## $L D \overline{\Lambda} D E S | G N$

# Oxford Technology Park: Hotel Application Landscape and Visual Appraisal Addendum

#### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) Addendum has been prepared by LDA Design on behalf of Hill Street Holdings in relation to the proposed development at Land east of Evenlode Crescent and south of Langford Lane Kidlington ('the site').
- 1.2. An outline consent for a "*New build Technology Park comprising 40,362 sq.m. of office, research and development, laboratory, storage and ancillary space*" at the site was granted by Cherwell District Council (LPA Ref. 14/02067/OUT) on the 10<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The application was accompanied by a LVA and Green Belt Review (2014) by LDA Design (ref. 4316\_RO1).
- 1.3. This LVA Addendum considers the potential change in effects to landscape and visual receptors and the Green Belt to those findings presented in the 2014 LVA in light of a full planning application for a hotel and carpark at the site on Plot 2.

### 2.0 Summary of Findings of Landscape and Visual Appraisal

- 2.1. The original LVA produced by LDA Design records the site displays urban fringe characteristics and does not strongly display the countryside characteristics of the Lower Cherwell Floodplain character area nor Estate Farmlands Landscape Type as identified in the Cherwell Landscape Character Assessment (1995) and Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (2004) respectively. The site was, however, judged to demonstrate some of the industrial characteristics of the Oxford Airport: Settled and Open River Terraces as identified within the Character Assessment of Oxford in its Landscape Setting (2003). The LVA records there to be localised change in character limited to the site and its immediate environs as a result of new buildings and change of use from vacant land to commercial uses, but that no effects to the key characteristics of the character areas identified above would occur.
- 2.2. In reference to visual effects, the LVA records the site to be surrounded by established vegetation forming its boundaries which serves to screen and filter potential views. Field and road boundary vegetation and existing industrial built form at London Oxford Airport and industrial units adjacent to the east and west also screen views and lend to an

## $L D \overline{\Lambda} D E S | G N$

industrial composition in views. Vegetation along Langford Lane has been removed under the outline consent.

- 2.3. The areas where most visual change would occur is the immediate context of the site along Langford Lane and Evenlode Crescent, and also a Public Right of Way 400m to the south which runs along the northern edge of Begbroke.
- 2.4. The LVA identities a limited number of residents on the north and north eastern edge of Begbroke would also have potential views of the development although views would be filtered by intervening boundary vegetation and, as these dwellings are over 400m away from the site, would not result in significant change to the composition of views of these receptors. The LVA records in these views development of the northern units (which includes Plot 2) would be less noticeable given they are at the far end of the site from this location.
- 2.5. Potential views of the tops of proposed buildings from the A44 between Begbroke and Blandon roundabout are also recorded but considered unlikely to be particularly noticeable given the location within built form and context.

### 3.0 Hotel Planning Application

- 3.1. The hotel planning application is in full and seeks:
  - a change from office space (B1a Use Class) of 4,626 sqm (Gross External Area) at Plot 2 of the consented Oxford Technology Park, to a 101 bed hotel (C1 Use Class) and ancillary restaurant (A3 Use Class) of 540sqm; and
  - a change from 116 car parking spaces to 139 spaces.
- 3.2. The maximum height of the building would remain as per the consented scheme and the building footprint, car park location and the treatment of elevations and facades, comprising principally of grey cladding and glass windows, would also be similar to that of the outline consent.

### 4.0 Effects to Landscape and Visual Receptors

4.1. As the hotel and carpark are of similar size, scale and appearance to the consented scheme, no discernible change to the landscape character beyond that assessed in the LVA is anticipated. Effects to character would remain localised with no change to key characteristics of the local landscape character.

# $L D \overline{\Lambda} D E S | G N$

- 4.2. The proposed changes affect Plot 2 only which lies in the north western corner of the site adjacent to Langford Lane. Units of the consented outline scheme lie to south of Plot 2 and would form an effective screen to visual receptors to the south, which include dwellings at the northern edge of Begbroke and the settlement edge footpath. Consequently, there would be no discernible visual change to views from the south from that of the outline consent.
- 4.3. Vegetation along Langford Lane has been removed under the outline consent. In views from Langford Lane, an area of landscape planting would front onto the lane with the hotel building set back behind. This is the same as the outline consent and no discernible change to the composition of views from Langford Lane between the hotel application and the outline consent are concluded. The increase in car parking spaces would have no discernible change in effect from that assessed as part of the consented outline scheme.
- 4.4. Visual changes from Evenlode Crescent would also be indiscernible from the outline consent given the nature of the proposals.
- 4.5. The change in views from the A44 between the schemes would be indiscernible given the buildings are the same height.

#### 5.0 Effects on Green Belt

5.1. As the hotel application is within the parameters set by the consented outline application, there would be no change to the effects on the Green Belt from that concluded for the outline consent which found the site not to perform any significant Green Belt functions and not result in unacceptable harm to the purposes of the designation.