm | High | Medium | Medium high |
| PRoW AU29 users | High | Medium | Medium high |
| Others within the urban context | | | |
| Users of Frontier Park | Low | Low | Low |
| Users of industrial park north of Hennef Way | Low | Low | Low |
| Others within the rural context | | | |
| Road and footpath users Nethercote and Overthorpe | High | Medium | Medium high |
| Rail users north of the Site | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Users of Banbury Country Park | High | Medium | Medium high |
| Users of the Oxfordshire Canal north west of the Site | High | Medium | Medium high |

5.5 GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE, MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS

5.5.1 There are notable opportunities for mitigation which is recognised in the CDBLSCA assessment of land parcel 101. Although woodland is not a characteristic feature within the landscape of the vale, the layering effect of hedgerows creates a well treed character within the vale farmland. The introduction of new green infrastructure provides an opportunity for landscape enhancement. This is also recognised within the CDBLSCA assessment of land parcel 101 particularly with reference to the strengthening of boundary vegetation adjoining the A422 and A361.

5.5.2 Measures to limit or remove potential landscape and visual effects will comprise of both inherent mitigation and proposed mitigation measures. Inherent mitigation is incorporated into the design proposals and are likely to be effective from the commencement of operational phase of the development. Proposed mitigation is in addition to inherent mitigation and is intended to provide new green infrastructure that reduces potential landscape and visual effects as it establishes.

Mitigation by Design

5.5.3 Inherent mitigation measures incorporated into the design strategy to reduce or eliminate landscape and visual effects will include:

- Retention of Site trees and hedgerows where practical to maintain existing green infrastructure and the corridors through the Site that they create. Existing trees retained within the Site have the potential to reduce the prominence of new built

form and maintain a correlation with the rural agricultural landscape adjoining to the east and the north. Although the character of the development Site will no longer be rural, the Site character can still reflect rural elements of the adjoining rural landscape. This will assist with softening the extent to which the Site will become urbanised by the built form and activities that will be introduced.

- The retention of trees and hedgerows and their contribution to creating green corridors through the Site will assist with diffusing the mass of the new built form so that parcels of development within a framework of new and existing green infrastructure softens the urban characteristics and maintains a correlation with the adjoining countryside.
- The retention of boundary hedgerows and associated trees is assessed as being an important element in reducing visual effects on road users. Changes to the management of these boundary hedgerows provides an opportunity to achieve additional height and width to hedges and encourage development of sapling trees so achieving greater potential screening of new built form in a short period of time when compared to new planting. This is assessed to be particularly valuable to reducing visual effects on road users along the A361 due to the well trimmed nature of the current field hedge.
- Retaining development footprint to the vale area of the Site and avoiding the ascending hill side landscape which has greater visual prominence in local views reduces potential visual effects from the outset.
- Maintaining the proposed building footprint away from boundaries and established internal green corridors allows space for mitigation planting as part of a meaningful green infrastructure strategy.
- Limiting lower height new built form to the Site margins adjoining open agricultural land will assist with screening or filtering views of those buildings from adjoining potentially sensitive visual receptors. Keeping taller proposed structures to mid Site areas will allow built form on Site margins to create much of the screening for the larger structures. Although larger structures may still be seen, they will be less prominent in views from adjoining areas.

Additional Mitigation

5.5.4 New mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate landscape and visual effects will include:

- New native tree planting to margins to achieve improved Site screening both to conserve local visual amenity and conserve the rural character of the undeveloped land to the north and east.
- Strengthen retained green corridors through the Site with new hedge and tree planting and establishment of improved diverse species grass swards.
- Tree planting within the development green corridors to soften visual prominence of new built form and achieve compartmentalising of future employment areas so reducing sense of scale and massing.
- Building materials particularly adjoining boundaries of the Site can contribute to mitigating effects on adjoining landscape character and visual amenity where darker and textured tones are incorporated. This mitigation is assessed to be effective in conjunction with boundary tree planting.

5.5.5 Mitigation measures are summarised in **Table 5.10** below.

| Ref | Measure to avoid, reduce or manage any adverse effects and/or to deliver beneficial effects | How measure would be secured | | |
|-----|---|------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| | | By Design | By S.106 | By Condition |
| 1 | Retention of Site trees and hedgerows | X | | |
| 2 | Retaining development footprint to the vale area | X | | |
| 3 | Maintaining the proposed building footprint away from boundaries and established internal green corridors | X | | |
| 4 | Limiting lower height new built form to the Site margins adjoining open agricultural land | X | | |
| 5 | New native tree planting to margins to improve Site screening | X | | X |
| 6 | Strengthen retained internal green corridors | X | | X |
| 7 | New tree planting within site green corridors | X | | X |
| 8 | Selective use of building materials | | | X |

Enhancements

5.5.6 Potential landscape enhancements are identified as follows:

- Incorporating new SuDS basins into green infrastructure corridors can assist with broadening the range of habitats maintained and added to the Site.
- Introducing new structural tree planting to contain highway corridors.
- New tree planting to provide long term replacement of existing tree structure.
- Introducing greater species diversity to retained and new grassland.
- Long term management of retained undeveloped land for landscape character and ecological benefits.

5.6 ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Effects on Landscape Receptors

5.6.1 Effects on confirmed landscape receptors will vary from onset of construction to the period of establishment of mitigation measures post operational phase. Although construction phase effects may be prominent and detrimental, they are generally temporary.

