APRIL 2018 | ASM | P16-0631

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

HEYFORD MASTERPLAN, HEYFORD PARK, OXFORDSHIRE

ON BEHALF OF DORCHESTER LIVING LIMITED

Prepared by: Alison Smith CMLI

Pegasus Group

Pegasus House | Querns Business Centre| Whitworth Road | Cirencester | Gloucestershire | GL7 1RT

T 01285 641717 | **F** 01285 642348 | **W** www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS

©Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Limited 2011. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Limited

Pegasus Group

Pegasus House | Querns Business Centre| Whitworth Road | Cirencester | Gloucestershire | GL7 1RT

T 01285 641717 | **F** 01285 642348 | **W** www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS

©Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Limited 2011. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Limited

CONTENTS:

FIGURES:

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX 1: METHODOLOGY

APPENDIX 2: MID CHERWELL DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXTRACTS

APPENDIX 3: ZONE OF THEORETICAL VISIBILITY METHODOLOGY AND MAPPING

APPENDIX 4: PHOTOVIEWS

APPENDIX 5: PHOTOMONTAGES

APPENDIX 6: SUMMARY OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

APPENDIX 7: SUMMARY OF VISUAL EFFECTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) evaluates the effects on the landscape and visual resource resulting from redevelopment of the former RAF Upper Heyford Air Base to realise the proposed comprehensive Heyford Masterplan (the 'Proposed Development'). The assessment is undertaken to determine the potential effects, both direct and indirect, on landscape character and visual amenity including views. Given the nature and intended longevity of the Proposed Development's operational life, decommissioning has not been considered as part of this study. Accordingly, this LVIA focuses on the potential likely significant effects of the Proposed Development during the construction and operational phases only. Effects upon night time character are qualitatively assessed, and potential cumulative effects arising in addition or in combination with other consented or proposed developments within the study area are also considered. The LVIA forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) relating to the Proposed Development and is prepared in support of and with reference to the planning application and associated documents. The findings of the EIA are reported in the Heyford Masterplan Environmental Statement (ES).

1.2 The Application Site covers approximately 457 hectares of land occupying much of the c.520 hectares of the former RAF Upper Heyford Air Base (the former Air Base) site, in Oxfordshire. It is located largely to the north of Camp Road and includes the section of Camp Road that lies between Kirtlington Road/Port Way to the west and Chilgrove Drive to the east, but includes other parcels of land to the south of Camp Road. The LVIA has been prepared with reference to the following planning application drawings and schedules which describe the parameters of the Proposed Development:

- P16-0631_33 Revision K, Application Boundary;
- P16-0631_34 Revision L, Demolition and Change of Use;
- P16-0631_08 Sheet No. 01 Revision Y, Composite Parameter Plan;
- P16-0631_08 Sheet No. 02 Revision E, Building Heights Parameter Plan;
- P16-0631_65 Revision C, Existing and Proposed Fence Plan;
- Schedule 1 – Buildings and Structures to be demolished;
- Schedule 2 – Continuation of Use of Buildings/Structures already with benefit of planning permission; and
- Proposed Land Use within each Parcel (Table).

1.3 This LVIA should be read alongside the suite of technical documents that accompany this application including:

- Planning Statement;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- Environmental Statement;
- Tree Survey;
- Report of Community Involvement; and
- Sustainability Assessment.

1.4 The majority of the Application Site boundary follows the former Air Base boundary which is marked by barbed-wire topped chain link security fences, beyond which lies open countryside to the north, east, and west; the southern boundary in part lies adjacent to open countryside, former Air Base structures, or new build development within Heyford Park. The boundaries and neighbouring land uses of individual development parcels within the Application Site varies according to its relationship with existing built form or open land.

1.5 Upper Heyford is the closest settlement and is separated from the south-west corner of the former runway by Somerton Road. 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**).

2. ASSESSMENT APPROACH

Methodology

2.1 This report and accompanying appendices presents the 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 the LVIA discusses the following topics: methodology; legislative and policy framework; scoping criteria; and limitations to the assessment.

2.2 The LVIA has been undertaken with regard to current best practice. The most relevant is the '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. A detailed methodology is presented in **Appendix 1**.

Assessment of Significance

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 1** and in **Appendix 1**.

Table 1 Significance Matrix

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

2.4 It is also noted, as stated in GLVIA3, that in some cases effects can be described as 'neutral' in their consequences.

2.5 Those effects assessed as major and/or moderate are considered significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms unless specific mitigating circumstances occur that would lessen this significance.

Legislative and Policy Framework

2.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's economic, environmental and social planning policies for England, and its vision for sustainable development.

2.7 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)

2.8 The 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…".

2.9 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)."**

2.10 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."**

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

2.12 Whilst heritage matters relating to the Proposed Development are addressed in ES Chapter 9, 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 discusses conservation areas and un-listed

heritage assets in the context of the NPPF. These matters are considered in greater depth in **ES Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage**.

Regional Planning Policies

2.13 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. Draft Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan.

Local Planning Policies

2.14 Documents containing planning policies for Cherwell District Council which may be of relevance to the Proposed Development have been reviewed as part of this report:

- Adopted Local Plan 1996 (Saved Policies);
- Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031; and
- Draft Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2031.

Adopted Local Plan 1996

2.15 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 **ES Chapter 8** and **ES Chapter 9**, 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.

2.16 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

2.17 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.

2.18 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."**

2.19 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.

2.20 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."**

2.21 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 study 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 7.3 below.

2.22 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.

2.23 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."

2.24 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."**

2.25 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 9 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.

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

Draft Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2031

2.27 The pre-submission draft Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan was published in July 2017 for consultation (mid-cherwell.org.uk/presubmissiondocuments). Policy PD4: Protection of Important Views and Vistas states that:

> **"Development proposals must demonstrate sensitivity to the important views and vistas described in Table 5 and illustrated by photographs in the documents referred to in that Table, and must not significantly harm these important views and vistas. Development must also be designed such that there is no adverse impact on the sensitive skylines identified in Fig.8 and referenced in Table 5.**
>
> **Applicants for development in or adjacent to a Conservation Area must demonstrate in a Heritage Impact Assessment that they have taken account of the appropriate Conservation Area Appraisal and of the Heritage and Character Assessment at Appendix K. The development should not do significant harm to the Conservation Area and its setting, other heritage assets, or historic and village views and longer distance vistas."**

2.28 The explanatory note at paragraph 3.2.21 states that:

> **"The underlying landform, historic landscape elements, and notable landmarks within the landscape make views an important characteristic within the Mid-Cherwell area. The Cherwell Valley provides opportunities for far-reaching and panoramic views from along the valley sides, and more intimate views from within the base of the valley. Along the Cherwell Valley the strong rural characteristics of the landscape are apparent, including the small-scale isolated settlements dispersed along the valley, most notable in views as a result of their churches standing tall above surrounding woodland. Views within the Cherwell Valley are more open from the eastern side of the valley than the west, which is more wooded and has slightly greater enclosure. Fig.8 (see Policy Maps on p59, shows the contours and highlights the sensitive skylines of high ground on each side of the Cherwell Valley that are to be protected."**

2.29 Paragraph 3.2.23 notes that village churches are the most prominent recurring landmarks within Mid Cherwell, together with Camp Road Water Tower and structures within the Application Site. Several views and vistas of particular importance that are to be protected were used as a reference point in producing the Heritage and Character Assessment and are referenced in Table 5.

