

11 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL AMENITY

11.1 INTRODUCTION

11.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) evaluates the effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape and visual resource. The assessment is undertaken to determine the potential effects, both direct and indirect, on the landscape character and visual amenity including views. The assessment covers the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development; decommissioning is not considered (see **ES Chapter 4, section 4.3**).

11.1.2 The Application Site covers an area of approximately 12.04 hectares of land at the former RAF Upper Heyford Air Base (the former Air Base), in Oxfordshire. It is located in the south west corner of the former Air Base with Kirtlington Road forming its western boundary and Camp Road forms the northern boundary. The Application Site is enclosed to the east by the recently constructed residential properties of Bovis Homes. The southern boundary, broadly speaking is formed by open countryside although the actual site boundary is formed by a barbed-wire topped chain link security fence, which is still in place from the former Air Base.

11.1.3 Upper Heyford is the closest settlement and is located to the north-west, approximately 0.5km away. The Application Site is located within the administrative boundary of Cherwell District Council. Its location is illustrated on the Site Location Plan (see **Figure 1.1**).

11.1.4 The Proposed Development, illustrated on the Parameter Plan, (see **Figure 4.1**) comprises the following elements:

- Two vehicular accesses off Camp Road to the north;
- Access road connecting with Izzard Road to the east;
- Residential properties; and
- Proposed open space, areas of play, and planting with surface water management.

11.2 ASSESSMENT APPROACH

Methodology

11.2.1 This chapter presents a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape and visual resource and takes into account different attributes of the landscape, and criteria associated with visual amenity. In order to do so a number of factors have been identified and reviewed to establish the baseline condition and the best approach for this LVIA. This section of **Chapter 11** discusses the following topics: methodology; legislative and policy framework; scoping criteria; and limitations to the assessment.

11.2.2 The LVIA has been undertaken with regard to the current best practice. A detailed methodology is presented in **Appendix 11.1**. The most relevant is the current 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition' (GLVIA3)

published in April 2013 by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment.

Assessment of Significance

11.2.3 The scale of effects is derived from the interaction of the receptor sensitivity and magnitude of change as detailed in the matrix set out in **Table 11.1** and in **Appendix 11.1**.

Table 11.1 Significance Matrix

		SENSITIVITY OF RECEPTOR			
		HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	NEGLIGIBLE
MAGNITUDE OF CHANGE	HIGH	Major	Major	Moderate	Negligible
	MEDIUM	Major	Moderate	Minor / Moderate	Negligible
	LOW	Moderate	Minor / Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	NEGLIGIBLE	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

11.2.4 Those effects assessed as major and/or moderate are considered significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms.

Legislative and Policy Framework

11.2.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) set out the Government’s economic, environmental and social planning policies for England, and their vision for sustainable development.

11.2.6 NPPF Section 11, entitled ‘Conserving and enhancing the natural environment’ explains within paragraph 109 that:

“...the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils.”

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) Design (March 2014)

11.2.7 The National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) ‘Natural Environment’ reinforces the policies contained in the NPPF with its section ‘Landscape’ referring to the **“...intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside...”**.

11.2.8 The PPG on Design, which supports section 7 of the NPPF, provides advice to Local Planning Authorities with regard to the weight attached to design and sustainability in decision making process (paragraph 004):

“Local planning authorities should give great weight to outstanding or innovative designs which help to raise the standard of design more generally in the area. (...) Planning permission should not be refused for buildings and infrastructure that promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal’s economic, social and environmental benefits).”

11.2.9 The PPG goes on to state (in paragraph 007) that: **“Development should seek to promote character in townscape and landscape by responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development...”** and should have the following qualities (paragraph 015):

- **“be functional;**
- **support mixed uses and tenures;**
- **include successful public spaces;**
- **be adaptable and resilient;**
- **have a distinctive character;**
- **be attractive; and**
- **encourage ease of movement.”**

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (April 2014)

11.2.10 Whilst heritage matters relating to the Proposed Development are addressed in Chapter 13, in preparation of the LVIA it is noted that this PPG relates to section 12 of the NPPF and recognises that: **“Heritage assets may be affected by physical change or by change to the character of their setting”** (paragraph 009). The PPG provides some guidance in terms of setting and potential substantial harm caused by development, and also discusses conservation areas and un-listed heritage assets in the context of the NPPF. These matters are considered in greater depth in **ES Chapter 13: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**.

Regional planning policies

11.2.11 The saved Structure Plan Policy H2 (Upper Heyford) of the former Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 has been replaced following adoption of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031. The development strategy for the former Air Base is now to be determined

through the provisions of Village Policy 5 of the Local Plan and the Local Plan Part 2 2011-2031.

Local planning policies

11.2.12 There are two documents containing planning policies for Cherwell District Council which may be of relevance to the Proposed Development and have been reviewed as part of this report:

- Adopted Local Plan 1996; and
- Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031.

Adopted Local Plan 1996

11.2.13 The Adopted Local Plan 1996 has now been superseded, although two relevant policies from it have been 'saved' in the current Adopted Local Plan 2011 – 2031. These comprise policies relating to the protection of rural character of the local landscape and its assets both heritage and natural; nature conservation and heritage are considered in Chapters 12 and 13, respectively. Nonetheless, Policy C5 seeks 'Protection of ecological value and rural character of specified features of value in the district', and a specific policy in relation to RAF Upper Heyford, the area within which the Application Site falls, and Rousham Park is addressed in Policy C11.

11.2.14 Another saved policy is Policy C28 'Layout, design and external appearance of new development' which deals with the design and external appearance of development and its relationship with existing developments.

Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031

11.2.15 Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 was adopted on 20th July 2015. A review of the current Adopted Local Plan has been carried out and policies relevant to the Proposed Development are identified below.

11.2.16 The Policy ESD13 'Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement' states that a character-based approach will be adopted by the Council; paragraph B.248 states that the Council 'seeks to conserve and enhance the distinctive and highly valued local character of the entire District'. Policy ESD13 states:

"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.

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.”**

11.2.17 Paragraph B.248 that accompanies Policy ESD13, notes that the Council will use the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Tranquillity Map of Oxfordshire as a guide to assessing areas of tranquillity, although further guidance on this matter will be contained in the Local Plan Part 2, which is currently in preparation and therefore not available to guide this LVIA.

11.2.18 Paragraph B.250 states:

“The relationship between the District’s towns and the adjoining countryside and the avoidance of abrupt transition from built development to open farmland requires special attention to the landscaping of existing and proposed development. This interface is important in determining the relationship between the urban areas and on the character of the countryside. Where new development will extend the built up limits of the towns the Council will seek a masterplan and well-designed approach to the urban edge. This could incorporate the enhancement of existing hedgerows and woodlands and new areas of woodland planting and hedgerows to be incorporated as part of the development, to ensure satisfactory transition between town and country. These considerations can equally be applied where extensions to villages are required. Landscape mitigation of the strategic sites will be negotiated on a site by site basis.”

11.2.19 The role of the Cherwell District Landscape Assessment (November 1995) and the more recent Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) in guiding the formulation of policy is noted at paragraph B.251. It is also noted that the OWLS identifies ‘forces for change’ in a particular location and includes landscape and biodiversity strategies and sets out guidelines for how development can contribute towards landscape character. Both of these studies are discussed in more detail at section 11.3 below.

11.2.20 In paragraph B.252, the setting of the River Cherwell is identified as one of the most important elements of the landscape that can add to the character and identity of an area.

11.2.21 Paragraph B.253 continues that the Council will seek retention of woodland, trees, hedges, ponds, walls and any other features deemed **“important to the character or appearance of local landscape as a result of their ecological, historic or amenity value”** and it concludes that **“Proposals which would result in**

the loss of such features will not be permitted unless their loss can be justified by appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures to the satisfaction of the Council."

11.2.22 To ensure that development conserves and enhances the character of the countryside, paragraph B.254 states:

"...The Council will carefully control the type, scale and design of development including the materials used, taking into account the advice contained in the Council's Countryside Design Summary and the OWLS."

11.2.23 It is noted at paragraph B.255 that Policy ESD15 'The Urban-Rural Fringe' provides further advice in terms of treatment of the urban edge and green infrastructure in relation to Conservation Areas; this is addressed in Chapter 13 of this ES. Policy ESD16 'The Character of the Built and Historic Environment' refers to the design of proposed built form and its relationship with the existing built and heritage environment.

11.2.24 It is worth reiterating at this stage that policies relating to heritage assets and their settings are excluded from this Chapter.

Guidance and Council's published documents relevant to the Proposed Development

11.2.25 The Proposed Development falls within the site of the former Air Base and the Council has published a number of documents outlining the vision for this site and guidance in relation to the requirements for developments within it. The documents which were considered of particular relevance are those listed in the Planning Inspector's Report to Cherwell District Council dated 09/06/2015 under the Modification Number 156:

- Former RAF Upper Heyford Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Assessment (2014);
- Former RAF Upper Heyford Urban Capacity Assessment (2014);
- The 2014 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment;
- RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief SPD (2007);
- Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal (2006);
- Former RAF Upper Heyford Landscape Character Assessment of the Airbase South of the Cold War Zone (2006);
- Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Plan (2005);
- Former RAF Upper Heyford Landscape and Visual Impact and Masterplan Report (2004); and
- Restoration of Upper Heyford Airbase – A Landscape Impact Assessment (1997).

11.2.26 Broadly speaking the information contained in the above quoted documents relates to the former Air Base as a heritage asset as an example of a Cold War landscape. These documents also discuss the issue of landscape character assessment within the Air Base and in the wider countryside, including Rousham Park. This information has been used to inform the baseline and assessment sections, where relevant, of this Chapter.

'Countryside Design Summary' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

11.2.27 The Council's SPG 'Countryside Design Summary' (1998) provides guidance on the design of developments in relation to the character of the local landscape. The document identifies a number of Countryside Character Areas and states that the Proposed Development falls within the Ploughley Limestone Plateau. The published document provides advice in terms of siting, landscaping and building material. The identified Countryside Character Areas are not consistent with the Council's published

Landscape Character Assessment, discussed in section 11.3 of this Chapter. They have been reviewed to inform the assessment but have not been specifically referenced or assessed in this Chapter.

Building in Harmony with the Environment - A Development Guide (SPG)

11.2.28 Section 6 'Landscaping' of this published document refers to the landscape planting and has been reviewed to inform the mitigation strategy for the Proposed Development.

'Restoration of Upper Heyford Airbase - A Landscape Impact Assessment'

11.2.29 The Council commissioned an assessment of the former Air Base from a landscape and visual perspective, known as 'Restoration of Upper Heyford Airbase: A Landscape Impact Assessment' which was published in 1997. This published report provides useful information in terms of visibility of the former Air Base and its restoration, assuming the airfield would be restored to an agricultural landscape; an assumption which has subsequently been superseded by the designation of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area in April 2006. Therefore, although useful as a reference and to confirm the extent and suitability of the study area (identified on the ZVI plans included within the published report) the document represents the past pre-RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area baseline situation with new developments and demolition work already taking place across some parts of the former Air Base.

11.2.30 The Upper Heyford Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (18th August 2014) (ENV20PM) and the Upper Heyford Assessment Interim Final Report (21st August 2014) (ENV21PM) have been reviewed to inform the assessment and along with the Inspectors decision, dated 09/06/2015 on the examination into the Cherwell Local Plan, confirm the general acceptability of this area for residential re-development.

Scoping Criteria

11.2.31 This assessment is based on our knowledge of the Application Site and the surrounding landscape as identified in available publications and reviewed during the site visits. A number of documents have been reviewed and referenced in this Chapter and have informed the preparation of this assessment. It has been carried out with regard to the recent guidelines and focuses on the potential significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape and visual resource.

11.2.32 Accordingly, the LVIA considers the following potential effects:

- Construction Phase – character of the local landscape;
- Construction Phase – change in views;
- Operational Phase – character of the local landscape; and
- Operational Phase – change in views, particularly as experienced by users of nearby Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and existing residential properties within the vicinity of the former Air Base.
- Cumulative Effects

Study Area

11.2.33 As discussed in **Appendix 11.1** in order to assess the effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape and visual resource a preliminary study area has been identified as 5km radii from the Application Site (see **Figure 11.1**). This extent has been

used to review the baseline condition, to carry out the initial site visit, and to identify relevant landscape and visual receptors.

11.2.34 The Proposed Development would cover a relatively small parcel of land. It is surrounded to the west and south by an agricultural landscape with trees, hedgerows and occasional blocks of woodland. The presence of vegetation restricts the visibility of the existing elements of built form present in the south western part of the former Air Base and it is likely that the visibility of the Proposed Development would also be limited.

11.2.35 The majority of the former airfield (the 'flying field') is located to the north and west and is enclosed by mature tree vegetation following its northern boundary. A plan showing theoretical visibility and so called 'screened' theoretical visibility has also been prepared to inform the baseline study and the assessment (see **Figure 11.2**). Plans in the aforementioned 'Restoration of Upper Heyford Airbase - A Landscape Impact Assessment' have also been used to verify the extent of the study area. Consequently, the assessment focuses on a much smaller study area which would correspond with the potential zone of visual influence of the Proposed Development. This is further explained in the assessment section of this Chapter.

Limitations to the Assessment

11.2.36 A site visit was carried out for the purpose of this assessment in mid-June 2015, with subsequent visits in June and September 2016 and site photography was undertaken. Therefore, the baseline photography illustrates the screening offered by the vegetation present in the local area. Viewpoints have been positioned to avoid vegetation or other obstructions, where possible, and allow for direct and less restricted visibility towards the Application Site.

11.2.37 The assessment has been carried out based on the information included in the ES and Parameter Plan (see **Figure 4.1**) for the Proposed Development as described in **Chapter 4**. The information provided in section 2 and 3 of this report forms the basis for the assessment carried out in this Chapter.

11.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS

11.3.1 This section identifies and describes the existing landscape features, and landscape and visual resource found within and around the Application Site. This study helps to gain an understanding of what makes the landscape distinctive, what its important components or characteristics are, and how it is changing prior to the introduction of the Proposed Development. The baseline study is instrumental in the identification of the landscape receptors and visual receptors / views to be included in the assessment.

Site Description and Context

Application Site

11.3.2 The Application Site comprises, broadly speaking, the area known as School Huts (as described in the 'Former RAF Upper Heyford Landscape Character Assessment of the Airbase South of the Cold War Zone' (2006)). It is defined by Camp Road (see Viewpoint 11) to the north and Kirtlington Road to the west. A construction site is located to the east and is associated with the partially completed Bovis Homes' residential and school development. Part of the eastern boundary is defined by the area of grassland and the former baseball pitches and tennis courts (see Viewpoint 8). The southern boundary,

broadly speaking is formed by open countryside, separated from the Application Site by a c.2.25m high chain link and barbed wire fence (see Viewpoint 12).

11.3.3 The Application Site comprises a variety of built form, mostly single storey in a derelict state of repair. Concrete roads connect individual buildings and provide access across the Application Site with the buildings arranged in a grid pattern north to south. Mature and juvenile trees are located in a haphazard manner across the Application Site with areas of grassland separating the built form from the western and southern boundary. There are a number of tall non-native evergreen trees located in the centre of the Application Site and near its south eastern corner.