5.6.2 Effects on confirmed landscape receptors at the onset of the operation phase will incorporate mitigation by design measures that will assist with reducing potential

landscape effects. The significance of these effects are identified at Year 1 in the summary table of landscape assessment. Landscape effects may be at their most detrimental at this stage but may reduce as mitigation measures begin to establish such as new tree and hedge planting.

5.6.3 Effects on confirmed landscape receptors after establishment of mitigation measures will be the residual effects of the development. The significance of these residual effects are identified in the summary table of the landscape assessment. The length of period required to achieve establishment is variable according to microclimate, soils, climate pattern, size of planting material and quality of maintenance and management during the establishment period. For this Site where trees are required to achieve height for screening or partial screening, the establishment period is assessed to extend to 10 years from the onset of the operation phase.

Construction Phase Landscape Effects

5.6.4 Construction phase landscape effects will be influenced by the following:

- Extent, size, height, area and screening of the main works compound.
- Use of heavy machinery including lifting equipment such as cranes and platforms
- Use of heavy machinery or operations that may introduce noise and activity that is prominent
- Site deliveries and movement of Site workers
- Order of the works

5.6.5 Mitigation measures that may be used to control construction phase landscape effects may include:

- Location of Site compound away from visually prominent areas of the Site.
- Early implementation of access infrastructure
- Tree and hedge protection measures
- Implementation of screening to active works area.
- Limitations imposed on works through construction management plan

5.6.6 The extent of potential detrimental effects through construction activities on landscape receptors is assessed to be similar to that construction of Frontier Park adjoining. Direct access from the A361 and availability of space allows sensitive location of Site compound which can limit impacts to a reduced area of the Site. Although construction activities may be prominent, they will be experienced in the context of the active highway network and limited and retained to the Site.

5.6.7 A summary of construction phase effects on landscape receptors are set out in **Table 5.35**.

Operational Phase Landscape Effects

5.6.8 Operational phase landscape effects have been assessed as follows:

Table 5.11 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – NCA Northamptonshire Uplands

| NCA 95 Northamptonshire Uplands | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct | or | Beneficial adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Low | Permanent | Indirect | | Slight adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not significant | | | | | |

5.6.9 The development proposals in the context of the scale of the national character area and the character of the urban area adjoining, results in a low magnitude of change on the Northamptonshire Uplands NCA. The development would result in a **slight adverse landscape effect** that is permanent arising from the loss of open pasture.

Table 5.12 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Clave Vales LCT

| Clay Vales LCT | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct | or | Beneficial adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Low | Permanent | Indirect | | Slight adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | | |

5.6.10 The development proposals in the context of the scale of the landscape character type, its association with the existing employment land and wider urban area of Banbury results in a low magnitude of change on the Clay vales LCT. The development would result in a **slight adverse landscape effect** that is permanent arising from the loss of open pasture.

Table 5.13 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Upstanding Village Farmlands LCT

| Upstanding Village Farmlands LCT | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct | or | Beneficial adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Low | Permanent | Indirect | | Slight adverse | Slight adverse |

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| Overall Significance | Not Significant |
|----------------------|-----------------|

5.6.11 The development proposals in the context of the scale of the landscape character type and the inherent mitigation to avoid development within this character area results in a low magnitude of change to the Upstanding Village Farmlands. The development would result in **slight adverse landscape effect** that is permanent arising from the loss of adjoining open rural countryside.

Table 5.14 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Local Landscape Character

| Local Landscape Character | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Medium | Permanent | Indirect | Moderate adverse | Moderate adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.12 The development proposals would result in a loss of open countryside and extension of the employment land that forms the urban edge in this location. The existing local landscape character is affected by urbanising features including highway features which already have a detrimental effect on local character. As such the magnitude of change is assessed to be medium, resulting in a **moderate adverse landscape effect**.

Table 5.15 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Wider Contextual Agricultural Landscape

| Wider contextual agricultural landscape | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <u>Sensitivity</u> | <u>Magnitude of change</u> | <u>Permanent or temporary</u> | <u>Direct or indirect</u> | <u>Beneficial or adverse</u> | <u>Residual effect</u> |
| <u>Medium</u> | <u>Medium Low</u> | <u>Permanent</u> | <u>Indirect</u> | <u>Moderate Slight adverse</u> | <u>Moderate Slight adverse</u> |
| <u>Overall Significance</u> | <u>Not significant</u> | | | | |

5.6.13 The development proposals will remove an area of the existing agricultural landscape which cannot be mitigated. The character of this agricultural landscape is influenced by the existing urban edge and highway infrastructure which contains the Site to the south and the west. In the context of the scale of the wider agricultural landscape to the north and east, the magnitude of change is assessed to be medium low. This results in a **moderate to slight adverse landscape effect** that is permanent.

Table 5.16 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Urban Employment Land

| Urban employment land | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct indirect | or | Beneficial adverse | Residual effect |
| Low | Low | Permanent | Indirect | | Slight adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | | |

5.6.14 The development proposals extend the area of employment land to the east and remove part of the existing open agricultural setting. The adjoining employment land has limited visual connectivity with the Site other than travelling to or from the employment land. As such the magnitude of change is assessed to be low, resulting in a **slight adverse landscape effect**.