2.30 Views and vistas listed at Table 5 of the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan pre-submission draft have informed the LVIA and have been assessed where

appropriate; the Heritage and Character Assessment which forms Appendix K is discussed in further detail below. Relevant extracts from the Mid Cherwell Draft Neighbourhood Plan are presented in **Appendix 2**.

2.31 Policy PD6: Control of Light Pollution states:

> **"The design of external and street lighting in all new development should minimise the risk of light spillage beyond the development site boundary. Additional street lighting within new development will however not be supported in the following villages: Ardley with Fewcott, Duns Tew, Fritwell, Kirtlington, Lower Heyford, Middle Aston, Somerton and Upper Heyford. Proposals should ensure that the installation of external lighting satisfies the following criteria:**
>
> **the means of lighting is appropriate, energy-efficient, of appropriate colour temperature, unobtrusively sited and would not result in excessive levels of light;**
>
> **elevations of buildings, particularly roofs, are designed to limit light spill;**
>
> **the proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the amenity of surrounding occupiers;**
>
> **the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the character of a village and its setting or of the wider countryside;**
>
> **the proposal will not be detrimental to an area of nature conservation interest;**
>
> **particular care is taken to avoid light pollution where the development is in a remote rural location."**

2.32 Explanatory text at Paragraph 3.2.34 that accompanies the policy sets out the rationale for control of light pollution with reference to Cherwell District Council's Local Plan policy ESD15: The Character of the Built Environment. Paragraph 3.2.34 continues:

> **"…Commercial users at Heyford Park already present a challenge to this policy because their night-time requirements for lighting are substantial. The night-time glow of light above the former Base is already significant, and is increasing, with detrimental effect on the sense of rurality in the neighbourhood area. The Community Action Plan can also attempt to address this. In the meantime, a policy controlling light pollution from new development will stop the problem from getting worse."**

2.33 Whilst the Application Site falls outside of the settlements noted in Policy PD6 where restriction of additional external and street lighting will not be permitted, it

does fall within Heyford Park which is highlighted in the explanatory text as being problematic. The policy and explanatory text infers an acceptance that additional external and street lighting will be required and will occur within the Application Site and that this can be acceptably controlled through appropriate design.

Draft Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2031, Appendix K: Heritage and Character Assessment

2.34 As described above, Table 5 of the Draft Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan sets out important views and vistas that are to be protected, and item (c) makes particular reference to vistas and views included in the Mid Cherwell Heritage and Character Assessment, dated April 2017. Specifically, reference is made in Table 5(c) to views and vistas noted on pages 22, 23, 76 and 90, and photographs of Fritwell (p.35), Kirtlington (p.43), Lower Heyford (p.51), Middle Aston (p.57), Steeple Aston (p.65) and Upper Heyford (p.72) of Appendix K.

2.35 Page 22 states:

> **"Across the area the most prominent recurring landmarks are the churches at the many small villages within Mid-Cherwell, and the historic water tower (currently due for demolition) and other structures at the former RAF Upper Heyford. The churches are often framed within the landscape by surrounding vegetation, and are often the first indicator of the location of the settlement. The views between church steeples along the Cherwell Valley, and the setting of these views, are a particularly characteristic feature.**
>
> **The neighbourhood plan group have identified a number of views within the neighbourhood area which are of particular importance to its history and character...A plan produced by the neighbourhood plan group showing the location of the views is presented in Appendix C."**

2.36 Review of Appendix C of the Heritage and Character Assessment (reproduced at **Appendix 2**) reveals that only five of the viewpoints deemed by the neighbourhood plan group to be of particular importance are oriented generally toward the Application Site and therefore have potential to be affected by the Proposed Development, namely:

- B4030 at M40 overbridge, looking north northwest;
- Footpath 364/7/10/The Dickredge, Steeple Aston looking east toward Upper Heyford;
- Fir Lane near Hatch End Industrial Estate looking east toward Upper Heyford;
- Water Street, Somerton, looking south; and
- Mill Lane, Kirtlington looking north.

2.37 Accordingly, these viewpoints have been assessed within the visual assessment as viewpoints 7, 17, 19, 22, and 24, respectively.

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

2.38 The Proposed Development falls within the site of the former Air Base and Cherwell District 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:

- Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Character Map (2017);
- 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).

2.39 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.

Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Character Map

2.40 In July 2017, the Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) project completed the characterisation and digital mapping of historic attributes across the county, which is available at oxfordshire.maps.arcgis.com. In the context of the Planning Application, the purpose of the HLC is to guide:

- The conservation and management of heritage sites and landscape;

- Planning applications and development strategy; and
- Landscape management schemes.

2.41 Reference has been made to the HLC Interactive Map during the preparation of the LVIA.

Countryside Design Summary Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

2.42 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 7.3 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)

2.43 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

2.44 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 Zone of Visual Influence (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.

2.45 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 and mixed-use re-development.

Scoping Criteria

2.46 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.

2.47 Accordingly, the LVIA considers the following potential effects:

- Construction Phase – character of the local landscape;
- Construction Phase – night-time character;
- Construction Phase – change in views;
- Operational Phase – character of the local landscape;
- Operational Phase – night-time character;
- 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; and
- Cumulative Effects.

Study Area

2.48 As discussed in **Appendix 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 from the Application Site boundary (see **Figure 1**). This extent has been used to review baseline conditions, to carry out site visits, and to identify and assess relevant landscape and visual receptors.

2.49 A series of plans showing 'screened' zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV), which takes into account the screening effects of substantial blocks of vegetation and buildings, have been prepared for each of the proposed development heights (5m, 10.5m, 13m, 18m and 30m) to inform the baseline study and the assessment (see **Appendix 3**). It should be noted that the ZTV does not take into account smaller buildings, blocks of vegetation, individual trees, or

hedgerows and therefore the area from which potential views of the Proposed Development may be gained is reduced further.

2.50 Previous published studies have also been used to verify the extent of the study area. Consequently, the visual assessment focuses on a much smaller study area which would correspond with the potential screened zone of visual influence of the Proposed Development. This is further explained in the assessment section of this Chapter.

Limitations to the Assessment

2.51 Multiple site visits and site photography were carried out for the purpose of this assessment on various dates in 2016, 2017, and 2018; extensive site studies have previously been undertaken to inform design evolution. 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.

2.52 Location of the relevant Draft Neighbourhood Plan views that are identified as being of importance are approximate, as accuracy has been limited by the low resolution of graphics available on the Neighbourhood Plan website.