11.3.4 Topographically there is little variation in levels across the Application Site with the ground appearing to be slightly raised in the middle of its southern part. The northern part of the Application Site reaches approximately 124m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) and gently slopes to the south with the levels of 122m AOD in the south west corner, 125m AOD along the central section of the boundary and around 122m AOD near the belt of evergreen trees in the south eastern corner. For the purpose of this assessment, the topography of the Application Site, as a landscape element has been assigned a low sensitivity to the Proposed Development.

11.3.5 No water features are apparent within the Application Site.

11.3.6 Views from within the Application Site are generally restricted by the boundary vegetation and the existing built form, within and outside its boundaries (see Figure 11.3). Views to the north terminate at the roadside vegetation and buildings, including the Hardened Aircraft Shelters (HASs), located to the north of Camp Road. A telecommunication mast is located to the north east of the existing entrance to the Application Site.

11.3.7 Views to the east are less restricted with an area of grassland and former basketball pitches (now disused) separating the Application Site from the residential properties located some 200 metres to the east (see Viewpoint 11.3). Views include the grassed-over and cone shaped fuel stores with trees and aforementioned residential buildings forming one of the key characteristic of the views. One of the retained water towers associated with the former Air Base is visible above the roofline. The recently constructed school is visible in the same direction with mature trees, including evergreens, screening views to the south east.

11.3.8 Some isolated trees are located along the southern boundary. The southern boundary is delineated by a c.2.25m high security fence with barbed wire. Views include the surrounding arable fields, hedgerows and groups of trees. Views vary from short range terminating at the nearby hedgerows along Kirtlington Road, to distant views across the River Cherwell valley. An area of grassland located in the southern part of the Application Site allows for open and relatively unrestricted views to the south, albeit impeded by the chain link security fence.

11.3.9 The western boundary of the Application Site is delineated by a tall hedgerow of approximately 4m height which screens views to the west (see Viewpoint 9). There are a number of mature trees located nearby, giving the perception that this edge of the site is well vegetated, with trees continuing along Camp Road to the north. Due to their value as landscape elements and limited potential for mitigation, a medium sensitivity has been assigned to the hedgerows. High sensitivity has been assigned to trees due to their higher value as a landscape element influencing the character of the Application Site and the surrounding landscape. The area of grassland, located in the southern part of the

Application Site has been considered low sensitivity with this landscape element easily restored and contributing to a limited degree to the overall character of this area.

11.3.10 There are no Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within the Application Site, but a permissive footway lies along the northern edge of the Application Site broadly parallel to, and associated with, Camp Road.

11.3.11 Existing landscape features associated with the Application Site are illustrated on Landscape Features Plan (see **Figure 11.3**). A tree survey has been carried out and is included in **Appendix 11.2**.

Surrounding Landscape

11.3.12 The Application Site is located in the south western corner of the former Air Base with the majority of the existing infrastructure and runways located to the north, north east and east. The roadside vegetation, built form and topography within the former Air Base restricts opportunities to gain views of the local and wider landscape with views generally terminating on the immediate environs. Views along Camp Road immediately to the north of the Application Site are channelled and restricted with the on-going construction traffic visible and audible. There is little appreciation of the former Air Base, its character or views of the heritage assets.

11.3.13 The landscape to the east is characterised by the presence of the built form associated with the former Air Base, the new school, and new two-storey residential developments to the south of Camp Road. The perception is of a developed townscape with views of the open countryside beyond the chain link security fence gained from certain locations along the edge of the developments.

11.3.14 Topographically, the landscape gently slopes to the south with the changes to the contours more evident to the west of the Application Site (see **Figure 11.4**). The valley of River Cherwell creates a relatively strong landform and separates the former Air Base from the higher ground located further west. The A4260 marks that higher ground but is not perceptible due to the distance and intervening vegetative screening. It is approximately 3.7km away at its closest point near Hopcrofts Holt.

Baseline Survey Information

Landscape Character

11.3.15 England has been divided into 159 areas, which are called National Character Areas (NCAs); previously known as Joint Character Areas (JCAs). This mapping, sometimes described as 'The Character of England Map', and the associated descriptions provide a picture of the differences in landscape character at the national scale. It is considered that whilst the NCAs provide a recognised, national, spatial framework the scale of the mapping and information makes it of limited use as a local planning tool.

The national level landscape character assessment is a 'broad brush' strategic approach and therefore was considered not appropriate for the purpose of this assessment.

Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (undated)

11.3.16 The current Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) for Oxfordshire is the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS), which is available at www.owls.oxfordshire.gov.uk.

11.3.17 The OWLS assessment classifies four landscape character types within the vicinity of the Application Site:

- Farmland Plateau – including the former Air Base;
- Wooded Estatelands – encompassing land to the southeast of Caulcott centred on Middleton Park;
- Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides – comprising land lying broadly between Station Road/Somerton Road and the River Cherwell flood plain; and
- River Meadowlands – encompassing the flood plain and valley floor of the River Cherwell.

11.3.18 The Application Site falls within and is surrounded on all sides by the Farmland Plateau landscape type. Key characteristics are listed as:

- **“Level or gently rolling open ridges dissected by narrow valleys and broader vales.**
- **Large, regular arable fields enclosed by low thorn hedges and limestone walls.**
- **Rectilinear plantations and shelterbelts.**
- **Sparsely settled landscape with a few nucleated settlements.**
- **Long, straight roads running along the ridge summits.”**

11.3.19 A number of local character areas are described within the overall Farmland Plateau landscape type, including ref. H Fritwell, in which the Application Site lies, for which the landscape character is described as:

“This area is characterised by large, regularly-shaped arable fields and medium-sized mixed plantations. There are small fields of semi-improved grassland surrounding villages. There are also a few large blocks of ancient semi-natural woodland, including Stoke Wood and Stoke Little Wood, which add to the wooded character of this area. The field boundaries are dominated by hawthorn and blackthorn hedges with scattered hedgerow trees, although the latter are almost totally absent to the south of Upper Heyford airfield. Hedges are generally low in height, except around Fritwell and Ardley where they are taller and more species-rich.”

11.3.20 The former Air Base is referenced under 'forces for change', which states:

“...The open plateau landscapes are very exposed and agricultural buildings and other large structures, such as the industrial units at Enstone Airfield, are particularly prominent. Similarly, the structures

associated with Upper Heyford airfield are very visible across the Cherwell Valley...”

11.3.21 In response to the ‘forces for change’, a number of Landscape Strategy guidelines are also noted to “conserve the open and remote character of the landscape, and maintain the large-scale field pattern.” Relevant guidelines include:

- **“Conserve the open, spacious character of the landscape by limiting woodland planting on the more exposed ridge tops. Locate new planting in the dips and folds of the landscape and establish tree belts around airfields, quarries and other large structures to reduce their visual impact using locally characteristic native tree and shrub species such as ash, oak and beech.**
- **Strengthen the field pattern by planting up gappy hedges using locally characteristic species such as hawthorn and blackthorn.**
- **Promote environmentally-sensitive maintenance of hedgerows, including coppicing and layering when necessary, to maintain a height and width appropriate to the landscape type...**
- **Maintain the sparsely settled rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development in and around existing settlements. The exposed character of the plateau is particularly sensitive to visually intrusive development, large buildings and communication masts...”**

11.3.22 Key Recommendations are made in conclusion to the Farmland Plateau landscape character description, as follows:

- **“Safeguard and enhance the open, sparsely settled character of the landscape whilst maintaining and strengthening its pattern of hedgerows, stone walls, small woodlands and tree belts.”**

Cherwell District Landscape Assessment (1995)

11.3.23 The OWLS notes that this county-wide assessment should be read in conjunction with LCA’s available at district level, which for Cherwell comprises the Cherwell District Landscape Assessment. However, it should be borne in mind that subsequent to the Cherwell District Landscape Assessment published in November 1995, the former Air Base has been designated as RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area, and some areas and buildings within it have been designated as Scheduled Monuments.

11.3.24 The landscape character assessment published by the Council, known as ‘Cherwell District Landscape Assessment’ (1995), provides an analysis of the character of the landscape at a local level. The following paragraphs summarise the information contained in the aforementioned published assessment and extracts from the document are included in **Appendix 11.3** for reference. The LCAs, as identified by the Council, are mapped on **Figure 11.5**.

11.3.25 The Proposed Development is located within the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA which continues further north and south of the Application Site. The Cherwell Valley LCA

is adjacent to the west. Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA is located to the south east approximately 1.1km away and stretches further north east, and south.

11.3.26 Other published reports, such as 'Former RAF Upper Heyford-Conservation Plan' also make reference to and quote various published landscape character assessments which are applicable to the Application Site and the preliminary 5km study area.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

11.3.27 The Upper Heyford Plateau LCA is, broadly speaking, located to the east of Cherwell River. It reaches the surroundings of the Croughton Airfield and Tusmore Park to the north-east and encompasses the settlement of Souldern to the north. It includes a short section of the M40 motorway and the settlements of Fritwell, and Ardley. The London Marylebone to Birmingham Snowhill railway line separates the northern part of this LCA from its central part which encompasses the former Air Base. To the south of the former Air Base the LCA forms a narrow triangular area between Middleton Park to the east; Kirtlington and Kirtlington Park to the south; and a break of the plateau with the valley of the River Cherwell to the west.

11.3.28 Broadly speaking this LCA is characterised by an elevated topography and is described in paragraph 3.57 of the 'Cherwell District Landscape Assessment' as:

"...an exposed, level, open plateau, which dips very gently into rolling hills to the south-east. Upper Heyford Airbase comprises about a third of this character area and dominates the landscape."

11.3.29 Gentle undulations characterise this LCA with the topography falling to the west into the River Cherwell valley. The former Air Base is surrounded by countryside. Smaller enclosed pastoral fields are generally located around villages and intensive arable cultivation tends to be located in open and level or gently rolling large fields.

11.3.30 The southernmost and northernmost parts of this LCA share a similar weak field pattern and landscape condition (paragraphs 3.60 and 3.61 of the 'Cherwell District Landscape Assessment'):

"...few hedges and virtually no trees." and

"...fields of arable land tend to run into one another with no visual or physical interruption."

11.3.31 Beyond the former Air Base, the development pattern is of small settlements with those located in the northern part of this LCA generally positioned on an elevated ground. The aforementioned assessment also notes the night time light pollution with the street and security lighting on the former Air Base visible over long distances.

11.3.32 Two ancient routes, the Portway and Aves Ditch, are also noted in the 'Cherwell District Landscape Assessment' as special features; the former following the alignment of Kirtlington Road which forms the western boundary of the Application Site. Aves Ditch lies to the east and is separated from the Application Site by existing buildings with the former Air Base.

11.3.33 The presence of the M40 has a strong influence over the character of the northern part of this LCA. Traffic and noise is discernible from the surrounding area and from the eastern part of the former Air Base. Views of the large scale built form within the former RAF Upper Heyford influence the way this LCA is perceived. The repetitive

pattern of buildings and their strongly geometric form are evident from a number of locations within the surrounding landscape.

11.3.34 The Upper Heyford Plateau LCA does not attract a statutory landscape designation. However, the former Air Base is subject to heritage designation as the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area, including the Application Site. Further, land immediately to the south and west of the Application Site falls within Rousham Conservation Area. Whilst subject to heritage designation, the area is not subject to landscape designation being a landscape comprising urban fringe and open countryside that is considered to display elements that are a distinctive component of the local landscape character. It is considered that the value of this LCA, as a whole, is medium. The susceptibility of the whole LCA to the Proposed Development is also considered medium. Notwithstanding, the susceptibility of the Application Site and its immediate environs, the surrounding countryside and in particular that part which is influenced by the former Air Base is considered to be low due to the large scale built form present and visible across this LCA. Overall, the sensitivity to the Proposed Development is considered to be low around the Application Site and medium elsewhere.

Cherwell Valley LCA

11.3.35 This LCA is associated with the valley of River Cherwell which is located to the west of the Application Site. It stretches as a relatively narrow corridor between Banbury to the north to Kirtlington to the south. The western boundary of this LCA is defined by a higher ground marked by the presence of the A4260. The higher ground of the Heyford Plateau defines the extent of the eastern boundary with a number of local roads following the edge of the plateau.

11.3.36 The changes in the local topography are evident with the roads following the sloping ground and often running along the higher ground. A number of settlements, such as Steeple Aston or Middle Aston are located on the upper slopes of the valley. The Council's published assessment states: **"Settlements are served by roads running along the higher ground, the villages sitting just below the brow of the valley sides facing each other."**

11.3.37 The valley floor is characterised by the meandering course of River Cherwell with pastoral fields located either side. Riparian vegetation and mature trees line the course of the river and the Oxford Canal. Isolated trees, groups of trees, and hedgerow trees are frequent. Tree vegetation is also frequent along the railway line, which runs to the west of the River Cherwell before crossing to the east of the River northwest of Upper Heyford village. The field pattern along the river is mostly of medium to small scale pastoral fields. Arable fields are predominantly localised on the valley sides and are of medium to large scale. The openness of the fields allows for distant views across the valley: **"...more open and unstructured, with long views across the valley."**

11.3.38 The Council's aforementioned assessment mentions a number of special features associated with the Cherwell Valley LCA. Notably, Rousham Park, Grade I Registered Park, is located on the edge of this LCA (within West Oxfordshire District) with the Cherwell Valley forming a backdrop to the views gained from the park. A broad swathe of the Cherwell Valley LCA to the northeast of Rousham Park, to the west of the former Air Base and the Application Site, is subject to a heritage designation as Rousham Conservation Area. A number of settlements and its vernacular architecture are also mentioned in the published document. Two Scheduled Monuments, namely Deddington Castle and the deserted medieval village in Somerton, are also identified.

11.3.39 The Cherwell Valley LCA does not attract a statutory landscape designation. In landscape terms, it is considered that the value of this LCA, as a whole, is medium. The susceptibility to the Proposed Development is considered medium due to the field

pattern, changes in the topography and visibility across Cherwell Valley LCA. In summary, the overall, the sensitivity to the Proposed Development is considered to be medium.

Other LCAs

11.3.40 Other LCAs which fall within the 5km study area are located further away and it is considered that the Proposed Development would have a limited potential to significantly affect their character. This is based on the distance, topography of these and the host LCA, and the presence of the former Air Base. As indicated by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) plan (see **Figure 11.2**) there are limited and distant opportunities for views to be gained. Therefore, other LCAs identified in the preliminary 5km study area and shown on the Landscape Character Areas Plan (see **Figure 11.5**) have been excluded from the assessment.

RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal

11.3.41 The 'RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal' (2006) discusses the character of the former Air Base in landscape terms and considers the inter-visibility of the airfield from the surrounding countryside. Similar to other published documents, it repeats the information provided by Cherwell District Landscape Assessment in terms of visibility of the former Air Base and its visual impact. The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the Application Site as part of the Residential Zone, to the south of Camp Road.