Table 5.17 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Motorway Corridor and Junction

| Motorway corridor and junction | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct indirect | or | Beneficial adverse | Residual effect |
| Low | Low | Permanent | Indirect | | Slight adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | | |

5.6.15 The motorway corridor has limited correlation with the Site and development would result in a negligible magnitude of change on the character of the highway and its corridor. The motorway junction has a greater correlation with the Site but remains generally unchanged by the development proposals in terms of character. The development proposals are assessed to result in a low magnitude of change which results in a **slight adverse landscape effect**.

Table 5.18 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Wider Banbury Settlement Area

| Wider Banbury settlement area | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct indirect | or | Beneficial adverse | Residual effect |
| Low | Low | Permanent | Indirect | | Slight | Slight |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|---------|---------|
| | | | | adverse | adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.16 The development proposals removes an area of open countryside from the eastern margin of the wider settlement area which part informs the wider rural setting of the town. In the context of the size of land lost to development and the scale of the wider surrounding countryside this loss is assessed to give rise to a low magnitude of change. This is assessed to result in a **slight adverse landscape effect**.

Table 5.19 Operational Phase Landscape Effects - Site

| Site | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | High | Permanent | Direct | Substantial adverse | Moderate adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.17 The development proposals will displace the open agricultural fields of the present Site and replace with large scale structures in employment land use. This creates a notable change that cannot be fully mitigated but can be contained through the retention and extension of new green infrastructure. The development will result in a high magnitude of change, resulting in a substantial adverse landscape effect that mitigates to a **moderate adverse landscape effect** with establishment of mitigation measures.

Table 5.20 Operational Phase Landscape Effects – Site Features

| Site features | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| High | Medium | Permanent | Direct | Moderate adverse | Slight adverse / Negligible |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.18 The development proposals retain many of the existing trees and some of the existing hedges including boundary hedges. Where trees and hedge are lost through the need to achieve a practical development a strategy of maintaining green corridors reinforced with new planting maintains both key natural features and their setting. It is accepted that some losses of Site features will occur resulting in a medium magnitude of

change. This results in a moderate adverse effect at outset of the operational stage but with mitigation establishing would result in a residual **slight adverse to negligible landscape effect**.

5.6.19 A summary of operational phase landscape effects is provided in **Table 5.36**.

Construction Phase Effects on Visual Receptors

5.6.20 Construction phase visual effects will be influenced by the following:

- Extent, size, height, area and screening of the main works compound.
- Use of heavy machinery including lifting equipment such as cranes and platforms
- Use of heavy machinery or operations that may introduce noise and activity that is prominent
- Site deliveries and movement of Site workers
- Order of the works

5.6.21 Mitigation measures that may be used to control construction phase visual effects may include:

- Location of Site compound away from visually prominent areas of the Site.
- Early implementation of access infrastructure
- Implementation of screening to active works area.
- Limitations imposed on works through construction management plan

5.6.22 The extent of potential detrimental effects through construction activities on visual receptors is assessed to be similar to those experienced with the construction of Frontier Park employment land adjoining. Direct access from the A361 and availability of space allows sensitive location of Site compound which can limit impacts to a reduced area of the Site. Although construction activities may be visually prominent, they will be experienced in the context of the active highway network and limited and retained to the Site.

5.6.23 A summary of construction phase effects on visual receptors are set out in **Table 5.37**.

Operational Phase Effects on Visual Receptors

5.6.24 Operational phase visual effects have been assessed as follows:

Table 5.21 Operational Phase Visual Effect – M40 Motorway

| M40 motorway users (Represented by Viewpoint photographs VP14, 15 and 16) | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----|--------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | or | Beneficial adverse | Residual effect |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Medium medium low | Low | Permanent | Direct | Slight adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.25 Views from the motorway are transient and generally well screened by foreground vegetation established to the eastern margin of the motorway corridor. Approaching from the north the Site is generally screened by this vegetation and the built form of Frontier Park. In closer proximity to Frontier Park a view opens up to the south east where built form of the proposed development would be seen to extend from the existing employment land. New built form along the northern margin of the Site would be seen until mitigation planting becomes established. Even with mitigation there are likely to remain glimpses of filtered views of the northern margin of the development proposals. Mitigation planting will be effective as it will be seen in conjunction with existing foreground vegetation seen in the views from the motorway, notably reducing the magnitude of change that would be experienced. Overall, the magnitude of change is assessed to be low resulting in a **slight adverse visual effect**.

Table 5.22 Operational Phase Visual Effect – A361 Users

| A361 users (Represented by Viewpoint photographs VP1 and VP2) | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | High | Permanent | Direct | Substantial adverse | Moderate adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.26 Views from the A361 are transient but open into the Site over low trimmed roadside hedges. The development of the Site would introduce built form and landscaping close to the visual receptors causing loss of views across and over the Site. The magnitude of change would be high due to this level of change. Road users already experience employment land features associated with Frontier Park in close association with the motorway network, motorway junction and engineered a highways which extend off of the junction. The character of the views is therefore already influenced by these urbanising features. Mitigation planting along the western margin of the proposed development will soften views of built form but clear views into the development will be created at access points with the A361. Although the value of views is medium, the high magnitude of change results in a substantial adverse visual effect before mitigation is established along the western margin. When established the residual visual effect is assessed to be **moderate adverse**.