3. BASELINE CONDITIONS

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 and Landscape Elements

Topography, Land Form and Drainage

3.2 The Flying Field occupies a plateau east of the Cherwell Valley and comprises convex high ground, with landform falling away locally to the north and south (see **Figure 3**). Topographically there are subtle variations in levels across the Flying Field, undulating locally to the north, south, east and west, although the

former runway is slightly elevated above neighbouring land uses for much of its c.3km length at between 135m AOD and 130m AOD (the western end slopes down to c.112m at Somerton Road). The northern part of the Flying Field reaches approximately 130m to 135m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) and gently slopes to the south at Camp Road which lies at c.125m AOD toward the western edge of the Application Site, and at c. 120m AOD at Chilgrove Drive junction.

3.3 To the south of Camp Road, parcels 16 and 18 occupy land that slopes generally to the south at c.122m AOD although a ditch that forms the boundary between the two parcels forms a shallow 'valley' at less than 120m AOD. Landform within parcel 17 slopes gently south-eastward from c.120m at its northern edge toward the Sewage Works which lies at about 115m AOD.

3.4 The ditch drains southward from the Land South of Camp Road site between parcels 16 and 18. No natural water bodies occur on site, but a number of small streams issue close to the Application Site boundaries and flow away from the Application Site. Several man-made water storage and drainage features are present within the Flying Field, historically used during the Air Base operation for firefighting.

Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure

3.5 The Application Site encompasses, broadly speaking, the irregular-shaped land parcel of the former Air Base to the north and south of Camp Road, but excludes areas of completed and ongoing residential and associated development within Heyford Park or areas subject to separate planning applications such as Land South of Camp Road and Village Centre North (see **Figure 1**). Two parcels of 'greenfield' agricultural land beyond the former Air Base boundary are also included within the Application Site in accordance with Policy 5 Villages of the CDC Local Plan. Parcel 16 and parcel 18 lie to the west of Tait Drive/east of Port Way, respectively, toward the southwest of the Application Site, and parcel 17 including the Sewage Works, lies to the west of Heyford Leys Farm, within the southeast of the Application Site. Camp Road and a broad corridor along Chilgrove Drive are also included within the Application Site, together with an access corridor through the Land South of Camp Road site which provides access to land west of Tait Drive, and Izzard Road which provides access to the Heyford Park Free School Site (parcel 32) south of Camp Road.

3.6 The former Flying Field is not publicly accessible, with many of the former Air Base buildings being in employment use. An extensive area (c.20ha) of the southern taxiway is used for car processing. Land use between and around the buildings north of Camp Road is dominated by the former runway and taxiways, and extensive areas of hard standing with temporary planning permission for miscellaneous vehicle processing, preparation and storage uses.

3.7 The area that lies principally to the south of Camp Road, and an area to the west of the Technical Area is in residential use based upon the former airmen's quarters and associated facilities which includes part of the Heyford Free School; the main body of the school occupies the former officer's mess to the north of Camp Road. The area is characterised by domestic scale houses and bungalows with gardens and street trees.

3.8 Due to its scale and former functions, the Application Site comprises a varied built form and scale, circulation routes, and spaces that are described in greater detail within the landscape character section of this Chapter. However, to the south of Camp Road the greenfield parcels west of Tait Drive and east of Heyford Leys Farm comprise arable farmland with no built form or paved access, that directly abut residential uses within Heyford Park. Heyford Park Free School site to the south of Camp Road (parcel 32W) is bound to the northeast and east by existing 2-storey and single-storey residential development. To the northwest, west and south it is bound by proposed 2 to 2.5-storey residential development and associated green infrastructure on Land South of Camp Road site (although the site is presently occupied by single storey pre-fabricated building of the former school huts; the planning application for this site is yet to be determined). Existing land uses within this parcel include the Free School building, sports pitches and all-weather courts, and an area of vacant land at the south-western end of Izzard Road.

3.9 Built form to the north of Camp Road is more complex and large scale, comprising utilitarian military structures of the former Flying Field and technical areas. However, on a more domestic scale, it also includes the Heyford Park Free School to the north of Camp Road (parcel 32E) and residential properties off Larsen Road and Soden Road.

Green Infrastructure

3.10 Mature and juvenile trees and shrubs occur in a haphazard manner across the Application Site with areas of grassland separating the built form and hard standings. Notable vegetation includes tree, hedgerow and/or shrub planting along the south-western and north-western boundary of the Flying Field, the southern boundary of the Southern Bomb Stores, flanking Chilgrove Drive, and the western boundary of the parcel east of Tait Drive. A dense tree belt lies outside of but adjacent to the northern boundary of the Flying Field. Extensive areas of rough grassland between buildings and hard standings are a characteristic of the Flying Field.

3.11 The high chain link security fencing that surrounds the former Air Base remains in place and therefore this defines and encloses much of the external boundaries (and occasional internal boundaries) of the Application Site. The security fence also forms the northern and eastern boundaries of parcels 16 and 18 to the west of Tait Drive, with the southern edge marked by an agricultural access track; the western boundary is formed by hedgerows and Port Way, separating this parcel from open countryside. The former Air Base security fence has been removed along the northern and western boundaries of parcel 17 west of Heyford Leys Farm, and it has been replaced by timber post and rail fencing with hedge planting adjacent to existing housing; the eastern boundary of this parcel is formed by existing hedgerows and/or tall chain link fencing of the Sewage Works, and the southern boundary is marked by a gappy hedgerow separating parcel 17 from open countryside.

3.12 Existing landscape features associated with the Application Site are indicated on planning application drawing P16-0631_08 Sheet 1 - Composite Parameter Plan. A Tree Survey has been carried out and is also submitted in support of the planning application.

3.13 As noted above, there is no public access to the Flying Field, north of Camp Road, and land that falls within the Application Site to the south of Camp Road is private agricultural or other private land. Only one Public Right of Way (PRoW), footpath 388/4/20, falls within the within the southwest corner of the Application Site, diagonally crossing parcel 18 in a northwest to southeast direction. No other PRoW falls within the Application Site, but several footpaths and bridleways terminate at or follow the boundary, having been severed or diverted by construction of the former Air Base. Notably, these include two historic long-

distance routes comprising Aves Ditch at the east along Chilgrove Drive, and Port Way to the west of the former runway.

Surrounding Landscape

3.14 The landscape that surrounds the Application Site is predominantly rural land, within agricultural use interspersed with villages including Fritwell 1.4km to the north, Ardley with Fewcott 0.7km to the northeast, Middleton Stoney 2.2km to the southeast, Caulcott 0.8km to the south, Lower Heyford 1.1km to the southwest, Steeple Aston 2.1km to the west, Middle Aston 2.2km to the west, North Aston 2.7km to the northwest and Somerton 0.9km to the northwest (see **Figure 1**).

3.15 A number of individual houses, farmsteads and hamlets occur between the settlements within approximately a 1km radius of the Application Site, including clockwise from the north: Troy Farm and Troy Cottages, Crossroads Farm, Upton Cottage, Ashgrove Farm, Manor Farm (Middleton Stoney), Letchmere Farm, Leys Farm, Duvall Park Homes, Lime Hollow/The Gorse, Cheesman's Barn, Mudginwell Farm, Village Farm (Somerton) and Portway Cottage.