11.3.42 The published document provides a limited amount of information in relation to the eastern part of the former Air Base and its visibility. 'Figure 11: Visual analysis of the flying field' indicates views out from the western edge of the Application Site and also notes that the western and northern boundaries represent 'degraded edges'. The Application Site is identified in Section 7: Character Analysis as part of the Residential Zone sub category 10E School and other areas of prefabricated buildings and is described at page 36 thus:

"The school is located in the south west corner of the site. A clutter of single storey prefabricated buildings. This group of buildings is isolated from its neighbours by either the road or a succession of baseball pitches. The proximity of buildings within the school complex gives the site a claustrophobic air..."

11.3.43 The document also states in section 6.4 (on page 29):

"and on the parade ground the alignment of buildings creates strong lines of sight which terminate in visual blocks. The residual of the Residential Area south of Camp Road is without significant internal views although there are views to be had from the southern boundary out over the Caulcott plateau..."

The main views into the airbase can be had from (...) the Somerton to Ardley road and associated footpaths which give a view into the northern section of the Flying Field; and the Caulcott plateau (the B4030 and associated lesser roads) which gives a panoramic view of the southern boundary of the airbase, an apparently random assortment of buildings surmounted by two water towers."

11.3.44 The published document does not provide any detailed information with regard the former school, where the Proposed Development would be located. The site visit confirmed that views towards the south western part of the former Air Base can be

gained from certain sections of the A4260 Oxford Road, Somerton Road and Kirtlington Road/Port Way. These are however limited with parts of the roads unlikely to offer views towards the Proposed Development. Views of the HASs located in the northern part of the airfield can be gained and are restricted by the vegetation associated with the northern boundary of the former Air Base and in the intervening landscape. Views towards the Proposed Development from the B4030 are restricted to a considerable degree along most of its length with the field boundary vegetation filtering and screening views to all but the section that is close to Port Way junction.

RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief (2007)

11.3.45 The 'RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief' (2007) adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) by the Council provides further information in relation to the former Air Base and the surrounding landscape which is broadly consistent with the previously mentioned reports. Of particular interest is the policy quoted in paragraph 4.4.5 which states:

"New development should respond to the established character of distinct character areas where this would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area."

11.3.46 However, the SPD focuses on the heritage value of the site and discusses the site of the former Air Base in the context of the Policy H2 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 rather than in general landscape and visual terms. In addition, the SPD focuses on the development located either side of Camp Road and does not provide any information on the area where the Proposed Development would be located and is therefore of limited use to this assessment.

Landscape Designations

11.3.47 There are no statutory landscape designations covering the Application Site or falling within the 5km study area and therefore this is not considered further within this assessment.

Visual receptors

11.3.48 The effects upon visual receptors are a key consideration in the case of the Application Site and the Proposed Development. This is particularly relevant in the context of the information contained in the above mentioned published documents.

11.3.49 A number of visual receptors have been identified through a combination of the desktop studies, site visits and consultation with Cherwell District Council's Landscape Officer. These receptors were mapped on **Figure 11.1**. The identified visual receptors include transport corridors, registered parks and gardens and PROW including recreational long distance routes. It is worth reiterating that not all of these receptors would gain views towards the Application Site or gain views of the Proposed Development and this is further explained in this assessment.

11.3.50 Settlements are frequent in the Cherwell Valley, particularly on its upper slopes. Upper Heyford is the closest one, approximately 0.5km to the west. Camp Road and Kirtlington Road connect with other local roads which link Upper Heyford with Lower Heyford and settlements to the west such as Steeple Aston, Hopcrofts Holt and Middle Aston. Settlements are also common in the surrounding landscape with Somerton located to the north some 2.3km away, Fritwell located approximately 3.6km to the north east, Fewcott with Ardley located some 1.8km to the north east, Middleton Stoney located approximately 3.2km to the south east and Caulcott located to the south some 1.2km away. The susceptibility of residential receptors to the Proposed Development is

considered to be high. Whilst the former Air Base is apparent in some views, views from settlements are generally of a managed agricultural landscape. The value of such views are therefore medium. Overall, their sensitivity would be high.

11.3.51 The local area and settlements are connected by a number of minor roads and 'B' roads which collectively form a relatively dense road network. The B430 is the closest road of this class and is located approximately 1km away to the east, connecting Ardley with Middleton Stoney and further south with the A43 to Oxford. The B4030 lies to the south and connects Upper Heyford with Bicester. It is located approximately 2km away at its closest point.

11.3.52 The M40 is the only motorway in the study area and is located approximately 4.4km to the east. The A43 connects with the M40 near Ardley and continues north beyond the 5km study area linking with the B4100. The A4095 connects Bicester with Kirtlington and is located approximately 4km away at its closest point to the south of the Application Site. The A4260 is located to the west some 3.7km away.

11.3.53 Due to the distance and alignment of these routes and the level of theoretical visibility and screening offered by vegetation, the majority of the above listed roads are considered not to be relevant to this assessment. The site visit confirmed that views of the existing built form within the Application Site can be gained from Camp Road and the B4030. These two routes would be the most relevant due to their proximity and the potential for visual effects upon the receptors travelling along them. The susceptibility of such receptors is considered to be medium with transitory views, including a variety of built form as receptors travel through the landscape. The value attached to such views would vary but generally is medium with views of the working agricultural countryside. None of the roads in the study area have been identified as scenic routes, which could potentially indicate a higher value. Overall, the sensitivity of these road receptors is assessed as medium.

11.3.54 Other roads such as Kirtlington Road or those within the settlements to the west may offer potential views towards the Application Site. Such views would however be glimpsed and receptors are unlikely to gain prolonged views of the Proposed Development.

11.3.55 The nearest railway line is the Oxford to Banbury (and Birmingham) line which follows the River Cherwell valley. A second railway line comprises the main line between London Marylebone and Birmingham. It is partially set within a cutting with a relatively short section of the railway passing between Somerton and Fritwell located in a tunnel. Receptors travelling along the railway line through the River Cherwell valley would have limited opportunities to view the Proposed Development (see **Figure 11.1**). Where views could theoretically be gained, these would be transitory and of a relatively short duration gained between Lower Heyford station and Somerton Crossing. In reality such views would be limited by the built form and vegetation along the railway tracks. Properties in Lower Heyford and Upper Heyford would provide some context and so views of other residential dwellings within the surrounding countryside would not be incongruous. None of these receptors have been considered relevant due to the limited level of theoretical visibility and likely screening offered by vegetation in the valley.

11.3.56 English Heritage has compiled a Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Registered sites of exceptional historic interest are assessed as Grade I, those of great historic interest as Grade II* and of special historic interest as Grade II. There are three registered historic parks and gardens in the 5km study area.

11.3.57 Middleton Park is a Grade II Registered Park and is the closest such receptor, located approximately 1.7km away to the south east; Rousham Park is a Grade I Park and is located approximately 2.2km to the south-west; and Kirtlington Park, is a Grade

II Park located approximately 4.2km away to the south east at its closest point at the A4095.

11.3.58 As indicated by the ZTV plan (see **Figure 11.2**) the Proposed Development is not theoretically visible from the majority of Rousham Park. Views from Middleton Stoney would be theoretically gained but the vegetation along the B4030 and within the park restricts such views. Similarly, views from Kirtlington Park are screened and distant with the perception of the Proposed Development limited. Due to the limited theoretical visibility, distance and the context provided by the former Air Base, only Rousham Park has been considered further in this assessment. The susceptibility of visual receptors within Rousham Park is taken as high. The value of such views would also be high with the surroundings defined by a designed Grade I historic landscape.

11.3.59 Public Rights of Way within the surrounding landscape are frequent with a promoted long distance route (the Oxford Canal Walk) following the River Cherwell valley floor. A number of routes promoted by Oxfordshire County Council such as the Cherwell Valley and Heyford Circular Walks cross the valley and lead through the nearby settlements. Generally speaking, users of PRow would have a high susceptibility to change. The value of such views would be generally medium with views of the open working countryside. Overall, the sensitivity of PRow users would be high.

11.3.60 Other promoted long distance walking routes falling within the study area are the Claude Duval Bridle route and Palladian Way. The Aves Ditch and Port Way are mentioned in several sources, including the Council's published assessment on the local landscape. Aves Ditch follows a southwest to northeast alignment to the southeast of the former Air Base (approximately 1.3km from the Application Site at its closest point) according to the Oxfordshire County Council Definitive Map, and variously comprises a restricted byway, a bridleway and public highway along Chilgrove Drive before being truncated by the former Air Base. Port Way follows the alignment of the Port Way/Kirtlington Road adjacent to the western boundary of the Application Site, comprising public highway with a short section (c. 430m) of bridleway to the north of Camp Road forming an extension to this route; again, the route is truncated by the former Air Base (see **Figure 11.1**).

11.3.61 Effects upon such receptors are generally assessed in the round taking into account their overall length and variety of views gained along their route. Due to the distance and alignment of these routes and the screening provided by tree vegetation they were not considered relevant for the purpose of this assessment; views from Port Way/Kirtlington Road are assessed as public highways as there is no footway along the road.

11.3.62 The nearest Sustrans National Cycle Network (NCN) routes comprise Route 5 (West Midlands) and Route 51 (South Midlands) which lie outside of the study area more than 5km to the southwest. The two routes are however connected via Tackley, Kirtlington and Bletchingdon (Tackley Road/Rousham Road/ Bletchingdon Road/ Springwell Hill), although this route does not form part of the NCN (Sustrans.org.uk/ncn/map). The linking roads lie just under 5km away at the closest point to the Application Site (see **Figure 11.1**). The susceptibility of rural road users to the Proposed Development would be generally be medium and the value of such views would be generally medium.

Viewpoints

11.3.63 The assessment of landscape and visual effects is informed by a series of fifteen representative viewpoints shown in conjunction with the ZTV on the 'Zone of Theoretical Visibility & Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility & Viewpoint Locations' (see **Figure 11.2**). The viewpoints have been selected during the site visit to cover locations such as

roads and PRoW, and taking into account nearby settlements, whilst offering views towards the Application Site. The selection of viewpoints includes the two most relevant LCAs, locations from different directions and at varied distances. The location of these viewpoints has been agreed with the Cherwell District Council Landscape Officer.

11.3.64 The viewpoint assessment is used to inform and illustrate the assessment of effects on landscape character and the assessment of effects on views. The relevant information is extrapolated in the assessment of effects on landscape character and the assessment of effects on views.

11.3.65 These viewpoints have been reviewed during the site visit and included in the assessment following discussion with Cherwell Valley Council's Landscape Officer.

11.3.66 A number of other locations have been visited during the site visit, but were deemed not to be appropriate to the assessment or not likely to add to the assessment due to similarities with other more appropriate viewpoints. Views from the layby along the A4260, south of Hopcrofts Holt are substantially screened by perennial vegetation and views during summer months are limited to the water tower and upper parts of the vegetation within the Application Site. Views of the surrounding landscape are limited and the focus is generally on the immediate road environs. A section of Port Way between Fir Tree Farm / Greenway and the junction with the B4030 has been visited and framed views of the surrounding landscape to the east and north east are gained through the gaps of vegetation. Such views are limited however and receptors would not gain prolonged views of the landscape towards the Application Site. The Camp Road water tower is visible in such views albeit such views are not easily gained when travelling. Views of the telecommunication tower located near the Application Site were not gained from these locations during the site visit. Views towards the Application Site become more open at the junction of Port Way and the B4030 offering relatively unrestricted views. Such views were judged to be similar in nature, albeit slightly more distant, to those gained along the public footpath (388/4/20) located to the south of the Application Site.

11.3.67 **Table 11.1** below lists the representative viewpoints and provides information on their location, receptor type, and distance from the Application Site.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

11.3.68 The ZTV plan (see **Figure 11.2**) prepared to aid the assessment and identification of viewpoints illustrates three different scenarios of the visibility of the Proposed Development based on the extent of the proposed built form (see **Figure 4.1**). The 'bare earth' scenario (shown in green) does not account for any screening offered by vegetation or built form and has been based on the assumed maximum development height of 15m allowing for + 2m changes in the contours for the development platform if required (i.e. a 13m development height +2m development platform). As indicated on the plan, such visibility would theoretically occur across areas of woodland and within settlements and is therefore misleading.

11.3.69 The two other ZTVs shown in conjunction represent the so-called 'screened' ZTV whereby the built form and substantial blocks of vegetation are assigned certain heights and used to model a more realistic representation of the theoretical visibility. The two 'screened' ZTVs (shown as blue and yellow) represent the visibility of the Proposed Development assuming varied heights, up to 10m height and up to 15m height respectively. By comparing both 'screened' ZTVs one can ascertain that upper parts of the built form (between 10m and 15m height) could be seen from limited locations (areas coloured blue). From the remaining areas (yellow) receptors may theoretically see lower parts of the Proposed Development, potentially including ground floor and upper storeys. It is worth reiterating that small groups or isolated buildings, small areas of

woodland, tree belts and hedgerows are not accounted for and therefore such ZTVs still represent a theoretical visibility. The actual extent of the visibility of the Proposed Development is likely to be smaller than that shaded blue and yellow.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

No.	Viewpoint Name	Location	Approximate grid coordinates	co- Distance to the Application Site (km)	Receptors
1.	Middle Aston Lane.	Grass verge near Warren Lodge.	447474; 227794	3.3	Road users.
2.	Public footpath 296/8/10, Middle Aston.	Public footpath leading from Middle Aston to Somerton.	447643; 227013	2.8	Users of PRoW.
3.	Public footpath 364/6/20, Steeple Aston.	Public footpath near Cow Lane and the Eyecatcher.	448214; 226169	2.0	Users of PRoW.
4.	Public footpath 364/1/10, Hopcrofts Holt.	Public footpath leading from Hopcrofts Holt to Steeple Aston.	446627; 225263	3.5	Users of PRoW.
5.	Rousham Park. Near the sculpture of the Dying Gladiator.	North east of the sculpture.	447756; 224434	2.7	Visitors to the Park and Garden.
6.	Tackley Road, south of Letchmere Cottage.	Grass verge near the field gate.	447735; 222350	4.0	Road users and users of the non-NCN route linking Sustrans Routes 5 and 51.
7.	Public footpath 388/4/20 south of the Application Site.	Public footpath leading from Upper Heyford to Caulcott.	450527; 225128	0.4	Users of PRoW.
8.	Residential properties to the east of the Application Site.	Car park near the residential properties and the school.	450650; 225747	0.02	Residential receptors.