Table 5.23 Operational Phase Visual Effects – A422 Users

| |
|---|
| A422 users (Represented by Viewpoint photograph VP9) |
|---|

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Medium | Permanent | Indirect | Moderate adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.27 Road users generally have limited views into the Site due to vegetation and topography until approaching the motorway junction. Similarly open views are experienced by road users leaving the junction heading eastwards over areas of well trimmed boundary hedge. Clear views of new built form will be seen to the north displacing the open countryside. The built form of Frontier Park is clearly identifiable and new built form will be seen as an extension of this employment land. Mitigation planting along the southern margin of the proposed development will notably assist in reducing detrimental effects as will the land which is retained free from development which adjoins the A422 and limits the actual interface of the development with the highway. Overall, the development proposals would result in a moderate adverse visual effect until mitigation planting has established. The residual visual effect is assessed to be **slight adverse** and permanent due to the loss of openness in current views which cannot be mitigated.

Table 5.24 Operational Phase Visual Effects – Banbury Road Users

| Banbury Road users (Represented by Viewpoint photograph VP4) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Medium | Permanent | Indirect | Moderate adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.28 Views from the Banbury Road are generally focussed to the west but indirect and transient views can be experienced towards the Site through and over intervening vegetation. The built form of Frontier Park can be seen and provides a 'yardstick' to judge potential visibility of new built form located on the northern margin of the Site. Mitigation planting will be effective in reducing potential views and will filter to an extent that the new built form is not a dominant feature in the landscape. Overall, the magnitude of change is assessed to be medium resulting in a **moderate adverse visual effect** which reduces to a **slight adverse residual visual effect** on establishment of the mitigation planting.

Table 5.25 Operational Phase Visual Effects – Junction 11 Users

| Junction 11 users (Represented by Viewpoint photograph VP17) | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Medium | Permanent | Indirect | Moderate adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.29 Users of this motorway junction are generally focussed on the highway but a clear view into the Site is obtained on approach to the A361. New built form will be seen in the view along with the new green infrastructure which will mitigate the prominence of the built form. Built form of Frontier Park are already seen in this context. The magnitude of change is assessed to be medium resulting in a **moderate adverse visual effect** which reduces to **slight adverse** on the establishment of the mitigation planting.

Table 5.26 Operational Phase Visual Effects – ProW AD22 Users

| PRoW AD22 users (Represented by Viewpoint photograph VP3) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium high | Low | Permanent | Indirect | Slight adverse | Slight adverse/negligible |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.30 Footpath users are generally focused on the immediate route of the path which has only limited visual connectivity with the Site. The built form of Frontier Park is seen and glimpses of new built form of the proposed development would be experienced in this context. Footpath users already experience the urban margin and motorway corridor which influences the character of local views. Mitigation planting along the western and northern margins of the proposed development will assist with adding to the screen of existing vegetation that generally maintains a sense of separation from the Site. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed to be low resulting in a residual **slight adverse/ negligible visual effect**.

Table 5.27 Operational Phase Visual Effects – ProW AD11 Users

| PRoW AD11 users (Represented by Viewpoint photographs VP4 and VP5)) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Medium high | Medium/ Low | Permanent | Indirect | Moderate adverse | Slight adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.31 Footpath users can have open views across the flatter vale landscape but these views are frequently limited by layering of established field vegetation. From the footpath views are limited by screening but the built form of Frontier Park can be seen where gaps exist. The scale and form of the Frontier Park structures provide a good illustration of how the proposed built form would be seen without mitigation measures established. New built form within the Site would be part screened but upper areas of the new structures are likely to be identifiable and appear as an extension of the existing employment land. These would be seen at distance resulting in a **moderate adverse visual effect** that would reduce to **slight adverse** with the establishment of mitigation planting.

Table 5.28 Operational Phase Visual Effects – ProW at Seales’s Farm Users

| PRoW at Seale’s Farm (Represented by Viewpoint photograph VP6) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium high | Medium | Permanent | Indirect | Moderate adverse | Moderate adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.32 Generally, footpath users of the PRoW to Seales Farm will have views towards the Site fully obscured by a combination of vegetation and topography. At the farm there is a limited but open view across Banbury including the immediately adjoining employment land and the northern area of the Site. New built form will be clearly seen in this view and can only be partly mitigated. There would be a loss of openness/agricultural land seen in the middle landscape but the character of the view would remain relatively unchanged being a view of the urban edge at the interface with the agricultural landscape. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed to be medium resulting in a **moderate adverse visual effect** that cannot be effectively mitigated.

Table 5.29 Operational Phase Visual Effects – ProW AU29 Users

| PRoW AU29 users (Represented by Viewpoint photograph VP7) | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium high | Negligible | Permanent | Indirect | Not Significant | Not Significant |

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| Overall Significance | Not Significant |
|----------------------|-----------------|

5.6.33 Footpath users experience rural views without influence from the urban edge of highway networks. As such they are tranquil and rural in quality. The footpath is located away from the hillside which permits the view from Seale’s Farm towards Banbury so the skyline is created by the crest of the elevated landscape and no views of Banbury or the Site are observed. There are **no residual significant effects** for the PRow AU29 users.

Table 5.30 Operational Phase Visual Effects – Frontier Park Users

| Users of Frontier Park | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Low | High | Permanent | Indirect | Moderate adverse | Moderate adverse |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.34 Users of Frontier Park generally do not have open views into the Site other than when entering or leaving the employment land. Users will be focused on their work activities so are assessed to have a low sensitivity to change but will experience a high magnitude of change as the agricultural setting of the park entrance becomes urbanised. This results in a **moderate adverse visual effect** that cannot be effectively mitigated.