3.16 Other notable land uses and built form within vicinity of the Application Site include Cherwell Valley Motorway Service Area 1.7km to the northeast and Ardley Quarry/Ardley Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) about 1.2km to the southeast.

3.17 Four Registered Parks and Gardens occur within the wider context of the Application Site including Aynho 3.8km to the north, Middleton Stoney 650m to the southeast, Kirtlington 3.6km to the south and Rousham 2km to the southwest.

3.18 Topographically, the landscape gently slopes to the southeast toward Gagle Brook and south toward Gallos Brook (see **Figure 3**). To the west, the valley of River Cherwell creates a strong landform and separates the Application Site 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.

Landscape Character and Designations

3.19 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 not considered appropriate for the purpose of this assessment.

3.20 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.

Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (undated)

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

3.22 The OWLS assessment classifies four landscape character types within the vicinity of the Application Site (see **Figure 4** Landscape Character Areas):

- 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.

Farmland Plateau LCA

3.23 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."**

3.24 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."**

3.25 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…"**

3.26 In response to the 'forces for change', a number of Landscape Strategy guidelines are 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…"**

3.27 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."**

Wooded Estatelands

3.28 This landscape character type includes land immediately to the southeast of the Application Site and the Farmland Plateau LCA, comprising in this area, the parkland of Middleton Park which is described as:

> **"A wooded estate landscape characterised by arable farming and small villages with strong vernacular character."**

3.29 Key characteristics include:

- "**Rolling topography with localised steep slopes.**
- **Large blocks of ancient woodland and mixed plantations of variable sizes.**
- **Large parklands and mansion houses.**
- **A regularly-shaped field pattern dominated by arable fields.**
- **Small villages with strong vernacular character."**

3.30 Typical land use and vegetation characteristics that apply in the vicinity of the Application Site include:

> **"…This is a well-wooded landscape with large, prominent blocks of ancient semi-natural woodland often located on steeper slopes. In addition, there is a significant number of smaller, mainly mixed plantations that are scattered throughout much of the area and this adds to the overall sense of enclosure…"**

3.31 The description of the Local Character Area C. Middleton Stoney notes the following which applies to the Application Site context:

> **"…Woodland is a strong landscape element, and large woodland blocks are associated with the parklands and estates…Throughout the landscape there are belts of young mixed and coniferous plantations next to roadside hedges and they often function as field boundaries…Hedgerows vary from tall, thick species-rich hedges…to low, gappy, internal field hedges. Parklands are a prominent feature throughout and they include Middleton, Bignell and Tusmore Parks in the north and Kirtlington and Bletchington Parks in the south."**

3.32 The 'landscape strategy' seeks to:

> **"Safeguard and enhance the characteristic landscape of parklands, estates, woodlands, hedgerows and unspoilt villages."**

3.33 Within the guidelines to fulfilling the landscape strategy, it is noted:

- "…**Minimise the visual impact of intrusive land uses such as quarries, landfill sites, airfields and large-scale development, such as new barns and industrial units, with judicious planting of tree and shrub species characteristic of the area. This will help to screen the development and integrate is more successfully with its surrounding countryside.**
- **Maintain the nucleated pattern of settlements and promote the use of building materials and a scale of development and (sic) that is appropriate to this landscape type."**

Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides

3.34 The Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA occupies the east and west facing flanks of the Cherwell Valley, lying immediately to the west of the Application Site and the Farmland Plateau landscape type. It typically comprises:

> **"A Landscape type with prominent slopes within broader valleys. It is occupied by a mixed pattern of pasture and arable land. Long-distant views across the valleys are characteristic."**

3.35 The presence of "small unspoilt villages with rural character" is also noted as a key characteristic of this LCA.

3.36 With regard to land use and vegetation it is noted that:

> **"In places characterised by very steep slopes and steep-sided minor valleys there is a strong pattern of dense hedges, hedgerow trees, small copses and scattered woodland belts. Ash, oak, beech and conifers are the main tree species associated with mixed plantations. This pattern is more noticeable along slopes in the Cotswolds, particularly around Swerford, Great Tew, Steeple Aston, Chipping Norton and Charlbury. There is also some wet woodland, and mature ash and willow fringing watercourses along the valley bottoms creating sense of intimacy and enclosure."**

3.37 With regard to cultural pattern it states:

> **"The settlement pattern is largely characterised by small, rural, unspoilt nucleated villages. There are also a few larger settlements such as Burford and Shipton-under-Wychwood…In places such as Chastleton, Sarsden, Great Tew, Over Worton and Middle Aston, there is the appearance of well-managed estates associated with the distinctive manor houses and small parklands…"**

3.38 A number of local character areas are elaborated upon, which of relevance to this assessment include E. Steeple Aston and F. Lower and Upper Heyford. With regard to E. Steeple Aston, the previously noted landscape characteristics of

agricultural land shaped and influenced by the River Cherwell and its tributaries, and parkland of Middle Aston are reiterated.

3.39 With regard to the landscape character of F. Lower and Upper Heyford it notes 'very intensively managed arable landscape dominated by medium-sized fields…some improved grassland and pony paddocks around villages.' It is also noted that field pattern is weak with gappy hedgerows and scattered trees.

3.40 Forces for Change highlights the detrimental effect of intensive arable farming on hedgerow patterns. It is also noted that whilst the vernacular character is strong in most settlements, there is still a localised impact from modern residential development particularly within Upper Heyford and Steeple Aston, amongst other settlements that are highlighted.

3.41 In response to the 'Forces for Change', a number of Landscape Strategy guidelines are noted to "conserve the intimate pastoral character of the small valleys and rural, unspoilt character of the villages. Strengthen the field pattern where it is weak." Relevant guidelines include:

> **"Maintain the vernacular character of settlements and promote the use of building materials and scale of development and (sic) that is appropriate to this landscape type…"**

River Meadowlands

3.42 This LCA follows a narrow corridor along the valley floor of the River Cherwell and it is considered that the Proposed Development would have a limited potential to significantly affect its character. This is based on the distance, intervening topography of this and the host LCA, and the presence of the former Air Base. As indicated by the ZTV's (see **Appendix 3**) there are limited opportunities for views to be gained. Therefore, River Meadowlands LCA has been excluded from further consideration within the assessment.

Cherwell District Landscape Assessment (1995)

3.43 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.

3.44 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 published assessment. The LCAs, as identified by the Council, are mapped on **Figure 4**.

3.45 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 abutting the Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive junction.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

3.46 The Upper Heyford Plateau LCA is, broadly speaking, located to the east of the River Cherwell. 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.

3.47 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."**

3.48 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.

3.49 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."**

3.50 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 elevated ground. The aforementioned assessment also notes the night time light pollution with the street and security lighting on the former Air Base being visible over long distances.

3.51 Two ancient routes, the Port Way and Aves Ditch, are also noted in the 'Cherwell District Landscape Assessment' as special features, with the former following the alignment of Kirtlington Road which forms the western boundary of parcel 18. Aves Ditch lies to the east and follows the alignment of Chilgrove Drive, truncated by the former Air Base, and then continues to the north along Raghouse Lane through Kennel Copse.