Table 11.2 Identified Viewpoints

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

9.	Public footpath 388/4/10 east of Upper Heyford.	Start of the public footpath near the bus stop.	449953; 225913	0.3	Users of PRow.
10.	Public bridleway 388/1/10, north of the former Air Base runway.	Adjacent to north-south fence line.	450039; 226666	0.8	Users of PRow.
11.	Footway adjacent to Camp Road at northwest corner of Application Site.	Adjacent to chain link fence, east of former Air Base security gate.	450253; 225915	Adjacent	Users of consented path within former Air Base.
12.	Public footpath 388/4/201 adjacent to Kirtlington Road at southwest corner of Application Site.	At open field entrance (ungated).	450163; 225613	Adjacent	Users of PRow and road users.
13.	Highway land at Tait Drive adjacent to former airmen's quarters.	On verge at southwest corner of road.	450900; 225306	0.3	Residential properties and road users.
14.	Public footpath 388/4/40 to southeast of former airmen's quarters.	To west of southeast-northwest aligned hedgerow, south of Field Barn Farm.	451364; 224965	0.8	Users of PRow.
15.	Public footpath 289/4/10 north of Caulcott and south of former airmen's quarters.	Approximately midway between Caulcott and boundary extending eastward from Cheesman's Barn.	450789; 224692	0.8	Users of PRow.

Table 11.2 Identified Viewpoints

11.4 ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

11.4.1 This assessment assumes that the whole of the Application Site will be developed simultaneously with the proposed built form of approximately 13m in height (and + or - 2m development platform). The Proposed Development would incorporate pedestrian and vehicular access, and landscaping, as part of the proposals. Therefore, some parts of the Proposed Development may be potentially less visible from the surrounding areas.

Impacts, Magnitude and Significance of Effects during Construction

11.4.2 The construction phase would require removal of the existing disused buildings, roads and other existing infrastructure such as lamp posts, road signs, defunct security gates and localised vegetation as agreed with Cherwell District Council Tree Officer. The proposed vegetation removal can be seen in more detail in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) which is a standalone report that accompanies the planning application.

11.4.3 Construction activity potentially evident on the Application Site would include:

- Temporary construction compound(s) and security fencing/hoarding;
- Temporary site offices and cabins within the Application Site;
- Removal of non-retained vegetation;
- Temporary protective fencing to retained landscape elements including hedgerows and trees;
- Construction of foundations, roads, footways and footings;
- Temporary storage of topsoil;
- Temporary machinery and construction material storage;
- Excavations for underground services and utilities;
- Construction of buildings;
- Vehicle and plant movements (including high-reach equipment including cranes);
- Construction lighting; and
- Reinstatement of areas following completion of construction phase.

11.4.4 Construction activity would extend over the majority of the Application Site and would be seen in the context of the built form already present within the former Air Base and the adjoining new housing and school to the east. The construction activity would be temporary in nature, therefore the resulting effects from such activity would likewise be temporary.

11.4.5 The retention of the existing vegetation along the western boundary, and much of the northern boundary, of the Application Site would help to ensure that the effects of the construction activity would be confined to the Application Site in these directions or from very limited locations within the surrounding landscape.

Landscape Elements

Topography

11.4.6 The topography appears to be simple with land sloping gently to the south. There would potentially be a requirement for localised changes to the contour levels across the Application Site during the construction phase to accommodate building platforms, roads and other structural elements. Such changes would be however kept to a minimum and

the overall perception of the relative landform and the profile of the Application Site would be retained.

11.4.7 With a low sensitivity and low magnitude of change there would be a negligible and not significant effect as the perception of the relatively flat terrain and its relationship with the surrounding landscape would not change.

Land Use and Vegetation

11.4.8 The land use of the Application Site would replace the derelict built form of the former school to a high quality residential area.

11.4.9 The retention of existing vegetation along the northern and western and north eastern boundaries of the Application Site would help ensure that the effects of the construction activity are confined to the Application Site and potentially experienced from very limited locations within the surrounding landscape.

11.4.10 However, in order to accommodate the Proposed Development some elements of the existing vegetation would need to be removed as agreed with Cherwell District Council's Tree Officer and itemised within the AIA that accompanies the planning application. The AIA notes that there are no 'A' category trees within the Application Site and that 17 no. 'B' category and 20 no. 'C' category trees would be retained. A total of 6 no. 'B' category and 49 no. 'C' category trees would be removed to enable the well-designed residential development and associated Green infrastructure to be implemented.

11.4.11 Mature vegetation, including trees in the northern, western and north eastern parts of the Application Site would be retained as part of the Proposed Development. Similarly, the existing hedgerows along the north and western boundaries would also be retained. The currently open area of grassland within the southern part of the Application Site would be retained and enhanced and incorporated as part of the proposed Green Infrastructure. Overall, the magnitude of change upon the landscape elements is considered to be negligible.

11.4.12 Based on the above assessment the Proposed Development would result in negligible and not significant effects upon the majority of 'soft' landscape elements associated with the Application Site such as grassland, hedgerows and topography. Trees

have been considered to be of high sensitivity and therefore the effects would be minor and not significant.

11.4.13 Overall, the replacement of derelict buildings and associated infrastructure with a high quality residential area with green corridors and landscape planting would result in moderate beneficial significant effects.

11.4.14 The Proposed Development would not directly affect any PROW identified on the Definitive Map for Oxfordshire.

Landscape Character

11.4.15 The construction activities within the Application Site would result in direct and indirect effects and would be temporary in nature. Permanent changes are assessed in the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study

11.4.16 The former Air Base including the Application Site falls within the Farmland Plateau, sub area H. Fritwell, as described in the OWLS, and both display characteristics of the Farmland (and Fritwell) Plateau as described by OWLS.

11.4.17 The Proposed Development would retain these characteristics with no direct effects beyond the former Air Base boundary and only temporary, limited indirect effects resulting from views predominantly to the south and southwest would occur during the construction phase.

11.4.18 The perception of construction activities would have little effect on the appreciation of the surrounding agricultural landscape with views generally limited to the users of public footpaths located immediately to the west and south and the road users travelling along the B4030. This is mostly due to the openness of the southern part of the Application Site and the lack of trees along the southern boundary.

11.4.19 Overall, there would be a negligible magnitude of change arising from construction of the Proposed Development, which would be temporary in nature. The sensitivity of this LCA, which is already influenced by Enstone Airfield and the former Air Base, is medium 'in the round' and low around the Application Site. The effect of construction activities on this LCA is therefore negligible and not significant.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

11.4.20 Based on the site visits it is evident that the Application Site has a strong relationship with the character of the former Air Base and that character is influenced by the recent residential and school developments located south of Camp Road. There is a strong perception of human presence with Camp Road providing key vehicular access in this part of the LCA. The Council's published assessment identifies the former Air Base as a feature within this LCA and indeed, the existing infrastructure influences the character of the overall LCA. The perception of the built form within the Application Site is limited however, with tree and hedgerow vegetation restricting opportunities to perceive this particular part of the former Air Base.

11.4.21 The surrounding countryside has the characteristics described in the published assessments but due to the screening offered by the boundary vegetation and the surrounding built form its appreciation is generally limited to the views to the south and

south west. Direct effects would be limited to the Application Site itself and offsite effects would be perceptual only.

11.4.22 As assessed above the topography of the Application Site would be largely preserved with potential for limited changes of up to 2m. The openness of the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA would be retained with the current level of enclosure within the Application Site temporarily reduced and eventually increased slightly by the Proposed Development. The retained trees and hedgerows around the north, west and northeast boundaries would help to preserve the current perception of enclosure.

11.4.23 Other characteristics of this LCA would also be retained with limited indirect effects resulting from the visibility of the construction activities across the landscape. Views of the construction traffic and activities within the Application Site would be generally limited to the residential receptors within the former Air Base located to the east and visitors to the local school. A few residential receptors along the eastern edge of Upper Heyford village may gain limited views of construction activities on the Application Site, although these would be largely screened by topography and the western hedgerow and trees

11.4.24 The perception of construction activities would have little effect on the appreciation of the surrounding agricultural landscape with views generally limited to the users of public footpaths located immediately to the west and south and the road users travelling along the B4030. This is mostly due to the openness of the southern part of the Application Site and the lack of trees along the southern boundary.

11.4.25 Overall, it is assessed that the construction activities would result in a negligible magnitude of change. They would be temporary in nature lasting approximately 3 years and would be located on brownfield land which contains, and is associated with, neighbouring established built form. The sensitivity of this LCA has been assessed as medium 'in the round' and low around the Application Site. Therefore, the effects of the construction activities upon the character of this landscape would be negligible and not significant.

Cherwell Valley LCA

11.4.26 The Application Site is not located within this LCA and therefore any landscape effects would be limited to the perceptual qualities of the Cherwell Valley LCA. The Council's published assessment does not identify specific perceptual or visual factors but its description states: **"...tranquil watermeadows", "This landscape is traditional and unspoilt", "...valley floor, which is isolated and peaceful", "Lines of trees resulting from outgrown hedges and small clumps of trees in field corners give parts of the valley a locally well-treed character. These combined elements result in pockets of pleasingly patterned landscape."** The document goes on to say: **"...more open and unstructured, with long views across the valley"** and **"Occasional solitary oak trees stand vulnerably within open ploughland."** Views from Rousham Park are also mentioned.

11.4.27 As identified during site visits there are limited opportunities to gain views towards the Application Site. The identified viewpoints falling within this LCA (Viewpoints 1, 2, 3 and 4) are generally medium distance and include the built form of the nearby settlements (Middle Aston, Steeple Aston, Lower Heyford and Upper Heyford) and the infrastructure within the former Air Base. The perception of vehicular traffic and construction activities would be limited due to the distance and the screening offered by mature vegetation along the western boundary of the Application Site. Some taller

elements such as cranes and upper sections of scaffolding may be potentially visible, seen above the hedgerows and amongst the tree canopies.

11.4.28 Views from the eastern part of this LCA would be generally screened or restricted by the rising topography. With the contours falling to the west, attention would be drawn across the valley floor towards the distant landscape to the west. There is a clear change in the landscape character between the Application Site and the River Cherwell valley. Any change introduced by the Proposed Development would be perceived as part of a landscape which already displays different qualities. The construction phase would have little influence over the character of the River Cherwell LCA and its perception would be largely preserved.

11.4.29 Overall, the construction activities would result in a negligible magnitude of change. The effects upon the landscape character of the Cherwell Valley LCA would therefore be minor and not significant.

Visual Amenity

Visual Receptors

11.4.30 The following provides an overview of visual amenity within the study area which sets the context of the individual viewpoint assessments presented at **Figure 11.6**.

11.4.31 The visibility of the construction activities and associated infrastructure would be generally limited to the immediate environs, mostly to the east and south. Receptors travelling along Camp Road would gain fleeting and transitory views as they travel along the road, seen in the context of existing buildings and structures and general activity of the former Air Base. Views would be interrupted and filtered by the existing vegetation including hedgerows and mature trees with the tree canopies filtering views of the upper sections of the scaffolding, cranes and the built form. Views from Camp Road would be generally limited to those gained at ground level and below the tree canopies. The current access to the Application Site is gained through the substantial former security gates offering less restricted views and potentially allowing for an increased level of intervisibility of the construction activities. Similar views would be gained by walkers and cyclists travelling along the road and associated footways.

11.4.32 It is evident that the magnitude of change upon the receptors of medium sensitivity travelling along Camp Road would be high in the immediate environs despite the presence of roadside vegetation. When considering the whole of this route the magnitude of change would however be neutral due to the existing context. The significance of visual effects during the construction phase would therefore be neutral when discussing the effects upon the whole route.

11.4.33 Other road users, again of medium sensitivity, travelling along Kirtlington Road / Port Way are unlikely to gain views of the construction activities due to the screening offered by the roadside vegetation. There are some limited locations along these two roads where gaps in vegetation allow for glimpsed, fleeting views towards the Proposed Development, such as the field entrance at the south west corner of the Application Site or near the junction of the B4030 with Port Way. Notwithstanding this, the overall appreciation of the surrounding landscape as perceived from these roads is unlikely to change. The magnitude of change would be negligible and the visual effects upon these and other roads within the surrounding landscape would be negligible and not significant.

11.4.34 Receptors of high sensitivity travelling along the nearby public footpaths connecting Upper Heyford with Caulcott and between Upper Heyford and the B4030 near Middleton Stoney would gain views as they approach the southern boundary of the

Application Site. The limited amount of vegetation along the southern boundary would allow for direct and relatively unrestricted views of the construction traffic where landform permits but such views are likely to be limited to the area adjacent immediately to the south; such views would be seen in the context of the chain link security fence. Views from the more distant parts of these two public footpaths would become increasingly distant and screened by vegetation and landform and distant and the perception of traffic and activities within the Application Site would be limited. In addition, the context provided by the existing residential properties and taller historic infrastructure within the former Air Base, which forms a backdrop to such views would also limit the visual influence of the construction phase. In close range views, the magnitude of change would be high but the overall appreciation of the surrounding landscape as perceived from these public footpaths as a whole would be low with the construction activities forming a relatively small element in the landscape and the overall view. The visual effects would vary from major to moderate and significant during the construction stage with the slightly increased perception of human activities within the surrounding area.

11.4.35 Receptors of medium sensitivity travelling along the more distant Rousham Road and Tackley Road in the south western part of the study area, which provides a link between two Sustrans routes, are unlikely to readily gain views towards the Application Site. The majority of the route is screened by roadside hedgerows and groups of trees. As indicated by Viewpoint 6 (see **Figure 11.6**) views, where gained, would be distant and construction activities difficult to discern. The magnitude of change is likely to be negligible with effects of negligible significance.

11.4.36 Residential receptors located to the east of the Application Site (Bovis Homes) are the most relevant receptors in terms of residential visual amenity. The residential amenity of the occupants of the former airmen's quarters within the former Air Base along Tait Drive and neighbouring roads are more distant, with views of intermittent vegetation tempered to a degree by landform and context of the adjacent new Bovis Homes and school. The visual amenity of the residents of Caulcott and Upper Heyford, and indeed those located further away is likely to be influenced only to a limited degree due to distance and intervening vegetation and landform. Views gained by the residents of Cheesman's Barn, located approximately 0.42km to the south (see **Figure 11.1**), would be restricted by associated garden vegetation surrounding this property. Oblique views of cranes would be potentially gained from the upper storey of this property and perhaps from the properties on the eastern outskirts of Upper Heyford, particularly in the winter months. The magnitude of change upon the residential receptors located immediately to the east and those gaining close range and direct views would be low to neutral with little in the view to screen or restrict the construction activities within the Application Site. These temporary visual effects would be therefore moderate to neutral and not significant. Although such a level of significance has been applied, it should be considered in context against the current buildings on the Application Site. The buildings currently present on the site are derelict and over time would continue to deteriorate further. Those receptors located further away, particularly to the west, are likely to be subject to low to negligible magnitude of change during construction, depending on the nature of their views. The visual effects experienced by such receptors would vary from moderate and significant to minor and not significant.

11.4.37 The majority of the construction traffic and activities would be screened from the Grade 1 Rousham Park by intervening vegetation within the park and along the western boundary of the Application Site. Some taller elements may be potentially visible above the hedgerow line and amongst the trees. Such views would be limited with only two very localised vantage points identified during the site visit offering views towards the

Proposed Development, including from above the Arcade, adjacent to the sculpture of the Dying Gladiator and also from adjacent to the River Cherwell near Heyford Bridge.