Table 5.31 Operational Phase Visual Effects – Users of Industrial Estate North of Hennef Way

| Users of Industrial Estate north of Hennef Way (Represented by Viewpoint photograph VP12) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Low | Low | Permanent | Indirect | Slight adverse | Not Significant |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.35 Users within the employment land to the west of the motorway are generally well separated from the Site and experience the urban character of the town. There are potential glimpsed views over the Site and towards the ascending land to the east of the Site which maybe incidentally experienced. Views generally have now been screened by

the Frontier Park development. Overall, the magnitude of change is assessed to be low resulting in a **slight adverse effect** that is likely to reduce to **Not Significant** with establishment of mitigation planting.

Table 5.32 Operational Phase Visual Effects – Road and Footpath Users Nethercote and Overthorpe

| Road and footpath users Nethercote and Overthorpe (Represented by Viewpoint photographs VP8 and 13) | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium high | Low | Permanent | Indirect | Slight adverse | Slight adverse/ Not Significant |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.36 Potentially higher sensitivity visual receptors have been assessed but represent a wider area of dispersed settlement to the south of the A422. Views were identified in the ZTV but in reality almost all views are screened by intervening established vegetation. An elevated view from the motorway bridge west of Overthorpe to illustrate the level of existing screening. There is potential for some limited and glimpsed views of the taller parts of new built form to be seen from south of the A422. However, the magnitude of change is assessed to be low resulting in a residual **slight adverse/ not significant visual effect**.

Table 5.33 Operational Phase Visual Effects -Rail Users

| Rail users (Views not represented) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium | Low | Permanent | Indirect | Slight adverse | Not Significant |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.37 Open and prominent views from the railway line are not predicted due to established intervening vegetation and localised containment of the line itself. However, the scale of the proposed new built form has potential to be seen over this vegetation. Although views are not predicted to be prominent it is assessed that rail users may experience a new built form as an extension to the existing employment land at what forms a gateway to Banbury. The magnitude of change is assessed to be low resulting in a **slight adverse visual effect** that will reduce to **not significant** on the establishment of landscape mitigation along the northern margin of the Site.

Table 5.34 Operational Phase Visual Effects – Banbury Country Park Users

| Users of Banbury Country Park (Represented by viewpoint photographs AVP1 to AVP5) | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium high | Low | Permanent | Indirect | Slight adverse | Not Significant |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.38 Users of the country park will experience a rural setting which are partly influenced by elements of the existing settlement edge. Views towards the Site are limited by established vegetation in the intervening landscape but available on higher ground. Views of part of the built form of Fronter Park employment land maybe seen and in a similar vein, the upper part of the northern margin of new built form on the Site will be seen above or through established vegetation. However, these views will not be prominent and will be seen as part of the urban edge that already influences the character of the open space. As a result, the magnitude of change is assessed to be low resulting in a potential for a **slight adverse visual effect** that reduces to **not significant** with the establishment of landscape mitigation.

Table 5.35 Operational Phase Visual Effects – Users of the Oxfordshire Canal Footpath

| Users of the Oxfordshire Canal (Represented by viewpoint photographs AVP1 to AVP5) | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Sensitivity | Magnitude of change | Permanent or temporary | Direct or indirect | Beneficial or adverse | Residual effect |
| Medium high | Low | Permanent | Indirect | Slight adverse | Not Significant |
| Overall Significance | Not Significant | | | | |

5.6.39 Views from the canal are generally screened by intervening established vegetation and in particular by the canal side hedgerow. To the west of the motorway views will be screened by the engineered form of the motorway, built form within the local employment land and further vegetation. No views were identified but where gaps in canal side vegetation existing then there is a slight potential for a view towards the Site as identified in the ZTV’s. There is therefore a limited potential to see upper parts of new built form through and over local vegetation. Where seen these views would be indirect and very limited. The magnitude of change assuming that part of new built form is seen, is assessed to be low. This results in a **slight adverse visual effect** which reduces to **not significant** with establishment of mitigation planting.

5.6.40 A summary of operational phase visual effects is provided in **Table 5.37** below

5.7 CUMULATIVE AND IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS

5.7.1 The development proposal is contained by a combination of settlement edge, highway infrastructure and topography which separates and distinguishes the Site from other local areas of potential development.

5.7.2 The existing employment land forms part of a distinct pattern of settlement that has a strong correlation with the M40 motorway and its access at junction J.11. This has resulted in a distinct band of employment land along the eastern margin of the wider settlement, adjoining the motorway corridor. It would not be unreasonable to assume that regular development and redevelopment may occur within this eastern belt of employment land and if such development occurred at the same time as the proposed development of the study Site, in landscape and visual terms it is very unlikely that there would be any notable landscape or visual effects to shared receptors.

5.7.3 The development of the Site will be experienced as an extension of this employment land because of the strong visual connectivity and distinctiveness of employment land built form. This is beneficial in that it reduces the magnitude of change to visual receptors but more detrimental to landscape receptors which appearance a spread of the urban characteristics and loss of rural characteristics. This becomes unacceptable where the rural landscape makes a significant contribution to the setting of the settlement. In the location east of the motorway, the rural setting plays a lesser role in the immediate setting of the urban area as it has been dissected by the motorway corridor and established employment land. As such the extension of the existing employment land does result in some landscape harm but harm that is not significant in terms of harm to the wider setting of the settlement.