3.52 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 Application Site. Views of the large scale built form within the former Air Base influences 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.

3.53 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 much of 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

3.54 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.

3.55 Changes in local topography are evident with 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."**

3.56 The valley floor is characterised by the meandering course of the River Cherwell with pastoral fields located either side. Riparian vegetation and mature trees line the course of the river and the broadly parallel 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."**

3.57 The Council's 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 views gained from the park. A broad swathe of the Cherwell Valley LCA to the northeast of Rousham Park, to the west of the Application Site, is subject to a heritage designation as Rousham Conservation Area. A number of settlements and vernacular architecture are also mentioned in the published document. Two Scheduled Monuments, namely

Deddington Castle and a deserted medieval village in Somerton, are also identified.

3.58 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 sensitivity to the Proposed Development is considered to be medium.

Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA

3.59 Topographically, this LCA is described as gently undulating and characterised by **"…the extensive remains of eighteen century parklands and estate farmland…"** (paragraph 3.67 of the 'Cherwell District Landscape Assessment').

3.60 The aforementioned document states that this LCA is wooded with trees associated with parklands, dividing and enclosing the landscape. Some distant views exist where breaks in vegetation allows and the document states that arable cultivation is the most common land use. The northern part of this LCA, largely outside of the 5km study area, is less wooded.

3.61 The 'Cherwell District Landscape Assessment' states that there are six distinct areas associated with the 18th century parklands. These have been reviewed as part of the baseline studies of visual receptors. Changes from pastoral to arable agricultural practices are noted in some areas. The surrounding countryside displays a number of characteristics typical for estate farmland such as boundary treatment and tree avenues.

3.62 The remaining part of this LCA is characterised by a patchwork of arable fields and woodlands. Fields tend to be large and open. Woodland belts follow linear features in the landscape such as watercourses, roads and other natural boundaries. To the north of Bicester, the landscape tends to have a strong field pattern with copses and trees and well-maintained hedgerows separating pastoral and arable fields. These pockets of landscape are separated by rolling arable landscape of weak field pattern and a few isolated trees.

3.63 Generally speaking, the landscape is punctuated by small copses and coverts. These landscape features are often associated with parklands that are evident in certain locations.

3.64 This LCA is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory landscape designation. The value of this LCA is therefore considered to be medium. Views of the large scale and tall built form within the former Air Base can be seen from certain parts of this LCA. The presence and audible noise of the M40 also has some influence over the character and appreciation of this LCA. The susceptibility to the Proposed Development is considered to be low. Overall, the sensitivity of the Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA to the Proposed Development is assessed as low.

Other LCAs

3.65 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) plans (see **Appendix 3**) 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 4**) have been excluded from the assessment, namely:

- Cherwell Landscape Assessment (1995) areas Ironstone Hillas and Valleys; and Otmoor Lowlands;
- Northamptonshire Landscape Character Assessment (2010) areas 10a Croughton, Aynho and Farthinghoe Plateau; 13a Middleton Cheney and Woodford Halse; and 17a River Cherwell Floodplain; and
- West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment (1998) areas 2 Ironstone Valleys and Ridges; and 4 Eastern Parks and Valleys.

3.66 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 5km study area including the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal and RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief.

RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal

3.67 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. Figure 8 of the Conservation Area Appraisal subdivides the former Air Base into three functional character areas namely the Flying Field, the Technical Area, and the Residential Area; the Application Site encompasses each of these character areas in whole or part (see **Figure 5: Existing Features**).

3.68 Views out from the southeast and western end of the former runway and two glimpsed views to the north are indicated at Figure 9: Visual analysis of the flying field of the Conservation Area Appraisal. 'Figure 10 Visual analysis of the technical site and officer's housing identifies two views out toward the Flying Field, and three lines of sight along access roads radiating northwest; the former officer's mess (now occupied by Heyford Park Free School) is noted as a positive landmark. 'Figure 11: Visual analysis of the residential area' notes views to the southeast, south and west. Three negative landmarks are noted of which, only the Camp Road Water Tower now remains.

3.69 Part 7: Character Analysis, section 7.1.1 summarises the Flying Field Landscape as:

> **"The general character of the Flying Field is one of open grassland bisected by runways, taxiways and hardstanding.**
>
> **Around the periphery of this open area are strategically located HASs and areas with specific function, some self-contained within their own security fencing; these areas are:**
>
> - **The Quick Reaction Alert Area (Area 1C)**
> - **Northern Bomb Stores and Special Weapons Area (Area 5A)**
> - **The Avionics Maintenance Facility Area (Area 8)**
> - **Southern Bomb Store (Area 4)."**

3.70 Section 7.1.2 describes the Technical Site as being the first area that is accessed off Camp Road after passing through the main gate. This includes original 1920's buildings laid out in a British Military campus style, with 'deliberately sited, low-density, buildings, grassland and organised tree planting'. Three partially tree-lined straight avenues radiate from just north of the main gate and these are 'fronted on either side by a mixture of functional building types. Its character is summarised as:

> **"…The Technical Area, now devoid of aviation-based activity, still retains the attribute of being at the hub of the airbase. Despite the infill buildings something of the organised campus origin of the area remains, overlaid by the successive accretions such as the addition of**

> **standard USA-style fire hydrants. Tall buildings whilst evident do not over-dominate the site; an effect achieved by the spacing of buildings, the tree planting, and distribution and variety of building heights."**

3.71 Section 7.1.3 describes the character of the Residential Zone, for which it 'easily divides into a number of distinct areas which form an array of very different characters'. These sub-character areas are mainly categorised by date and include RAF officer's married residential area at Soden Road and Larsen Road; RAF domestic and residential section to the south of the Technical Area; Airmen's housing and bungalows to the southwest of the Technical Area, and a small pocket to the north of the RAF officers' area; service and recreational area to the west of the Airmen's quarters; and School and other areas of prefabricated buildings to the east of Port Way. Extensive areas of the service and recreational area have now been redeveloped as two-storey housing.

3.72 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."**

3.73 One of the water towers has subsequently been removed. **Chapter 9** of the ES considers the Conservation Area Appraisal in greater depth. Views toward the northern section of the Flying Field and toward the southern edge of the former Air Base are addressed in the LVIA.

RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief (2007)

3.74 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."**

3.75 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 and is therefore of limited use to this assessment and is not considered further.

Night-time Character

3.76 A qualitative visual assessment of obtrusive lighting (sometimes referred to as light pollution) within and around the Application Site was conducted on the evening of 20th September 2017, to review existing light sources and their influence upon night time landscape character in terms of location and extent, type, and effects. For the purposes of this assessment, the following terms are used, as defined by the Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Notes for the reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01, published in 2011 as:

- Sky Glow – the brightening of the night sky;
- Glare – the uncomfortable brightness of a light source when viewed against a darker background; and
- Light Intrusion ("Trespass") the spilling of light beyond the boundary of the property or area being lit.