11.4.38 The view from the top corner of the Arcade near the sculpture of Dying Gladiator, Viewpoint 5, allows a restricted, narrow view of part of the western boundary of the Application Site (see **Figure 11.6**). It should be noted that this viewpoint is to the back left of the sculpture and the viewer has to actively scan for a framed view between tree canopies toward the former Air Base; the former Air Base is not apparent from the normal viewing point of and around the sculpture from the pathway in front of it. This viewpoint is located approximately 2.7km away at its closest point. Any movement and temporary infrastructure within the Application Site would form a relatively small element in the view. The character of the immediate surroundings would remain intact and the view would continue to be characterised by the architectural elements in the park, designed landscape, and the surrounding agricultural fields. It is worth reiterating that views along the top of Arcade and around the sculpture are substantially screened by the trees in the foreground.

11.4.39 limited area along the River Cherwell, near Heyford Bridge, also allows for some framed views, which form a small proportion of the wider panorama. The tranquillity of this viewpoint is intermittently disturbed by vehicle movements and noise from the B4030 Station Road and the Marylebone to Birmingham trains. This riverside location is positioned at a lower elevation and the rising topography and vegetation along the western boundary of the Application Site would screen the construction phase to a considerable degree. The magnitude of change during the construction phase is therefore considered to be negligible. The overall effects upon this viewpoint of high sensitivity within Rousham Park would be minor and not significant. Views from other locations within the park are also screened.

Viewpoints

11.4.40 A detailed assessment of visual effects upon the identified viewpoints during the construction stage of the Proposed Development is included **Figure 11.6**.

11.4.41 In summary, receptors present at Viewpoints 1-6 (including Rousham Park), 10 and 14 would be subject to negligible and/or negligible (no change). Receptors at Viewpoints 7, 9, 13 and 15 would experience moderate significant effects. Viewpoints 8, 11 and 12 which experience close proximity views of the derelict buildings and

underused site would experience neutral effects as this is replaced by construction activities, being of neutral significance.

Impacts, Magnitude and Significance of Effects during Operational Phase

11.4.42 Permanent elements of the Proposed Development, as defined on the Proposed Development Parameter Plan (see **Figure 4.1**) that are of most relevance to landscape and visual matters are those that relate to:

- The location and height of the proposed residential development;
- The location of proposed Green Infrastructure, open spaces and green corridors;
- The proposed removal of any trees and hedges or other notable landscape features; and
- The replacement of derelict buildings and brownfield site with high quality residential development.

11.4.43 Residential developments tend to give rise to effects within the landscape by virtue of a number of attributes specific to both their individual form and to the location, and overall mass of the built form. These attributes include:

- Strong geometric form, particularly visible in the form of rooftops;
- Layout of access roads and their influence over the layout of the development;
- Lighting associated with residential properties and street lighting; and
- Relationship to the scale and nature of the existing landscape and development context.

11.4.44 The operational phase of the Proposed Development would be long term. The significance of such effects would depend on the nature of the receptors and are discussed further below.

Landscape Elements

Topography

11.4.45 The topography of the Application Site would not change post construction.

Land Use and Vegetation

11.4.46 The proposed Green Infrastructure (see **Figure 4.1**) would establish a landscaped buffer strip along the western and southern boundaries of the Application Site within which the retained trees lie. Additional tree and shrub planting and amenity grassland would be introduced to enhance the setting of the Proposed Development. Tree planting is also proposed along the green corridors which form the principal circulation routes within the Application Site. Play and fitness equipment would be appropriately located within the peripheral landscape buffer for community use. Proposed tree planting would markedly increase the number of trees within the Application Site compared to the existing situation, and overall this would lead to a positive low magnitude of change, being of low beneficial significance.

Landscape Character

Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study

11.4.47 The Proposed Development would replace existing, derelict buildings and under-used land within the confines of the former Air Base and therefore the Farmland Plateau LCA would be subject to minimal indirect change.

11.4.48 The Proposed Development would however, help to fulfil some of the Landscape Strategy guidelines set out within the OWLS, insofar as it would contribute to the

objective 'establish tree belts around airfields' and notably 'maintain the sparsely settled rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development in and around existing settlements.'

11.4.49 Proposed landscape management of existing vegetation within the Application Site and proposed new planting particularly along the southern edge, would also contribute to the Key Recommendations of OWLS in relation to the Farmland Plateau by maintaining and strengthening its pattern of hedgerows and tree belts.

11.4.50 There would be no loss of landscape features or elements outside of the former Air Base that contribute to the character of the LCA. The Proposed Development would be of a smaller scale, height and massing than the large scale structures of the former Air Base referred to in the OWLS assessment, and would therefore be less apparent in views from the Cherwell Valley.

11.4.51 Overall, the Proposed Development would exert a positive effect upon the achievement of the Landscape Strategy for, and a low magnitude of effect upon, the farmland Plateau and Fritwell LCA. With medium sensitivity, the effects would be minor beneficial in the overall context of this LCA.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

11.4.52 The Proposed Development would be located within the existing boundaries of the former Air Base and would occupy land comprising derelict built form located within the Application Site. Therefore, in landscape character terms there would be little change with the area continuing to be characterised by built form albeit of different type, height and density. The Council's published landscape character assessment does not take into account the recent changes within the former Air Base and recently constructed residential developments which have already influenced the character of this part of the LCA. The Proposed Development would extend the envelope of the residential properties closer to the edge of the plateau but the existing built form within the Application Site already characterises views gained from the south and west and influences the perception of the surrounding landscape.

11.4.53 There would be no loss of agricultural landscape or any other landscape elements which could be regarded as contributing to the character of this LCA. The current level of enclosure and the topography of this LCA would also prevail and be enhanced by proposed removal of the chain link security fence and establishment of landscape planting along the southern boundary of the Application Site and green corridors within the development. The field pattern and a relatively limited amount of vegetation in the surrounding landscape would continue to form the key characteristics of this LCA.

11.4.54 Perceptual factors associated with the Upper Heyford LCA, such as openness and the perception of 'big skies' are also unlikely to be redefined considering the limited locations where the Application Site can be appreciated from.

11.4.55 Overall, based on the above assessment the Proposed Development would have a low magnitude of change. Considering the overall medium sensitivity of this LCA the effects would be minor and not significant. Such landscape effects around the Application

Site would however be negligible and not significant due to the lower sensitivity of this part of the LCA.

Cherwell Valley LCA

11.4.56 The landscape effects of the Proposed Development upon this LCA would be limited to its perceptual qualities only. This relates to the intervisibility of the Proposed Development and its influence over the character of the perceived landscape.

11.4.57 As indicated on the ZTV plan (**Figure 11.2**) there would be areas within this LCA where the Proposed Development could be theoretically visible. In reality such views are generally limited to the open countryside on the upper slopes of the Cherwell Valley with views from the settlements often restricted or screened by intervening landform, buildings and vegetation. The perception of the low lying landscape of the River Cherwell would continue to be defined by the surrounding landscape elements, settlements and the rising topography of the valley. The settlement of Upper Heyford would provide context and is seen on the upper slopes of the valley in the same direction of view as the former Air Base and the Application Site. The perceptual qualities identified by the Council in their published document such as tranquillity, unspoiled character and peacefulness would not be redefined with the Proposed Development in place. A minimal increase in light pollution may potentially occur with the new residential dwellings adding to the current level of light glow. This would however be seen as part of the light glow associated with the nearby residential dwellings of the Bovis Homes development and Upper Heyford, and the former Air Base/Heyford Park including existing lighting along Camp Road.

11.4.58 Views from the higher ground within this LCA include the built form of the former Air Base including the water tower and HASs. The Proposed Development would be seen in this context and would potentially extend the perceived envelope of the built form along the horizon. Such perception would however be limited with views likely to be restricted to the upper storeys of the Proposed Development. The existing landscape framework around the Application Site would continue to provide a substantial level of screening limiting the perception of a developed horizon, enhanced by proposed Green Infrastructure.

11.4.59 The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible due to the limited influence of the Proposed Development. The effects would be therefore minor and not significant.

Visual Amenity

Visual Receptors

11.4.60 Receptors of medium sensitivity travelling along Camp Road are likely to experience and recognise the Proposed Development as a new element in the view due to proximity, with the new townscape replacing a derelict and neglected site. The retained trees along the road and proposed landscaping would help to assimilate it into the view but nevertheless it would result in a high magnitude of change when seen from the immediate environs. Only a relatively short section of Camp Road would offer such views of the Proposed Development between the Bovis Homes residential development and the junction with Kirtlington Road. Views from the remaining sections of Camp Road would be screened or views considerably restricted by the roadside vegetation and built form and in turn, would be viewed in the context of existing built form. The operational phase of the Proposed Development would bring about a positive high magnitude of change when perceived from close range and low magnitude of change when considering the whole route. This in turn would result in major and significant effects immediately

north to the Application Site diminishing to minor and not significant along the whole route.

11.4.61 Views from other roads, as discussed in the effects during the construction phase, would be generally screened. Some localised sections of the B4030 offer less restricted views towards the Application Site. As receptors travel through the landscape they would gain a variety of views and the introduction of the Proposed Development would not change their overall visual amenity. The residential properties recently constructed by Bovis Homes are visible from the B4030 near the junction with Port Way and the Proposed Development is likely to exert a similar level of visual influence. Due to the distance and scale of the proposed built form it would represent a relatively small element in views from this section of the road. Views would be generally oblique to very oblique with hedgerows lining the majority of this road. The magnitude of change would be generally negligible with some localised low magnitude of change where views of the Proposed Development would be gained. The visual effects would vary from minor to negligible and not significant, depending on the proximity to the Proposed Development.

11.4.62 Receptors of medium sensitivity traveling along Kirtlington Road would gain close range views as they approach the south west corner of the Application Site. The magnitude of change at this particular location is likely to be high regardless of the fact that such views would be glimpsed and transitory, albeit that new high quality townscape will replace a derelict and neglected site. Due to the proximity the change in the composition of the view and the scale of the proposed built form would be evident. The majority of this road is screened however, and views of the proposed built form are unlikely to be gained. The magnitude of change would be therefore negligible for the majority of the route with one location where the magnitude would be high. The effects upon the receptors travelling along this road would be negligible and not significant along the majority of its route.

11.4.63 Users of the more distant non-NCN rural road that links SUSTRANS routes 5 and 51 have limited opportunities to gain views towards the Application Site with the majority of this route screened by roadside hedgerows and groups of trees. Some glimpsed views to the east would be gained as indicated by Viewpoint 6 (see **Figure 11.6**) but these would be distant and limited. The appreciation of the surrounding landscape and the overall visual amenity of these receptors would not be changed with the Proposed Development in place. The magnitude of change is assessed as negligible with the effects negligible and not significant.

11.4.64 Views from other routes within the surrounding landscape are unlikely to be gained due to the combination of vegetative screening, topography and the existing built form.

11.4.65 Night time views would include the lighting associated with the Proposed Development, particularly from the south. These would be seen however in the context of the adjacent Bovis Homes development and former Air Base housing and would add little to the overall light pollution. Such views would be gained from limited locations with the amenity of road receptors largely preserved.

11.4.66 The effects upon the receptors of high sensitivity travelling along the local PROW would be similar to the assessment of the construction phase. The users travelling between Upper Heyford, Caulcott and Middleton Stoney would gain some views of the Proposed Development particularly as they approach the Application Site and the southern boundary of the former Air Base as illustrated by Viewpoints 7, 12, 14 and 15 (see **Figure 11.4**); new high quality built form and Green Infrastructure would replace views of the existing derelict and neglected site. Views from the more distant sections of these PROW would however be screened or influenced by the existing built form within the former Air Base, including the Bovis Homes development, the new school and the

former airmen's quarters, and therefore the perception of the Proposed Development would be limited. It is likely that the magnitude of change would vary from high in close proximity diminishing to negligible along the majority of these public footpaths. The Proposed Development would form a relatively small part of the overall 360-degree view as perceived from the more distant sections of these PROW. The Proposed Development would be assimilated into the overall panorama without changing the composition of the view with the built form already present in the view and indeed within the Application Site. The effects would vary from major beneficial to moderate adverse and significant diminishing to minor or negligible along those sections of the footpaths where views would be limited.

11.4.67 Those traveling along PROW in the surrounding countryside, predominantly to the west of the Application Site would potentially gain elevated views towards the Application Site. Such views would generally include other settlements and the built form of the former Air Base which is visible on the horizon. The aforementioned built form would provide some context to the Proposed Development which would be screened to a considerable degree by its existing and proposed boundary vegetation. It would exert a limited level of visual influence and this is further explained in the assessment of effects upon the viewpoints.

11.4.68 Residential receptors located immediately to the east would experience a high positive magnitude of change, with the existing low derelict built form and relatively open areas of neglected grassland changed to a high quality landscaped residential development with new vehicular accesses as illustrated by Viewpoint 8 (see **Figure 11.6**). Residents of Cheesman's Barn would continue to have views screened and restricted by garden vegetation within the curtilage of the property. Any views gained from Cheesman's Barn toward the Application Site would be seen in the context of Bovis Homes, the new school and other structures associated with the former Air Base. The majority of the Proposed Development would be seen at approximately 0.5km away and the magnitude of change would be medium with the effects major and significant. Bungalows comprising the former airmen's quarters to the southeast, as illustrated by Viewpoint 13 (see **Figure 11.6**) would experience oblique views toward the Proposed development seen within the context of the Bovis Homes development. From this direction, the existing derelict buildings within the Application Site are obscured by boundary vegetation to the south of the new school, and so the proposed development would appear as a new townscape element extending the built form westward. The magnitude of change would be low, resulting in a moderate but not significant effect which would reduce to negligible as the proposed planting matures. Residents of more distant properties, including in Upper Heyford, are likely to be subject to a low to negligible magnitude of change with the visual effects varying from moderate and significant to minor and not significant.

11.4.69 The Historic England entry for Rousham Park identifies a number of built elements within the surrounding landscape visually connected with Rousham House and its garden. Based on the description it appears that those located to the north are most relevant, with the Temple of Mill / Cuttle Mill and the Eyecatcher both visible from the bowling green to the north of the house. Views from the front of the house, to the east and north east, are screened by tree canopies and views are framed and channelled along the bowling green. Views of features within the former Air Base including the water tower and telecommunication mast along Camp Road were not gained from these locations during the site visits.

11.4.70 The informal pleasure grounds and associated architectural features located to the west of the house, were intended to provide views to the north and east. The surrounding vegetation has, however, matured and now encloses views to a considerable degree. None of the identified features within and around the Application Site and the former Air Base as a whole, such as its vegetation, water tower and telecommunication

mast were observed from these locations. Where views towards the Eyecatcher can be gained these are restricted by the trees along the River Cherwell or within the wider landscape and are generally limited to views to the north.

11.4.71 Similarly, the open riverside walk leading from the informal pleasure grounds towards the Pyramid House gazebo and the kitchen gardens allows for views of the immediate agricultural landscape and the park but more distant views are screened or restricted. Views towards the Application cannot generally be gained.

11.4.72 Views from the kitchen garden and the walled garden are enclosed and inward looking with no connectivity with the agricultural landscape surrounding Rousham Park.