5.7.4 It is assessed that the development of the Site would not give rise to cumulative effects on shared receptors of similar development, such as the adjacent approved commercial development now under construction (23/00501/REM and 19/00128/HYBRID Part B). The development of the Site would result in in-combination landscape and visual effects with the employment land development at Frontier Park but this is assessed to be overall beneficial to anchoring the development into the established pattern of settlement found along the motorway corridor east of the wider settlement.

5.8 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE OF LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS***Significance of Landscape Effects***

5.8.1 The landscape in which the Site is located is undesignated at both national and local level. The landscape is not identified as a 'Valued' landscape with reference to NPPF paragraph 174. The Site features contribute to the desirable characteristics as identified in published landscape character assessment and is assessed to have generally medium sensitivity as confirmed in the Cherwell District Council Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (Assessment Addendum 18/08/2014) which was assessed and published prior to the construction of the Frontier Park employment land.

5.8.2 Taking the above into consideration the threshold for significant landscape harm is higher than if the land were designated or formed part of a 'Valued' landscape. In this context, moderate adverse harm falls below the threshold of significant harm particularly when considered in the context of the proximity and influence of the urban edge and the extensive highway and communications routes.

5.8.3 When the landscape effects assessed in Tables 1 and 3 Appendix A are considered against the threshold of significant harm, it is clear that significant harm is identified from the loss of Site character at onset of operational phase which reduces to less than significant harm with the establishment of mitigation measures. This harm is contained to the Site for a period of up to 10 years. No other significant harm is assessed to confirmed landscape receptors at the onset of the operational phase.

5.8.4 Overall, with the establishment of mitigation measures, **no significant residual harm** has been assessed.

Significance of Visual Effects

5.8.5 Views are generally not recognised to be of high value within the contextual area of the Site. Although walkers using country public rights of way may have high susceptibility to changes in views, the views they experience in close proximity to the Site are generally influenced by the wider highway and urban features. As such, the threshold for significant harm to views is assessed to be substantial.

5.8.6 The Cherwell District Council Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (Assessment Addendum 18/08/2014) which was assessed and published prior to the construction of the Frontier Park employment land, identified that the Site (parcel 101) was visually prominent and had high visual sensitivity in the wider context but as it had no public access, locally it was assessed to have lower visual sensitivity. This has changed with the construction of the Frontier Park employment land development which has created a robust screen between the wider urban area and the Site. The study identified that the Site was predominately viewed from local highways and this remains true with the exception of the M40 where views have been reduced by Frontier Park built form.

5.8.7 Taking these into consideration, the visual prominence of the Site has been reduced and the nature of views reduced in value due to the presence of new employment built form. In this context the threshold for significant visual harm is assessed to be substantial adverse.

5.8.8 When the visual effects assessed in Tables 2 and 4 Appendix A are considered against the threshold of significant harm, it is clear that significant harm is identified from the loss of the rural Site character at onset of operational phase which reduces to less than significant harm with the establishment of mitigation measures. This harm is limited to users of the A361 in views immediately adjacent to the Site. With mitigation establishing along the eastern side of the road, a rural character is partly re-established. As mitigation can be achieved partly through a change of management to the existing clipped field hedge and new tree planting immediately adjoining potential visual receptors, it is assessed that mitigation would be effective at reducing visual harm within 5 years. No other significant harm is assessed to confirmed visual receptors at the onset of the operational phase.

5.8.9 Overall, with the establishment of mitigation measures, **no significant residual visual harm** has been assessed.

Summary of Significance

5.8.10 In summary, no significant residual landscape or visual harm is identified arising from the development proposals.

5.8.11 Landscape and visual harm is limited to the Site and local receptors due to the nature of inherent mitigation provided through the existing topography, established

vegetation, existing employment land built form and location of potentially sensitive receptors.

5.8.12 The development of any green field land will give rise to some landscape and visual harm but this assessment has identified that this harm is less than proportionate to the scale of the development proposals. National and local landscape policy relevant to the Site are not nil harm policies so harm should be considered in the wider planning balance.

5.9 SUMMARY

Introduction

5.9.1 The Site consists of open, agricultural land with field hedges and trees that contribute to its rural character. The land has not rare or valuable attributes and does not form part of a valued landscape with reference to NPPF paragraph 174. The change in topography from west to east is a feature of the Site and marks a transition from the settled vale adjoining Banbury to the more deeply rural landscape to the east. The landscape of the Site reflects published characteristics of the local landscape character types but the immediately adjoining urban edge, employment land and highway infrastructure are also key features of the local landscape, reflecting the Site location on the edge of the wider urban area. The Site creates a transitional area of land between the present urban edge and this more deeply rural landscape to the east.

5.9.2 The sensitivity of the Site has been assessed in the Cherwell District Council Banbury Landscape Sensitivity Assessment prior to the construction of the Frontier Park employment land to the immediate west of the Site. The assessment identified a generally medium sensitivity to the landscape and medium high sensitivity to the visual sensitivity. This baseline has now been changed due to the influence of the adjoining employment development. Even without this change in baseline, the assessment found capacity for employment development. This published assessment has been confirmed by this landscape and visual impact assessment.

5.9.3 The development proposals are in outline and consist of a number of large scale built forms to accommodate employment uses. These are set within a layout that retains structural hedgerows and trees and avoid the ascending landform found to the east of the land parcel. This approach incorporates inherent mitigation that assists with limiting the potential for significant landscape and visual harm.