3.77 The perception of night time sky glow varies with atmospheric conditions as it is caused by a scattering of artificial light by airborne dust and/or water droplets. Weather conditions during the survey were cloudy tending toward light drizzle.

3.78 The qualitative visual assessment showed that dusk and night-time landscape character within the wider study area is influenced by existing sky glow above Heyford Park (contiguous with the Application Site) and Upper Heyford village/Somerton Road, the M40/A43 Junction, Cherwell Valley Services, and Bicester, and to a lesser extent Ardley ERF. The landscapes beyond the larger settlements near the Application Site, especially within the Cherwell Valley to the west, are characteristically darker landscapes, with small clusters of street lights and domestic lighting indicating the settlements of Fritwell, Lower Heyford and the railway station, Steeple Aston and Somerton. Elsewhere, occasional isolated lights indicate a dwelling, farmstead or hamlet.

3.79 The qualitative visual assessment is corroborated by Night Lights mapping published by the Campaign for Rural England (CPRE) website (www.cpre.org.uk)

of light levels expressed as colour banded pixels that show by district the level of radiance (night light which contributes to sky glow) shining up into the night sky. CPRE Night Lights mapping for Cherwell District shows night light at the Application Site radiating from a bright core centred on the Heyford Park residential area (8-16 NanoWatts/cm2/steradian) reducing to 1-2 NanoWatts/cm2/steradian at its edges/Upper Heyford village; the Flying Field falls into a darker zone of 0.5-1 NanoWatts/cm2/steradian. Night Lights recorded for Ardley ERF are similar to those of the Application Site, albeit comprising a smaller more localised source. By contrast, central Bicester and the M40/A43/Cherwell Valley Services area are brighter at 16-32 NanoWatts/cm2/steradian, and much of the Cherwell Valley is darker at 0.25-0.5 NanoWatts/cm2/steradian.

3.80 The qualitative visual assessment observed that lighting from vehicles provides transitory lighting along the roads and lanes, and is most noticeable along routes upon the elevated plateau when observed from Cherwell Valley to the west. Ardley ERF, and vehicular and c.12m high junction lighting of the M40, define the dusk and night-time landscape character when observed from the northeast, east and southeast. The external walls of Ardley ERF are semi-translucent and therefore are illuminated by internal lighting which produces a greenish-white glow that is emitted from the building, and in turn, this glow lights up the exhaust stack; the top of the exhaust stack is marked by a cluster of red aviation warning lights which are seen from long distances at ground level, including from the western bluff of the Cherwell Valley. A tall structure with four sets of vertically mounted aviation lights is visible much further to the southeast (possibly, but unconfirmed as, Didcot Power Station chimney).

3.81 The main sources of light locally around and within the Application Site includes street lighting along Somerton Road at Upper Heyford (c.6m high), Camp Road (c.8-10m high), and the Camp Road/B4030/Chilgrove Drive junction, and residential roads (c.4-7m high) within the existing Heyford Park settlement to the north and south of Camp Road. This lighting includes both high pressure (white-yellow light) and domestic scale low pressure sodium (orange-yellow light). Isolated white security lights occur within the former Flying Field to the north of Camp Road, outside of the residential areas. These sources combine with light emitted from individual buildings, which all contribute to the sky glow although it is noted that new street lighting and sections of replacement street lighting along Camp Road have cut-off luminaires which focus light downwards, minimising sky

glow when compared to the older non-directional low-pressure sodium lanterns. Hedgerows and woodland blocks around and within the periphery of the Application Site provide a 'curtain' that prevents direct effects of light trespass onto adjacent land and the wider countryside.

Visual Receptors

3.82 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.

3.83 Residential receptors fall principally within the frequently occurring settlements, as described above, but individual dwellings, hamlets and isolated farmsteads also occur within the wider landscape. Upper Heyford is the closest settlement to the west of Somerton Road, however views toward the Application Site are limited by prevailing landform within the village and to the east of it. The same may be said of some of the other settlements such as Somerton and Ardley where landform controls the opportunity for views. The availability of views toward the Application Site within each of the settlements is also further limited by the orientation of buildings/windows and presence of intervening buildings or tree canopies. The susceptibility of residential receptors to the Proposed Development from within or without the settlements, 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 is therefore medium. Overall, their sensitivity would be high.

3.84 Residential receptors also occur adjacent to the Application Site boundary consisting of long established and/or recently constructed houses and bungalows within the Heyford Park/former Air Base. As with settlements beyond the former Air Base boundary, the availability of views of the proposed development is controlled by landform, orientation of view and occurrence of intervening built form and vegetation. Residential receptors within Heyford Park, are considered to be less susceptible to the Proposed Development due to the nature of existing land uses and ongoing development, and susceptibility and sensitivity is therefore considered to be medium.

3.85 A number of non-residential visual receptors have been identified through a combination of the desktop studies, site visits and consultation with Cherwell

District Council's Landscape Officer as mapped on **Figure 2**. The identified non-residential visual receptors include places of work, 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 which is further explained in this assessment.

3.86 The local area and settlements are connected by a number of minor roads and 'B' roads which collectively form a relatively dense road network outside of the Cherwell Valley. The B430 is the closest road of this class and is located approximately 820m to the east, connecting Ardley with Middleton Stoney and further south with the A43 to Oxford. The B4030 lies to the south approximately 660m away at its closest point, connecting Lower Heyford with Bicester.

3.87 The M40 is the only motorway in the study area and is located approximately 1.5km to the east. About 1.6km to the northeast of the Application Site, the A43 connects with M40 junction 10 near Ardley and continues north beyond the 5km study area linking with the B4100. The A4095 connects Bicester with Kirtlington and is located approximately 3.8km away at its closest point to the south of the Application Site. The A4260 Oxford Road is located to the west some 3.4km away.

3.88 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 Application Site, in part, can be gained from Ardley Road (Somerton)/Somerton Road (Fewcott), Somerton Road (Upper Heyford), parts of Port Way/Kirtlington Road, the B4030 Lower Heyford Road, Greenway (Caulcott) and glimpses from A4260 Oxford Road. 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.

3.89 Other roads within the agricultural landscape or those within the settlements 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.

3.90 The nearest railway line is the main line between London Marylebone and Birmingham, running on a southeast to northwest alignment just 115m to the east of the Application Site at its closest point. However, it is set within cuttings in the vicinity of the Application Site with a short, tunnelled section of the railway passing between Somerton and Fritwell. Receptors travelling along the Oxford to Banbury (and Birmingham) railway line which follows the River Cherwell valley would have limited opportunities to view the Application Site (see **Figure 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 to any proposed residential dwellings or other built form. 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, and so are not considered further in this assessment.

3.91 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 four registered historic parks and gardens in the 5km study area. Aynho Park is a Grade I Registered Park about 3.8km to the north, Middleton Park is a Grade II Registered Park and is the closest such receptor, located approximately 650m away to the south east; Rousham Park is a Grade I Park and is located approximately 2km to the south-west; and Kirtlington Park, is a Grade II Park located approximately 3.6km away to the south east at its closest point at the A4095.