11.4.73 As discussed previously there are two very limited locations within Rousham Park where views of the Application Site would be gained. The site visit confirmed that views can be gained from the very localised top corner of the Arcade as illustrated by Viewpoint 5 (see **Figure 11.6**), and on the approach to the Heyford Bridge. Elsewhere the vegetation screens or restricts views. Where views would be gained, at a distance of over 2km, the Proposed Development would be seen as a relatively small element on the horizon. Its boundary vegetation would help to assimilate it into the view and the perceived landscape with the landscape features surrounding the receptor continuing to characterise the view.

11.4.74 Considering Rousham Park 'in the round' the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible with the majority of the park free from views towards the Proposed Development. The effects are therefore assessed as minor and not significant in landscape and visual terms. Heritage effects are assessed in **Chapter 13: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**.

Viewpoints

11.4.75 A detailed assessment of visual effects upon the identified viewpoints during the operational stage of the Proposed Development is included at **Figure 11.6** and includes the effects at Year 1 and Year 15, taking into account the retained vegetation and proposed planting. The following is a summary of these effects. The assessment was undertaken in summer months when the level of enclosure is generally higher. In winter the visibility of the Proposed Development may be slightly higher following leaf-fall from deciduous vegetation.

11.4.76 Receptors present at Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 would be subject to negligible and not significant effects, and those at Viewpoints 10 and 14 would experience negligible (no change). Such effects would be similar at Year 1 and Year 15.

11.4.77 Receptors located at Viewpoints 13 and 15 would experience moderate and significant effects at Year 1 and reducing to minor or negligible at Year 15 with the retained vegetation along the western boundary providing some limited screening.

11.4.78 Receptors at Viewpoints 7 and 9 would be subject to major and significant effects due to close proximity. Such effects would be similar at Year 1 and 15 for Viewpoint 9, but new landscape planting long the southern boundary of the Application Site would reduce the effect to moderate and significant for Viewpoint 7 at Year 15.

11.4.79 On balance, neutral effects at Year 1 would rise to major beneficial at Year 15 and significant effects for receptors at Viewpoints 8, 11 and 12 due to the replacement

of derelict buildings on the brownfield site with high quality residential development and Green Infrastructure.

11.5 MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT

Mitigation by Design

11.5.1 Over time the proposed planting indicated on the Parameter Plan (see **Figure 4.1**) would help to screen and filter views from the surrounding landscape, particularly in views from the south. The proposed planting consists of a loose belt of trees and informal groups of trees and shrubs arranged along the northern, southern and western boundaries and within the Application Site itself along green corridors, helping to integrate the Proposed Development with the proposed and existing landscape framework, replicating the settlement boundaries found elsewhere in the immediate area.

11.5.2 Landscape elements and features, including topsoil, that have been identified as being retained will be appropriately protected throughout the construction phase to ensure their long term viability for re-use with regard to the best practice current at that time. Trees to be retained will be protected in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment which is a standalone report that accompanies the planning application

Additional Mitigation

11.5.3 During the construction phase of the Proposed Development, consideration will be given to appropriate positioning of construction compounds to limit or reduce their visibility from the surrounding areas. The southern and south western part of the Application Site appear to be more sensitive in visual terms due to the limited amount of tree vegetation; the eastern boundary is more sensitive due to its proximity to residential properties (Bovis Homes) and the new school.

11.5.4 Site hoarding will be used to reduce or remove sight of the works from nearby receptors. This would be most effective along the Camp Road footway and the eastern boundary of the Application Site, and possibly the southern boundary. The perception of movement and clutter within the Application Site would be reduced but the overall effects would remain unchanged due to proximity.

11.5.5 Consideration will be given to the materials and colour palette used for the Proposed Development to reduce its visual prominence and help to integrate it into the landscape. The residential properties recently constructed by Bovis are easily identifiable within the views gained from the PROW and the B4030 located to the south due to their relatively light colours. In contrast the existing built form within the Application Site, which is characterised by dull off white and dark brick colours is less visible and blends in with the surrounding vegetation. Such mitigation measures implemented along with the proposed planting are likely to reduce the visual effects upon the PROW and road receptors in the vicinity of the Application Site and residential receptors to the west and southwest. Such mitigation measures would have a limited effect upon the close range views where the effects are determined by the scale and height of the Proposed Development. Conversely, the replacement of derelict structures and neglected site with high quality built form and Green Infrastructure will have a positive effect on close range views.

11.5.6 The proposed planting along the southern boundary of the Application Site would help to assimilate the Proposed Development into the overall panorama. In some instances, such mitigation would with time lower the previously assessed effects from major to moderate (or less) as the vegetation develops, particularly as perceived by

receptors travelling along certain PROW and along Kirtlington Road/Port Way, near the south west corner of the Application Site.

Enhancements

11.5.7 A selection of appropriate plant species would be considered with the focus on native plants. Consideration would also be given to the arrangement of trees in the southern part of the Application Site to provide a high quality designed open space offering views of the surrounding open countryside whilst restricting views of the Proposed Development.

11.5.8 Appropriate play space and a fitness equipment trail would be provided along the western and southern boundaries of the Application Site, with access provided by a network of new pedestrian paths.

11.6 CUMULATIVE AND IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS

11.6.1 Chapter 2, section 2.9 of this ES sets out the two-stage basis for the assessment of cumulative and in-combination effects. With respect to landscape and visual matters, cumulative effects arise where the visibility of other proposals overlaps with that of the proposed development to incur an incremental effect. Cumulative effects relate to landscape character and visual amenity. Within cumulative assessment, the proposals may be viewed in combination, in succession, or sequentially whereby:

- **“Combined or simultaneous visibility occurs where the observer is able to see two or more developments from one viewpoint, without moving his or her head;**
- **Successive or repetitive visibility occurs where the observer is able to see two or more [schemes] from one viewpoint but has to move his or her head to do so; and**
- **Sequential cumulative effects on visibility occurs when the observer would see the proposals with other developments, either simultaneously or in succession, when moving through the landscape.”¹**

11.6.2 The cumulative development stages to be assessed are set out on **Figure 2.1**. In relation to the landscape and visual assessment of the Proposed Development, the

¹ Page 17, Scottish Natural Heritage, Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments (March 2012)

cumulative sites can be geographically grouped according to distance, orientation and proposed land use and are summarised as follows:

Stage 1

- Parcels 5-7 – residential development, 216 dwellings, about 0.9km northeast of the built form of the Proposed Development;
- Parcels 8, 9 and 10 - residential development, 131 dwellings in total, about 1.2km to the east of the built form of the Proposed Development;
- Parcel 11 - residential development, 62 dwellings, about 0.9km to the east of the built form of the Proposed Development;
- Parcel 12 - residential development, 178 dwellings, immediately to the southeast of the built form of the Proposed Development;
- Parcel 14 - residential development, 84 dwellings, immediately to the north of the built form of the Proposed Development; and
- SBS Phase 1 – commercial and industrial uses, about 1.7km to the northeast of the Proposed Development.

Stage 2

- 17ha residential development about 1.1km to the northeast of the Proposed Development;
- 4.6ha Mixed Use about 1.48km to the northeast of the Proposed Development;
- SBS Phase 1 – commercial and industrial uses, about 1.7km to the northeast of the Proposed Development; and
- Paragon Area – open car storage uses about 0.55km to the northeast of the Proposed Development.

Cumulative Effects on Landscape Visual Receptors and Viewpoints (Construction Phase)

11.6.3 During construction, the potential for each of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 developments to be seen in cumulation with the Proposed Development from the 15 identified viewpoints has been assessed.

Landscape Character

OWLS

11.6.4 Each of the sites to be considered with regard to potential cumulative development falls wholly within the Farmland Plateau LCA set out in the OWLS, and all but Sites 8, 9, 11 and 12 fall within the former Air Base boundary. With regard to Sites 8, 9, 11 and 12, they each abut the former Air Base and are therefore strongly influenced by the adjacent development. Development of these sites would not require removal of any notable landscape features or elements; existing boundary vegetation would be retained and enhanced.

11.6.5 Construction activities would potentially be seen from surrounding land and would lead, in the context of the LCA as a whole, to indirect effects of negligible magnitude. The sensitivity of the LCA, which is already influenced by the former Air Base and Heyford Park, is medium 'in the round' and low around the Application Site. The

cumulative effect of construction activities on this LCA would be negligible and not significant.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

11.6.6 With the construction stage there would be an increased perception of the vehicular traffic and activities across much of the former Air Base and within the surrounding countryside. The area identified for residential developments under the Policy Villages 5 site would particularly add to this perception as it encroaches into the open countryside to the south and south east of the former Air Base.

11.6.7 The character of the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA would alter to some extent but the additional construction activities of the Proposed Development would be seen in the context of the aforementioned development to the south of the former Air Base and the mixed use development along Chilgrove Drive which would collectively exert much stronger influence over the character of this LCA. The majority of other cumulative sites under construction would add little to these effects due to their locations within the boundary of the former Air Base. Sites 8, 9, 11 and 12 would extend the built form of the former Air Base slightly into neighbouring countryside; however, this would be perceived as part of the existing urban form, 'rounding off' the prevailing developed edge.

11.6.8 It is unlikely that the construction activities of the Proposed Development would have any significant cumulative effects upon the landscape elements of this LCA as the majority of the sites occupy disparate areas of land within the boundary of the former Air Base, albeit in proximity to each other. A few of the Stage 1 sites lie outwith the former Air Base and therefore would lead to localised changes to the attributes of the LCA. Such effects are however, ameliorated by their juxtaposition and association with the former Air Base, and they would not individually or collectively exert a much stronger influence over the character of the LCA. Other perceptual factors of this landscape would also be largely unaffected with the construction limited to a relatively small parcel of brownfield land. The perception of the character of this LCA would be generally retained and any potential changes are likely to be limited to the immediate environs around the former Air Base. As indicated by receptors in closest proximity to the Application Site (Viewpoints 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12) the perception of such change is likely to be higher but equally it provides evidence of a limited level of visual interconnectivity between the Application Site and the wider landscape of this LCA.

11.6.9 Overall, it is considered that the cumulative magnitude of change of the construction phase either locally or on the LCA as a whole, would be negligible. The cumulative effects on landscape character would therefore be negligible and not significant.

Cherwell Valley LCA

11.6.10 None of the identified cumulative developments would be located within this LCA therefore any cumulative effects would be limited to the change upon the perceptual qualities of this landscape.

11.6.11 As indicated by Viewpoints 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 the construction activities within the Application Site and other cumulative sites are unlikely to be easily perceived from the majority of this LCA and its elevated parts. The existing changes in topography create a clear division between this and the adjacent LCAs and any construction activity would be seen as part of a more distant landscape. It is likely that the construction phase of the

Proposed Development would be seen in isolation with the remaining cumulative developments unlikely to be visible.

11.6.12 Due to its elevation and direction of view, Viewpoint 2 experiences a broad panorama of the former Air Base extending from the HASs and the runway in the north, to the Application Site and land to the south of it. Site 12 would largely be screened by the ridgeline and existing hedgerows along Kirtlington Road/Port Way, resulting in a negligible magnitude of change and negligible cumulative effects. However, there is potential for tall construction plant such as cranes to be gained, although the effect would be short-term and temporary giving a low magnitude of change, resulting in a cumulative effect of negligible significance.

11.6.13 Overall, the cumulative magnitude of change of the construction activities upon the character of the Cherwell Valley LCA is considered indirect and negligible. The landscape effects would be therefore minor and not significant.

Visual Receptors

11.6.14 It is likely that cumulative effects during the construction phase would be limited to close range receptors where the level of inter-visibility with the Application Site is generally higher. As discussed in the earlier section of this report such receptors are likely to be the users of Camp Road, Kirtlington Road and the B4030. Subject to the location of construction access for the identified cumulative developments, the users of Camp Road and Kirtlington Road may gain close range and frequent views of traffic and activities within the Application Site and cumulative developments, including sites 9,10, 12 and 14; all other construction sites would be screened by existing development and/or roadside vegetation. Receptors travelling along the B4030 would potentially gain some views near the junction with Port Way resulting in some sequential views of construction activities toward the Application Site and Site 12; all other construction sites would be screened by existing development and/or roadside vegetation.

11.6.15 The magnitude of change upon these receptors during the construction phase would be neutral near the Application Site along Camp Road and Kirtlington Road as derelict or underused brownfield land is replaced by high quality residential development. Those travelling along the remaining sections of these two roads would be subject to a low magnitude of change. Similar low magnitude of change would be experienced by the road users at the junction of the B4030 with Port Way. The effects would therefore also vary from major and significant in close proximity where the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the perception of construction activities diminishing to minor and not significant elsewhere.

11.6.16 Users of more distant roads would be subject to a negligible magnitude of change and negligible visual effects during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.

11.6.17 Receptors travelling along the non-NCN road that links the two Sustrans cycle routes or the railway line are also likely to experience a negligible magnitude of change with negligible and not significant visual effects during the construction phase. This is due to the distance and limited opportunities to gain views.

11.6.18 The visual amenity of the receptors travelling along the nearby PROW and promoted routes to the south and southeast and west (Viewpoints 7, 9, 12, 14 and 15) would be influenced by views of the construction activities along the southern boundary of the former Air Base comprising the Application Site and Site 12, with tall plant such as cranes on Site 11 also potentially visible in successive or sequential views from the southernmost or easternmost lengths of PROW; all other construction sites would be screened by existing built form, topography or intervening vegetation. The Proposed

Development would increase the presence of such activities in the surrounding landscape, particularly when viewed from close range views. It would result in a low magnitude of change when seen from the public footpaths to the south and south east between Kirtlington Road and the B4030, resulting in moderate cumulative effects.

11.6.19 Users of the more distant PROW within the wider landscape (Viewpoints 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6) are likely to be subject to a negligible magnitude of change and negligible not significant visual effects due to the distance, vegetative screening and the overall scale of the panorama. The construction activities across the Application Site, if seen, are likely to be perceived in isolation with views of other cumulative developments unlikely to be gained or barely discernible due to distance. Receptors at Viewpoint 4 may perhaps gain more open views of the Application Site due to the elevation and location of the viewpoint. In such views Sites 5, 7, 12, 14 and New Residential (17ha) fall within same angle of view, direction and at a similar distance, however, they are likely to be screened by intervening built form and/or vegetation, or perceived as part of the existing development context. As such, the addition of the Proposed Development would have little influence during the construction stage.

11.6.20 Due to its elevation and direction of view, Viewpoint 2 experiences a broad panorama of the former Air Base extending from the HASs and the runway in the north, to the Application Site and land to the south of it. Site 12 would largely be screened by the ridgeline and existing hedgerows along Kirtlington Road/Port Way, Site 7 and the Stage 2 developments would be largely screened by topography and therefore construction activities would not be discernible, overall there would be a negligible magnitude of change and negligible cumulative effects. There is potential for tall construction plant such as cranes to be gained, although the effect would be short-term and temporary giving a low magnitude of change, resulting in a cumulative effect of negligible significance.