5.9.4 The **Figure 3.4- Illustrative landscape strategy** uses these retained natural features to create corridors of green infrastructure which contribute to both landscape and visual mitigation as well as provide a distinct sense of place to the future development. The green corridors also conserve existing habitat and provide an opportunity for expansion of this habitat. In landscape and visual terms both the inherent and proposed mitigation measures reduce the scale and massing of the development structures and reduce visual prominence of new built form from confirmed visual receptors.

Likely Significant Effects

5.9.5 The introduction of the Frontier Park employment land development has reduced potential views from the wider Banbury area and limited views towards the Site from the motorway corridor. Where views remain the new built form of the development has potential to be seen over and through foreground vegetation but where seen it will generally appear as an extension of the existing employment land. This reduces the potential magnitude of change that will be seen in views from confirmed visual receptors. As the value of local views is generally lower because of the influence of the

urban edge and highway infrastructure, effects on views are assessed to be limited and less than significant. A significant effect is identified to users of the A361 immediately adjacent to the Site before mitigation measures are established.

5.9.6 The introduction of the Frontier Park employment land in association with the existing highway infrastructure and urban edge similarly inform the local landscape character. Whilst the development proposals have been assessed to have a detrimental effect on landscape receptors, these effects are limited in the context of the scale of development. A **substantial adverse** landscape effect is assessed on the Site character itself due to the high magnitude of change that development would cause. However, with mitigation measures established this landscape harm is reduced to **moderate adverse**.

Mitigation and Enhancements

5.9.7 The **Figure 3.4- Illustrative landscape strategy** uses these retained natural features to create corridors of green infrastructure which contribute to both landscape and visual mitigation as well as provide a distinct sense of place to the future development. The green corridors also conserve existing habitat and provide an opportunity for expansion of this habitat. In landscape and visual terms both the inherent and proposed mitigation measures reduce the scale and massing of the development structures and reduce visual prominence of new built form from confirmed visual receptors.

Conclusions

5.9.8 Overall, the residual landscape and visual harm arising from the development is assessed to be less than significant due to **Figure 3.4- Illustrative landscape strategy** for mitigation and its potential to contain detrimental effects to the Site.

5.9.9 Landscape policy at both national and local level are not 'nil harm' policies due to the undesignated status of the Site. Any development in a green field Site is likely to give rise to some landscape and visual harm and the development proposals are assessed to give rise to harm which is localised and contained. As such landscape and visual harm does not conflict with national and local policies but must be considered in the overall planning balance.

5.9.10 The Cherwell District Council Banbury Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study found that the Site has capacity for employment development. This has now been confirmed by this assessment which identified that the harm arising from the development proposals is less than proportionate with the scale and nature of the development proposals. As such the harm that has been assessed in this landscape and visual impact assessment should not carry great weight against the proposal when considered in the full planning balance.

Table 5.35: Summary of Landscape Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects **** |
|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Construction Phase Landscape Effects | | | | | | | | |
| NCA 95 Northampton hire Uplands | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium | Low | Borough/ District | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |
| Clay Vales LCT | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |
| Upstanding Village Farmlands LCT | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, | Temporary | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | | | | | | location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | |
| Local landscape character | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Moderate adverse |
| Wider contextual agricultural landscape | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium Low | Medium Low | Local | Moderate adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Urban employment land | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |
| Motorway corridor and junction J.11 | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |
| Wider Banbury settlement | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, | Temporary | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | construction traffic | | | | | | controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | |
| Site | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium | High | Local | Moderate adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Moderate adverse |
| Site features | Construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Slight adverse |
| Operational Phase Landscape Effects | | | | | | | | |
| NCA 95 Northamptons | Small reduction in open agricultural | Permanent | Medium | Low | Borough/ District | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| hire Uplands | landscape and extension of urban employment land | | | | | | retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/phasing | |
| Clay Vales LCT | Small loss of landscape characteristics contributing to LCT | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/phasing | Minor adverse |
| Upstanding Village Farmlands LCT | Small effect on the setting of the LCT through loss of open agricultural landscape | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | programme/ phasing | |
| Local landscape character | Loss of rural character on edge of settlement | Permanent | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Moderate adverse |
| Wider contextual agricultural landscape | Loss of agricultural land and associated rural characteristics | Permanent | Medium Low | Medium Low | Local | Moderate adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |
| Urban employment land | Extension to employment land and slight loss of rural setting | Permanent | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | |
| Motorway corridor and junction | Loss of rural setting | Permanent | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |
| Wider Banbury settlement | Loss of rural setting | Permanent | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Minor adverse |
| Site | Loss of rural | Permanent | Medium | High | Local | Major adverse | Protection of | Moderate |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | characteristics and replacement with urban characteristics | | | | | | vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/phasing | adverse |
| Site features | Some loss of natural Site features including hedges, trees and pasture | Permanent | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Protection of vegetation to be retained, limited works area and location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/phasing | Negligible |
| Cumulative and In-combination | | | | | | | | |
| NCA 95 Northamptons hire Uplands | No effects identified | Permanent | Medium | Negligible | Borough/District | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |
| Clay Vales LCT | Small effect from extension of wider employment land | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Upstanding | No effects identified | Permanent | Medium | Negligible | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects **** |
|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Village Farmlands LCT | | | | | | | | |
| Local landscape character | Small effect from extension of wider employment land | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Wider contextual agricultural landscape | Small effect from extension of wider employment land | Permanent | Medium Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Urban employment land | Enlarge of employment land changing local scale | Permanent | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Motorway corridor and junction | Small effect from extension of wider employment land | Permanent | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Wider Banbury settlement | Small effect from extension of wider employment land | Permanent | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Site | Site development seen as part of wider employment land | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Site features | No effects identified | Permanent | Medium | Negligible | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |

Notes:

* Enter either: Permanent or Temporary / Direct or Indirect

** Only enter a value where a sensitivity v magnitude effects has been used – otherwise 'Not Applicable'

*** Enter either: International, European, United Kingdom, Regional, County, Borough/District or Local

**** Enter either: Major / Moderate / Minor / Negligible AND state whether Beneficial or Adverse (unless negligible)

Table 5.36: Summary of Visual Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Construction Phase Visual Effects | | | | | | | | |
| M40 motorway users | Visibility of construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium medium Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| A361 users | Visibility of construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium | Medium High | Local | Moderate Major adverse | Location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Moderate/ Minor adverse |
| A422 users | Visibility of construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and | Temporary | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ | Moderate/ Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | noise, large machinery, construction traffic | | | | | | phasing | |
| Banbury Road users | Visibility of construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Moderate/ Minor adverse |
| Junction J.11 | Visibility of construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Medium medium Low | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/ phasing | Moderate/ Minor adverse |
| PRoW AD22 users | Visibility of construction activities | Temporary | Medium High | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| PRoW AD11 users | Visibility of construction activities | Temporary | Medium High | Medium/ Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| PRoW Seale's farm users | Visibility of construction | Temporary | Medium High | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Not applicable | Moderate adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | activities | | | | | | | |
| PRoW AU29 users | Not applicable | Temporary | Medium High | Negligible | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |
| Users of Frontier Park | Visibility of construction compound, earthworks, temporary parking, security fencing, increased movement and noise, large machinery, construction traffic | Temporary | Low | High | Local | Moderate adverse | Location of works compound away from sensitive features. Screening, controlled works methods and programme/phasing | Moderate/ Minor adverse |
| Users of Ind. Estate off Hennef Way | Visibility of construction activities | Temporary | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Road and footpath users Nethercote and Overthorpe | Not applicable | Temporary | Medium High | Low | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |
| Rail users | Visibility of construction activities | Temporary | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| Users of Banbury Country Park | Not applicable | Temporary | Medium High | Low | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |
| Users of the Oxfordshire Canal | Not applicable | Temporary | Medium High | Low | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Operational Phase Visual Effects | | | | | | | | |
| M40 motorway users | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium medium Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| A361 users | New employment structures and associated green infrastructure will be seen to displace the agricultural fields | Permanent | Medium | High | Local | Major adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Moderate adverse |
| A422 users | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| Banbury Road users | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| Junction J.11 | Upper parts of a number of new employment | Permanent | Medium medium Low | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | | | | | | introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | |
| PRoW AD22 users | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium High | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse/ Negligible |
| PRoW AD11 users | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium High | Medium/ Low | Local | Moderate adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| PRoW Seale's Farm users | New employment structures and green infrastructure will be seen from elevated view | Permanent | Medium High | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Not applicable | Moderate adverse |
| PRoW AU29 users | No effects identified | Permanent | Medium High | Negligible | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |
| Users of Frontier Park | New employment structures and associated green infrastructure will be seen to displace the agricultural fields | Permanent | Low | High | Local | Moderate adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Moderate adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Users of Ind. Estate off Hennef Way | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Negligible |
| Road and footpath users Nethercote and Overthorpe | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium High | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse/ Negligible |
| Rail users | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse/ Negligible |
| Users of Banbury Country Park | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over intervening vegetation | Permanent | Medium High | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse/ Negligible |
| Users of the Oxfordshire Canal | Upper parts of a number of new employment structures may be seen over | Permanent | Medium High | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Retention of existing green infrastructure and introduction of additional | Minor adverse/ Negligible |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | intervening vegetation | | | | | | screening green infrastructure | |
| Cumulative and In-combination | | | | | | | | |
| M40 motorway users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium Medium Low | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| A361 users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Moderate/ Minor adverse |
| A422 users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| Banbury Road users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| Junction J.11 | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium Medium Low | Low/ Negligible | Local | Negligible | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Negligible |
| PRoW AD22 users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium High | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | infrastructure | |
| PRoW AD11 users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium High | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |
| PRoW Seale’s Farm users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium High | Medium/ Minor | Local | Minor adverse | Not applicable | Minor adverse |
| PRoW AU29 users | Not applicable | Permanent | Medium High | Not applicable | Local | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| Users of Frontier Park | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Low | Medium | Local | Moderate adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Moderate/ Minor adverse |
| Users of Ind. Estate off Hennef Way | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Low | Low/ negligible | Local | Negligible | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Negligible |
| Road and footpath users Nethercote and Overthorpe | Not applicable | Not applicable | Medium High | Low/ negligible | Local | Negligible | Not applicable | Negligible |
| Rail users | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium | Low | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse |

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

5 Landscape & Visual

| Receptor/ Receiving Environment | Description of Effect | Nature of Effect * | Sensitivity Value ** | Magnitude of Effect ** | Geographical Importance *** | Significance of Effects **** | Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures | Residual Effects ***** |
|--|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Users of Banbury Country Park | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium High | Low/ Negligible | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse/ Negligible |
| Users of the Oxfordshire Canal | New employment structures seen in association with existing | Permanent | Medium High | Low/ Negligible | Local | Minor adverse | Maintain visual separation through screening green infrastructure | Minor adverse/ Negligible |