3.92 As indicated by the ZTV plans (see **Appendix 3**) the Proposed Development is not theoretically visible from Aynho due to intervening landform. Views from Middleton Stoney would be theoretically gained but the vegetation along the B4030 and within the park restricts such views. The Application Site is not theoretically visible from the majority of Rousham Park, and views from Kirtlington Park are screened and distant with the Application Site not being perceptible. 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.

3.93 One public footpath crosses the south-western corner of the Application Site, and other PRoW including footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways run parallel or close to the Application Site boundaries to the north, southeast, west and northwest. Elsewhere, PRoW within the surrounding landscape are frequent with a promoted long-distance route (the Oxford Canal Walk) following the River Cherwell valley floor to the west. 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.

3.94 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 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 south-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 1**). Other promoted long-distance walking routes falling within the study area are the Claude Duval Bridle route and Palladian Way to the southeast.

3.95 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.

3.96 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), but 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 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.

3.97 Close, middle and distant views from within the Application Site as a whole are generally controlled by boundary vegetation, existing built form, and landform within and outside its boundaries. Apart from the eastern end of the former runway, views at all distances from the Flying Field to the north are screened by vegetation within the Application Site along its north-western boundary (although occasional 'slot' views are permitted), and by a dense tree belt adjacent to but outside of the northern boundary. The eastern end of the former runway is more open permitting close, middle and distant views to the north, east and south. All views from the remainder of the Flying Field toward the south are controlled by built form within the southern part of the Technical Area, by existing and ongoing residential development to the north and south of Camp Road, and to a lesser extent by vegetation. Westward middle and distant views are gained from the western end of the former runway across the Cherwell Valley toward its western bluff; much of the valley floor is screened by a combination of convex landform of the eastern bluff and intervening hedgerows and trees thus preventing closer distance views.

3.98 Northward views from parcels 16, 17 and 18 to the south of Camp Road are screened by adjacent development and tree planting. Views to the east are limited to the immediate, close distance by substantial blocks of woodland including The Heath and parkland planting around Middleton Stoney. Views to the south from parcels 16, 17 and 18 are limited to the close and middle distance by topography and vegetation, and views to the west are screened by landform and hedgerow planting along the Port Way, although occasional views are permitted through hedgerow gaps.

3.99 Distinctive retained structures within the former Air Base establish points of orientation in views looking toward the Application Site from the surrounding landscape. These include Camp Road Water Tower and Telecoms Mast, the Radio Mast (adjacent to the Control Tower), various HAS's, Northern Bomb Stores

Watch Tower, Southern Bomb Stores bunkers, and the red brick boiler house chimney in the former School Huts area to the south of Camp Road.

Viewpoint Selection

3.100 A series of screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) plans have been prepared, one for each of the proposed development heights, to aid the assessment and identification of viewpoints by illustrating the potential visibility of the Proposed Development of up to the height assessed, plus an allowance of up to 1.5m ground construction level adjustment. The ZTV represents the so-called 'screened' ZTV whereby existing built form and substantial blocks of vegetation are assigned certain heights and used to model a more realistic representation of the theoretical visibility. It is worth reiterating that small building 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, as unmapped features can control or prevent views locally. The extent of vegetation modelled by the ZTV is included at **Appendix 3**. The theoretical extent of where views may be gained from is shaded yellow on the ZTV's, however, the actual extent of the visibility of the Proposed Development is likely to be smaller than this shaded area (see **Appendix 3**).

3.101 The assessment of landscape and visual effects is informed by a series of twenty-four representative viewpoints shown in conjunction with the ZTV on the 'Zone of Theoretical Visibility & Viewpoint Locations'. The viewpoints have been selected during the site visit to cover publicly accessible 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, and relevant views identified as 'important views' within the Mid Cherwell Draft Neighbourhood Plan. TA number of these viewpoints have been agreed with the Cherwell District Council Landscape Officer, whilst others have been added in response to desk studies and field work.

3.102 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.

3.103 A number of other locations have been visited during the site surveys, 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. Camp Road Water Tower is visible in such views albeit such views are not easily gained when travelling. Views of Camp Road Telecoms Mast 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.

3.104 **Table 2** below lists the representative viewpoints to be assessed and provides information on their location, receptor type, and distance from the Application Site.

3.105 The Flying Field is not presently accessible to the public other than during occasional escorted heritage visits to the Scheduled Monuments and other points of interest. **Table 3** lists viewpoints at three of these locations and additional viewpoints that would be created along the reinstated long-distance recreational Port Way and Aves Ditch routes.

Table 2 Identified viewpoints looking toward Application Site

No.	Viewpoint Name	Location	Approx. Grid C-ordinates	Distance to the Application Site	Receptors
1	Footpath 367/15/10, Tusmore	At point where footpath crosses into second field heading southwest away from road.	455088, 230487	3.8km	PROW and road users
2	East Street, M40 overbridge	At northeast corner of bridge, looking west-southwest	453168, 229783	2.5km	Road users/public realm
3	Footpath 219/8/20, Fritwell	Footpath south of the churchyard stile, at the edge of the tree canopy, looking west-southwest	452465, 229240	1.7km	Residents and PROW in Conservation Area
4	Fritwell Road, Fewcott	Western edge of carriageway at field gate opposite Manor Farm, looking southwest	453696, 228056	900m	Road users/public realm in Conservation Area
5	Bridleway 109/30/10, Ardley	On bridleway to west of Station Road, south of rail overbridge, looking west.	454073, 226718	800m	PROW users
6	Footpath 148/3/10, Bucknell	On footpath, west of Middleton Road rail overbridge, looking northwest.	455560, 225314	2.7km	PROW users
7*	B4030/M40 overbridge, Linkslade	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, on north-eastern edge of M40 overbridge, looking northwest.	454760, 223309	3.4km	Road users

No.	Viewpoint Name	Location	Approx. Grid C-ordinates	Distance to the Application Site	Receptors
8	Heyford Road/Footpath 297/4/10, Middleton Stoney	On northern verge adjacent to overgrown stile, looking northwest	453181, 223683	2.2km	PROW and road users along edge of Registered Park and Garden
9	Aves Ditch Restricted Byway 289/1/20 at Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive	On byway at southern verge of junction adjacent to stile.	452170, 225664	0m	Existing PROW/road users/public realm
10	Footpath 289/5/40 west of Aves Ditch at Gallows Brook	Footpath south of Caulcott, looking north	450488, 223153	2.2km	PROW users
11	Footpath 388/4/40 northwest of Lime Hollow	North of footbridge, looking north	451364, 224965	330m	PROW users
12	Footpath 289/4/10 north of Caulcott	Footpath north of Caulcott, looking north	450789, 224692	640m	PROW users
13	Port Way/B4030 Lower Heyford Road junction	Port Way at field entrance north of B4030 junction.	450016, 224468	900m	Road/PROW users in Conservation Area
14	Tait Drive, Heyford Park	Verge at southern end of Tait Drive looking northwest	450903, 225364	0m	Existing residents
15	Somerton Road/Mill Lane (Barley Mow PH) junction	South western pavement at junction of Somerton Road and Mill Lane, adjacent to the Barley Mow pub.	449870, 226109	300m	Residents/road users in village
16	Rousham Park, Dying Gladiator Statue	North east and behind of the sculpture, looking northeast.	447763, 224432	2.5km	Visitors to Registered Park and Garden in Conservation Area