11.6.21 Effects experienced by residential receptors within the surrounding landscape and settlements with views of other construction areas influencing their visual amenity are limited. Residential receptors located immediately to the east of the Application Site (Bovis Homes development) are likely however to be subject to a high magnitude of positive change with construction activities on the Application Site and Sites 12 and 14 surrounding the receptors. In such circumstances the cumulative effects would be major beneficial and significant.

11.6.22 As previously described, vantage points within the Grade 1 Rousham Pak toward the Application Site are limited to two localised areas. Views from these areas are framed and controlled by intervening landform and vegetation to a small part of the Application Site and so the former Air Base and its environs (and hence the cumulative sites) as a whole are not visible. The magnitude of effect is 'no change', resulting in a negligible (no change) significance of effect when considering the cumulative sites.

Viewpoints

11.6.23 **Figure 11.6** provides a detailed viewpoint assessment supported by the photoviews prepared for each viewpoint. This assessment has been used to review the potential for cumulative effects during the construction stage, which is summarised below.

11.6.24 Construction activity on nine individual or clusters of Stage 1 and Stage 2 development sites have been considered in relation to the Application Site and the

potential to give rise to cumulative visual effects during construction as experienced from each of the 15 representative viewpoints.

11.6.25 Due to a combination of orientation of viewpoint, distance and intervening topography, built form and vegetation cover, it is unlikely that construction activity would be discernible on the majority of cumulative sites when seen from the majority of the representative viewpoints, leading to negligible or negligible (no change) significance of effect.

11.6.26 However, due to proximity to the Application Site and location/orientation of view, it is considered that Viewpoints 7, 8, 11 and 12 have the potential to experience in combination or sequential views of construction activity in relation to the development of Sites 12 and/or 14. The temporary effects would be medium to high magnitude, resulting in neutral (Viewpoints 8, 11 and 12) or major to moderate (Viewpoints 7 and 12, respectively) significance of effects.

11.6.27 Viewpoints 14 and 15 have the potential to experience in combination or sequential views of construction activity in relation to the development of Site 11, resulting in a low magnitude of change and a minor significance of effect.

11.6.28 The development of Site 12 would obscure views toward the Proposed development from Viewpoint 13, resulting in a negligible (no change) effect.

Cumulative Effects on Landscape; Visual Receptors and Viewpoints (Operational Phase)

11.6.29 The cumulative assessment during the operational phase assesses the addition of the Proposed Development to the cumulative situation assuming that all other cumulative developments have been constructed.

Landscape Character

Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy

11.6.30 The redevelopment of the Application Site and other sites within the former Air Base, together with development directly abutting the former Air Base boundary is in keeping with the Landscape Strategy and Key Recommendations for the Farmland Plateau LCA. The proposed sites would cumulatively promote the conservation of the 'open, spacious character' of the LCA remote from the former Air Base, and notably, would 'maintain the sparsely settled rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development in and around existing settlements.' The Proposed Development would also provide an opportunity to establish tree belts and /or hedgerows to surround the former Air Base and in doing so will enhance and soften the physical interface between the former Air Base and surrounding landscape.

11.6.31 Overall, the Proposed Development and cumulative sites would exert a positive, low magnitude of change on the Farmland Plateau (including Fritwell) LCA. With medium sensitivity in the wider LCA, and low magnitude, the significance of effect would be minor beneficial.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

11.6.32 The identified cumulative developments would be located within or adjacent to the former Air Base, extending the urban edge into the currently open agricultural landscape. The Proposed Development would reinforce the presence of the built form within the former Air Base. It would be located within the already established boundary of the built form thus respecting the character of this LCA and preserving its features

and agricultural character. The proposed residential dwellings would exert a limited influence over this LCA considering the context provided by other cumulative developments. In cumulative terms, the magnitude of change would be negligible and the effects negligible and not significant.

Cherwell Valley LCA

11.6.33 The effects of the cumulative construction phase upon this LCA have been assessed as negligible and not significant due to the limited opportunities to perceive the Proposed Development with other cumulative developments. It is therefore likely that the addition of the Proposed Development, assuming all other schemes have been developed, would also be negligible and not significant.

Visual Receptors

11.6.34 The previous assessments concluded that only close range receptors would potentially gain views of the Proposed Development and other cumulative developments. Those travelling along the local public footpaths and roads would experience some change in their views. It is likely that such magnitude of change would be medium to high depending on the location. The effects would be major and significant for the both types of receptors, diminishing to moderate and significant for the road users.

11.6.35 The visual receptors at medium to long distance views of the cumulative developments will experience less of an effect than the close range receptors. The effects at these medium to long distance views will be of a similar level as those experienced in the construction phase.

Viewpoints

11.6.36 **Appendix 11.3** provides a detailed viewpoint assessment supported by the photoviews prepared for each viewpoint. This assessment has been used to review the potential for cumulative effects during the construction stage, which is summarised below.

11.6.37 Nine individual or clusters of Stage 1 and Stage 2 development sites have been considered in relation to the Application Site and the potential to give rise to cumulative visual effects as experienced from each of the 15 representative viewpoints.

11.6.38 The visual assessment has shown that whilst cumulative sites may be theoretically visible in combination with the Proposed Development, in reality for Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 the cumulative effects would be negligible or negligible to negligible (no change) due to topography, intervening buildings or intervening vegetation or a combination thereof.

11.6.39 Viewpoint 7 would experience negligible and /or negligible (no change) for all cumulative sites except Site 12. Due to the proximity and orientation of view, Viewpoint 7 would experience a high magnitude of change arising from the implementation of Site 12 in its own right, with development on the Application Site within the former Air Base further contributing to this effect, leading to a major significance of effect.

11.6.40 Viewpoints 8 and 11 would experience negligible significance of effect in relation to all cumulative sites except Site 14. The transformation of the Application Site and Site 14 from existing brownfield uses to high quality residential developments would have a major beneficial significance of effect upon Viewpoints 8 and 10.

11.6.41 The Proposed Development would be seen in combination with the upper parts of development on Site 12 as experienced from Viewpoint 12, resulting in moderate

adverse significance of effects. No other cumulative sites would be visible from this viewpoint, resulting in negligible (no change) effect.

11.6.42 Development upon Site 12 would obscure views toward the Proposed Development when seen from Viewpoint 13, thus resulting in a negligible (no change) effect.

11.6.43 Due to their location and proximity to the former Air Base, Viewpoints 14 and 15 would potentially gain sequential views of the proposed development and Site 11, resulting in a minor and not significant effect. Whilst other sites to the north/northwest of these viewpoints may potentially be visible including Sites 8-10, Mixed Use and SBS, in reality they would be screened by intervening buildings and vegetation, and together with all other cumulative sites would have a negligible or negligible (no change) effect on Viewpoints 14 or 15.

Summary of Cumulative Effects

11.6.44 In summary, the potential for cumulative visual effects to arise between the Proposed Development and the Stage 1 and Stage 2 cumulative schemes varies according to juxtaposition, distance, orientation and the relative elevation of viewpoint and the presence and scale of intervening buildings and vegetation.

11.6.45 Cumulative sites in proximity to the Application Site or those south of Camp Road are likely to give rise to the most notable effects upon the representative viewpoints that lie within close range.

11.6.46 Two representative viewpoints would experience major to moderate temporary effects during construction, although this would be offset to some degree by beneficial effects arising from the Application Site and other brownfield sites being redeveloped.

During operation, one viewpoint would experience major effects, and one viewpoint would experience moderate cumulative effects in relation to the Proposed Development and Site 12, although such effects would lessen over time as landscape proposals reach maturity. Again these effects would be tempered by major beneficial effects that would arise from the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield land within the former Air Base.

11.7 SUMMARY

11.7.1 The following paragraphs summarise the established baseline of the Application Site as it relates to landscape and visual receptors, potential effects of the Proposed Development, and the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation measures.

Introduction

11.7.2 This **Chapter 11** has described and evaluated the local landscape and visual resource and has assessed the potential effects of the Proposed Development. Consideration has been given to the landscape described in published documents and has focused on the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy and Cherwell District Council's published Landscape Assessment. The effects upon visual amenity have been

assessed based on a number of viewpoints and visual receptors as identified through desktop studies and site visits.

Baseline Conditions

11.7.3 The Proposed Development is located in the south western corner of the former Air Base, in the area known as School Huts. Kirtlington Road forms the western edge of the Application Site with Camp Road abutting it to the north. Access to the Proposed Development would be from Camp Road.

11.7.4 The character of the site is influenced by the presence of boundary vegetation, such as mature hedgerows along its western boundary, mature trees in its western and northern part and non-native evergreen belts of trees in the south eastern corner. The site is relatively enclosed by the aforementioned vegetation with limited opportunities to gain views out to the west, towards the surrounding countryside. Views of the recently constructed residential properties of Bovis Homes can be gained to the east. Views of the open countryside can be gained mostly to the south, though these are influenced by the chain link fence that secured the former Air Base.

11.7.5 The review of landscape receptors found within the preliminary 5km study area resulted in three Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) being considered, the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA, the Cherwell Valley LCA, and the most recent, the Farmland Plateau LCA, (which overlaps with the Heyford Plateau LCA) as described within the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study, prepared by Oxfordshire County Council. The Upper Heyford Plateau LCA/Farmland Plateau LCA form the host LCA and covers much of the landscape to the north and south of the Proposed Development. The Cherwell Valley LCA is the nearest adjacent LCA and is located approximately 0.3km away to the west.

11.7.6 The character of both the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA and the Farmland Plateau LCA is influenced by the former Air Base and its built form, particularly in close proximity to the Air Base. Elsewhere these LCAs are characterised by elevated and generally simple topography, agricultural land use, sparse settlements and limited tree cover.

11.7.7 Cherwell Valley LCA lies to the west, and broadly speaking covers the floor and upper slopes of the River Cherwell valley. It is characterised by its topography and small settlements. Tree vegetation is frequent, but due to the changes in levels distant views can be gained locally.

11.7.8 Other LCAs identified within the preliminary 5km study area have been scoped out at the baseline stage due to distance, screening provided by the intervening topography, and elements found within the wider landscape such as vegetation and built form.

11.7.9 In terms of visual receptors, the users of Public Rights of Way and road users in the vicinity are the most relevant with direct and often open views towards the Proposed Development gained from close proximity. Upper Heyford is the closest settlement outside of the former Air Base, located to the west some 0.3km away. Other settlements are more distant and benefit from vegetative screening, which is one of the key characteristics of the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA.

11.7.10 There are a number of historic parks located in the surrounding landscape, mostly to the south and south west, with Rousham Park (Grade I) the most relevant due to its proximity and elevation. Other visual receptors, such as cyclists and those travelling along railway lines have also been considered.

11.7.11 A number of viewpoints have been identified to inform the assessment upon the character of the local landscape and illustrate the visual effects of the Proposed

Development. They have been selected in consultation with Cherwell District Council's Landscape Officer and are at varying distances and locations to represent different type of receptors, where possible.

11.7.12 The summary of the assessment upon landscape character and viewpoints is included in **Table 11.2**.

Likely Significant Effects

11.7.13 The Proposed Development has been assessed in terms of its landscape and visual effects during its construction and operational phases. The effects upon the landscape elements found within the Application Site, the surrounding LCAs and a number of identified visual receptors and viewpoints have been assessed.

11.7.14 The effects of the Proposed Development upon the character of the Upper Heyford Plateau LCAs during the construction stage have been assessed as negligible and not significant. The operational phase would also result in negligible effects with the character of this LCA prevailing.

11.7.15 The Proposed Development would have little effect upon the fabric of this landscape and associated landscape elements such as tree vegetation. The visibility of the Proposed Development is also likely to be limited to close range locations and the overall appreciation of this landscape would be largely unchanged with the built form of the former Air Base providing an appropriate context. It is worth reiterating that the Application Site is already characterised by the presence of buildings in the form of the derelict school huts and associated infrastructure such as street lighting and signage.

11.7.16 The adjacent Cherwell Valley LCA has been assessed as subject to minor perceptual landscape effects both during the construction and operational phase of the Proposed Development; there would be no direct physical effects. The appreciation of this landscape would be largely unchanged and the overall character would prevail with only limited areas where the Proposed Development would be visible.

11.7.17 The Proposed Development would, help to fulfil some of the Landscape Strategy guidelines set out within the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study relating to the Farmland Plateau LCA, insofar as it would contribute to the objective 'establish tree belts around airfields' and notably 'maintain the sparsely settled rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development in and around existing settlements', resulting in minor beneficial effects upon this character area.

11.7.18 During the construction stage receptors at eight viewpoints would be subject to negligible and/or negligible (no change), including receptors at Rousham Park. Receptors at four viewpoints would experience moderate significant effects. Three viewpoints which experience close proximity views of the derelict buildings and underused site would experience neutral effects as this is replaced by construction activities, being of neutral significance.

11.7.19 During operation, receptors at 8 viewpoints, including Rousham Park, would be subject to no change or negligible effect, which would be not significant effects. Receptors located at two viewpoints would experience moderate and significant effects at Year 1, reducing to minor or negligible at Year 15 with the retained vegetation along the western boundary providing some limited screening. Receptors at two viewpoints would be subject to major and significant effects due to close proximity. Such effects would be similar at Year 1 and 15 for one of these viewpoints, but new landscape planting long the

southern boundary of the Application Site would reduce the effect to moderate and significant for the other viewpoint at Year 15.

11.7.20 Neutral effects at Year 1 would rise to major beneficial and significant effects for receptors at three viewpoints due to the replacement of derelict buildings on the brownfield site with high quality residential development and Green Infrastructure.

11.7.21 The potential for cumulative visual effects to arise between the Proposed Development and the Stage 1 and Stage 2 cumulative schemes varies according to juxtaposition, distance, orientation and the relative elevation of viewpoint and the presence and scale of intervening buildings and vegetation. Cumulative sites in proximity to the Application Site or those south of Camp Road are likely to give rise to the most notable effects upon the representative viewpoints that lie within close range.

11.7.22 Two representative viewpoints would experience cumulative major to moderate temporary effects during construction, although this would be offset to some degree by beneficial effects arising from the Application Site and other brownfield sites being redeveloped.

11.7.23 During operation, one viewpoint would experience major effects, and one viewpoint would experience moderate cumulative effects in relation to the Proposed Development, although such effects would lessen over time as landscape proposals reach maturity. Again these effects would be tempered by major beneficial effects that would arise from the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield land within the former Air Base.

Mitigation and Enhancement

11.7.24 The proposed planting, consisting of tree belts and informal groups of trees, arranged along the northern, southern and western boundaries of the Application Site would help to integrate the Proposed Development with the existing landscape framework, replicating the settlement boundaries found elsewhere in the immediate area and fulfilling Landscape Strategy guidelines published by Oxfordshire County Council.

11.7.25 Landscape elements and features, including topsoil, that have been identified as being retained will be appropriately protected throughout the construction phase to ensure their long term viability for re-use with regard to the best practice current at the time.

11.7.26 During the construction phase of the Proposed Development, consideration will be given to appropriate positioning of construction compounds to limit or reduce their visibility from the surrounding areas. The southern, south western and eastern parts of the Application Site appear to be more sensitive, in visual terms due to the limited amount of tree vegetation or proximity to residential properties.

11.7.27 The use of site hoardings will be considered in key locations to reduce or remove sight of the works from nearby receptors. This could potentially be more effective along Camp Road and the eastern boundary of the Application Site. The perception of movement and clutter within the Application Site would be reduced but the overall effects would remain unchanged due to the proximity.

11.7.28 Consideration will be given to the materials and colour palette used for the Proposed Development to reduce its visual appearance and help integrate it into the landscape perceived.

11.7.29 As part of enhancement measures a selection of appropriate plant species would be considered with the focus on native plants. Consideration would also be given to the

arrangement of trees in the southern part of the Application Site to provide a high quality designed open space.

Conclusion

11.7.30 In summary, the Proposed Development is considered to be appropriate to the character of the local landscape and of the site and offers suitable landscape mitigation measures in terms of visual amenity. Certain high sensitivity receptors would experience a higher degree of change and consequently higher level of effects as a result of the Proposed Development but these would be few and would generally be limited to those occurring in close proximity to, but separated from, the Application Site by agricultural land. These effects would be experienced by those travelling along the public footpath between Upper Heyford and the B430. It also has to be remembered that currently this site houses a series of derelict structures that have already degraded considerably since development began on the wider area of the former Air Base. Their demolition and removal from the site will be a significant beneficial gain to receptors immediately adjacent to the Application Site and users of the local area and the host Landscape Character Area.

11.7.31 **Table 11.2** provides a summary of effects, mitigation and residual effects.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

Table 11.2: Summary of 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								
Landscape elements – Topography	Changes to the contours to accommodate foundations and building platforms	Permanent	Low	Low	Local	Negligible	Retained and protected	Negligible
Landscape elements – area of grassland	Retained and incorporated as part of the proposed Green Infrastructure	Permanent	Low	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and protected	Negligible
Landscape elements – Hedgerows	Retained, no removal necessary	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and protected in accordance with the British Standards current at the time	Negligible
Landscape elements – Trees	Removal of some of the trees to accommodate the Proposed Development	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Minor	Trees to be retained protected in accordance with the British Standards current at the time	Minor

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

Landscape Elements – Existing built form	Removal of derelict buildings and associated features including chain link security fence	Permanent	Low	High (Positive)	Local	Moderate Beneficial	N/A	Moderate Beneficial
Farmland Plateau LCA	Limited change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined. Located on a brownfield land	Temporary	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	~	Negligible
Upper Heyford Plateau LCA	Limited change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined. Located on a brownfield land	Temporary	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	~	Negligible
Cherwell Valley LCA	Limited level of intervisibility and therefore limited change to the perceptual qualities. Distance and context provided by the	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Minor	~	Minor

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	built form of the former Air Base							
Nearby residential receptors (to east)	Direct and relatively open views towards the construction activities	Temporary	High	High	Local	Major	Use of site hoarding along the eastern boundary.	Major
Users of nearby PROW (between Upper Heyford and to the south of the Application Site)	Direct and relatively open views towards the construction activities. Increased perception of human activities in the landscape	Temporary	High	High	Local	Major	Consider the use of site hoarding along the southern boundaries	Major
Users of nearest roads (short sections of Camp Road and one particular location of Kirtlington Road)	Direct and relatively open views towards the construction activities. Vehicular movement	Temporary	Medium	High	Local	Major	Use of site hoarding along Camp Road and southern boundary	Negligible
Non-NCN road linking Sustrans routes	Glimpsed views, generally the route is well	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained vegetation; consider location of the	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	screened. Views distant with the Proposed Development visible on the horizon and in the context of other built form						construction compound and site office	
Rousham Park	Views are generally screened or restricted. Very limited opportunities to gain views of the western boundary of the Application Site. Views relatively distant	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Minor	Retained vegetation; consider location of the construction compound and site office	Minor
Users travelling along more distant sections of the nearby PROW	Views would be generally restricted or screened and the construction activities would be seen as a relatively small element in the overall view	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate	Consider the use of site hoarding along the southern boundary	Moderate
Users of other roads (except	Views glimpsed and transitory, with the	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained vegetation; consider	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

Camp Road and B430)	majority of these routes screened or distant. The construction activities would be difficult to identify in the overall panorama						location of the construction compound and site office away from the western and southern boundary of the Application Site	
Distant residential receptors	Restricted and distant views of the construction traffic and activities within the Application Site	Temporary	High	Low to Negligible	Local	Moderate to Minor	Retained vegetation; consider locating the construction compound and site office away from the western and southern boundary of the Application Site	Moderate to Minor
Viewpoint 1	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained vegetation	Negligible
Viewpoint 2	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained vegetation	Negligible
Viewpoint 3	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained vegetation; consider locating the construction compound and site office away from the	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

							western and southern boundary of the Application Site	
Viewpoint 4	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained vegetation; consider locating the construction compound and site office away from the western and southern boundary of the Application Site	Negligible
Viewpoint 5	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Minor	Retained vegetation; consider locating the construction compound and site office away from the western boundary of the Application Site	Minor
Viewpoint 6	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained vegetation.	Negligible
Viewpoint 7	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate	Retained vegetation; consider locating the construction	Moderate

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

							compound and site office away from the western and southern boundary of the Application Site. Consider the use of site hoarding along the southern boundary	
Viewpoint 8	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Neutral	Local	Neutral	Use site hoarding along the eastern boundary	Neutral
Viewpoint 9	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate	Retained vegetation	Moderate
Viewpoint 10	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	None required	Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 11	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Neutral	Local	Neutral	Use of site hoarding to boundaries	Neutral
Viewpoint 12	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Neutral	Local	Neutral	Use of site hoarding to boundaries	Neutral
Viewpoint 13	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (not significant)	Use of site hoarding to boundaries	Moderate (not significant)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

Viewpoint 14	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	None required	Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 15	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Medium	Local	Moderate (not significant)	Use of site hoarding to boundaries	Moderate (not significant)
Operation								
Farmland Plateau LCA	Proposed Development would be located within a brownfield land where built form is already present; its extent would be limited to the already established boundaries of built form and seen in the context of the former Air Base	Permanent	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Low Positive	Local	Minor Beneficial		Minor Beneficial
Upper Heyford Plateau LCA	Proposed Development would be located within a brownfield land where built form is already present; its extent would be	Permanent	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Low	Local	Minor (overall) Negligible (around the Application Site)	High quality built form replacing derelict structures. Retained and proposed planting	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	limited to the already established boundaries of built form and seen in the context of the former Air Base							
Cherwell Valley LCA	Proposed Development perceived as part of a distant landscape of different character; relatively small element with little visual influence over the perceptual qualities of this LCA	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	High quality built form replacing derelict structures. Retained and proposed planting	Negligible
Nearby residential receptors (to the east)	Close range views with the mass of the Proposed Development changing the composition of the view and replacing a derelict and underused site with high quality built	Permanent	High	High	Local	Major	High quality built form and landscape planting (in keeping with that of the receptors) to replace derelict structures/ underused brownfield site.	Major Beneficial

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	form (in keeping with that of the receptors) and overall townscape							
Users of nearby PROW (between Upper Heyford and the B430)	Close range views with the mass of the Proposed Development replacing derelict structures and unsightly infrastructure (fencing etc.). Increased perception of density of built form in the surrounding landscape	Permanent	High	High	Local	Major	Retained vegetation but removal of intrusive chain-link and barbed-wire fence. Introduction of high quality built form and landscape planting replacing derelict structures/ underused brownfield site	Major Beneficial
Users of nearest roads (short sections of Camp Road and one particular location of Kirtlington Road)	Close range fleeting and intermittent views with the mass of the Proposed Development replacing derelict structures and unsightly infrastructure	Permanent	Medium	High	Local	Major	Retained vegetation but removal of intrusive chain-link and barbed-wire fence. Introduction of high quality built form and landscape planting	Major Beneficial

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	(fencing etc.). Increased perception of density of built form in the surrounding landscape						replacing derelict structures/ underused brownfield site	
Rousham Park	Views restricted due to the vegetation along the western boundary of the Application Site and within the park itself; perceived as a relatively small and distant element in the view	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Minor	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Minor
Non-NCN road linking Sustrans routes	Distant intermittent views with the Proposed Development generally screened and perceived as a small part of the overall panorama	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Users of more distant PROW (north)	Distant intermittent views with the	Permanent	High	Negligible (generally)	Local	Minor	Retained and proposed planting along	Minor

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

western part of the study area)	Proposed Development generally screened and perceived as a small part of the overall panorama						boundaries and within site	
Users of other routes (except Camp Road and Kirtlington Road)	Distant and fleeting views with the Proposed Development generally screened and perceived as part of the overall panorama	Permanent	Medium	Negligible (generally) to Low	Local	Minor to Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Minor to Negligible
Distant residential receptors	Distant views with the Proposed Development generally screened and perceived as part of the overall panorama	Permanent	High	Low to Negligible	Local	Moderate to Minor	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Moderate to Minor
Viewpoint 1	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

Viewpoint 2	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Viewpoint 3	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Viewpoint 4	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Viewpoint 5	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Minor	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Minor
Viewpoint 6	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Viewpoint 7	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Medium	Local	Major	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Major reducing to Moderate at Year 15
Viewpoint 8	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	High Neutral (Year 1) to	Local	Neutral (Year 1) to Major	Retained and proposed planting along	Neutral (Year 1) to Major

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

				High Positive (Year 15)		Beneficial (Year 15)	boundaries and within site	Beneficial (Year 15)
Viewpoint 9	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	High to Medium	Local	Major	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Major
Viewpoint 10	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	None required	Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 11	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Neutral (Year 1) to High Positive (Year 15)	Local	Neutral (Year 1) to Major Beneficial (Year 15)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Neutral (Year 1) to Major Beneficial (Year 15)
Viewpoint 12	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Neutral (Year 1) to High Positive (Year 15)	Local	Neutral (Year 1) to Major Beneficial (Year 15)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Neutral (Year 1) to Major Beneficial (Year 15)
Viewpoint 13	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Low	Local	Moderate (not significant)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Moderate reducing to Negligible at Year 15
Viewpoint 14	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	None required	Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 15	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Medium to Low	Local	Moderate	Retained and proposed planting along	Moderate reducing

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

							boundaries and within site	to Minor at Year 15
Cumulative Effects								
Farmland Plateau LCA	Proposed Development increasing the density of development but contained within the established boundaries of the former Air Base	Permanent	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Low Positive	Local	Minor Beneficial	~	Minor Beneficial
Upper Heyford Plateau LCA	Proposed Development increasing the density of development but contained within the established boundaries of the former Air Base	Permanent	Low (around the Application Site)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	~	Negligible
Cherwell Valley LCA	Proposed Development seen against other cumulative sites or in isolation with little change to	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Minor	~	Minor

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	the overall composition of the view							
Nearby residential receptors	Variety of close range views gained; the Proposed Development would add to the cumulative situation particularly when observed from the east	Permanent	High	High	Local	Major	~	Major
Users of nearby PROW (between Upper Heyford and the B430)	Sequential and simultaneous views; the Policy Villages 5 sites exert more visual influence and the addition of the Proposed Development would add to the overall magnitude of change	Permanent	High	High	Local	Major	~	Major
Users of nearest roads (short sections of Camp Road and one particular	Sequential views; the Policy Villages 5 sites exert more visual influence and the addition of	Permanent	Medium	High	Local	Major	~	Major

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

location of Kirtlington Road)	the Proposed Development would add to the overall magnitude of change							
Other visual receptors, including non-NCN road linking Sustrans routes and Rousham Park	Proposed Development seen against other cumulative sites or in isolation with little change to the overall composition of the view	Permanent	High to Medium	Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	~	Minor to Negligible
Viewpoint 1	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to cumulative sites 8-10 or Paragon Area	Permanent	Medium	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible (no change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with all other sites	Permanent	Medium	Negligible to No Change	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No Effect)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible to Negligible (No Effect)
Viewpoint 2	Proposed Development seen in isolation in	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	Retained and proposed planting along	Negligible (no change)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	relation to cumulative sites 8-11 and Paragon Area						boundaries and within site	
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Sites 5-7, 12, 14 SBS Phases 1 and 2 and New residential (17ha)	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Viewpoint 3	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to cumulative sites 7-11 and the SBS Phase 1	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible (no change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Sites 12, 14, New residential (17ha) and SBS Phase 2	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Viewpoint 4	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	cumulative sites 8-11							
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Sites 5-7, 12, 14, New residential (17ha) and SBS Phase 1 and 2	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible
Viewpoint 5	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to all cumulative sites	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 6	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to all cumulative sites except Site 11 and Paragon Area.	Permanent	Medium	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with the remaining sites	Permanent	Medium	Negligible to No Change	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No Change)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible to Negligible (No Change)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

Viewpoint 7	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to cumulative sites 5-11, 14 and Paragon Area	Permanent	High	Negligible to No Change	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No Change)	~	Negligible to Negligible (No Change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Sites 12, New Residential (17ha), and SBS Phases 1 and 2	Permanent	High	Medium to Negligible	Local	Major to Negligible	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Major reducing to Moderate at Year 15, and Negligible
Viewpoint 8	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to all cumulative sites except Site 14	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Site 14	Permanent	High	High (positive)	Local	Major Beneficial	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Major Beneficial
Viewpoint 9	Proposed Development seen in isolation in	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	relation to all cumulative sites except Sites 12 and 14							
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Sites 12 and 14	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 10	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to all cumulative sites	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 11	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to cumulative sites 8-12, Paragon Area, Mixed Uses and the SBS Phases 1 and 2.	Permanent	Medium	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Site 5-7, 14, and New Residential (17ha)	Permanent	Medium	High Positive to No Change	Local	Major Beneficial to Negligible (no change)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site, and high quality built form	Major Beneficial to Negligible (no change)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

Viewpoint 12	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to all cumulative sites except Site 12.	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
	Would be seen in cumulation with Site 12	Permanent	High	Low	Local	Moderate	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Moderate
Viewpoint 13	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to all cumulative sites except Sites 12 and 14.	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Negligible (no change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with Sites 12 and 14	Permanent	High	Low	Local	Moderate	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Moderate reducing to Minor at Year 15
Viewpoint 14	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to cumulative site	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Landscape and Visual Amenity

	14 and Paragon Area							
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with remaining sites	Permanent	High	Low to No Change	Local	Moderate to Negligible (No Change)	None required	Moderate reducing to Minor at Year 15, and Negligible (No Change)
Viewpoint 15	Proposed Development seen in isolation in relation to cumulative sites 5-7	Permanent	High	No Change	Local	Negligible (no change)	~	Negligible (no change)
	Potential to be seen in cumulation with remaining sites	Permanent	High	Moderate to No Change	Local	Major to Negligible (No Change)	Retained and proposed planting along boundaries and within site	Major reducing to Moderate at Year 15, and Negligible (No Change)