No.	Viewpoint Name	Location	Approx. Grid C-ordinates	Distance to the Application Site	Receptors
17*	The Dickredge, Steeple Aston	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, at eastern end of lane before field gate, looking east.	447726, 225665	2.2km	Residents and PROW users
18	Footpath 364/6/20, Steeple Aston	Footpath north of The Eyecatcher and Cow Lane, looking east.	448225, 226166	1.7km	PROW users, representative of views from The Eyecatcher, an outlying part of Rousham Registered Park and Garden and in Conservation Area
19*	Public footpath 296/8/10, Middle Aston	Representative of Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, from close to footpath northeast of Fir Lane, looking southeast	447647, 227012	2.2km	PROW users/occupants of Middle Aston House
20	Middle Aston Lane, south of North Aston	From the grass verge near Warren Lodge, looking southeast.	447473, 227801	2.7km	Road and PROW users
21	St Mary's Walk/Footpath 310/12/10, North Aston	From upper edge of car parking area south of St Mary's Church, looking southeast.	448053, 228847	2.8km	Residents and road users in Conservation Area

No.	Viewpoint Name	Location	Approx. Grid C-ordinates	Distance to the Application Site	Receptors
22*	Water Street, Somerton	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, from southern edge of road midway between River Cherwell and Oxford Canal adjacent to field gate, looking south	449591, 229031	1.6km	Road users
23	Ardley Road, Somerton	From Fritwell Road where a field gate permits glimpsed southwest views.	450268, 228481	800m	Road users
24*	Mill Lane, Kirtlington	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, from northern edge of carriageway where hedge dips locally, looking north-northeast.	449762, 219891	5.5km	Users of bridleway and track

* Position interpreted from low resolution mapping of published Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C.

Table 3 Proposed Representative Viewpoints within Application Site

No.	Viewpoint Name	Location	Approximate grid co-ordinates	Receptors
A	Avionics Building, building #299	North of Avionics building looking northeast	450416, 226050	Visitors to Scheduled Monument
B	Reinstated Bridleway, Port Way	Proposed Port Way route (extending north of bridleway 388/1/20) at centre of former runway looking east	450250, 226530	Users of proposed reinstated PROW
C	Quick Reaction Alert (QRA) Area	Southeast corner of Quick Reaction Alert Area, close to building #3004, looking southeast	450897, 226923	Visitors to Scheduled Monument
D	Northern Bomb Stores	Entrance gate to Northern Bomb Stores, looking south	452037, 227184	Visitors to Scheduled Monument
E	Reinstated Aves Ditch	Proposed Aves Ditch route, north of former runway, looking southwest	453048, 227166	Users of proposed reinstated PROW
F	Reinstated Bridleway Aves Ditch/Chilgrove Drive	Northern end of Aves Ditch/Chilgrove Drive, looking north	452367, 226455	Proposed reinstated PROW users

4. ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

4.1 This assessment assumes as a 'worst case' that the whole of the Application Site will be developed simultaneously with the proposed built form at varying development heights ranging from 5m, 10.5m, 13m, 18m and 30m in height (with + or – 1.5m development platform) as shown on planning application drawing P16-0631-08, Sheet 02: **Building Heights Parameter Plan**. 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 than others.

Impacts, Magnitude and Significance of Effects during Construction

4.2 The construction phase would require removal of the existing disused buildings, and structures to be demolished as shown on as shown on planning application drawing P16-0631-34: **Demolition and Change of Use Plan**. Other features within the demolition zones such as roads and other existing infrastructure including lamp posts, road signs, and localised vegetation would be cleared where appropriate. The planning application seeks outline permission for the Proposed Development and therefore development of each parcel would be subject to approval of detailed design under Reserved Matters applications. Similarly, the extent of vegetation removal would be subject to Arboricultural Impact Assessments (AIA) to be submitted in support of the Reserved Matters applications, which would guide detailed design and minimise tree loss.

4.3 Demolition and construction activity potentially evident on the Application Site would include:

- Temporary construction compound(s) and security fencing/hoarding;
- Temporary site offices and cabins;
- Demolition of buildings and structures listed in Schedule 1;
- Removal of non-retained vegetation;
- Temporary protective fencing to retained landscape elements including trees, hedgerows and grassland;
- Excavation and construction of foundations, roads, footways and footings;
- Temporary storage of topsoil and bulk materials;
- Temporary construction vehicle, machinery and plant storage;
- Excavations for underground services and utilities;
- Vehicle and plant movements (including high-reach equipment such as cranes);

- Construction lighting;
- Construction of buildings; and
- Reinstatement of areas following completion of construction phase.

4.4 Construction activity would extend over the development parcels and would be seen in the context of the built form already present within the Flying Field, Technical Area and adjoining old and new housing including both Heyford Park Free School sites. The construction activity would be temporary in nature, therefore the resulting effects from such activity would likewise be temporary.

Landscape Elements

Topography, Land Form and Drainage

4.5 The topography appears to be simple with land sloping gently away from the plateau. There would potentially be a requirement for localised changes of + or - 1.5m to the contour levels across the development parcels during the construction phase to accommodate building platforms, roads and other structural elements. However, such changes to topography and land form would be kept to a minimum and the overall perception of the relative landform and the profile of the Application Site would be retained in the wider context.

4.6 With a low sensitivity and low magnitude of change there would be a negligible and not significant effect on topography and land form as the perception of the relatively flat terrain and its relationship with the surrounding landscape would be unchanged.

4.7 Existing drainage features and structures, comprising engineered water holding tanks, would be retained where practicable, and protected throughout the construction phase. The value of these tanks in terms of landscape elements is low and therefore localised tank removal would lead to no more than negligible magnitude of change, resulting in a negligible significance of effect (see also **ES Chapter 8** for assessment of ecological effects).

Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure

4.8 With the exception of the relocated car processing area, the land use within proposed development parcels would be temporarily changed to construction sites and compounds during the construction phase.

4.9 Demolition of various buildings and structures would be necessary to enable implementation of the proposed development (see **planning application**

drawing P16-0631-34: Demolition and Change of Use Plan). These structures are confined to the Technical Area, Southern Bomb Stores, Christmas Tree area, and southeast of the Avionics Building which includes small and medium scale structures; no buildings or structures would be demolished to the north of the former runway. A number of the northern HASs would be subject to a change of use thus increasing activity levels, but these would be in keeping with ongoing employment activities within the Flying Field.

4.10 Miscellaneous structures would be removed that have a small footprint, mass and height and are of low sensitivity. Many of these structures are not visible from publicly accessible locations and, even collectively, their loss would lead to a negligible magnitude of change upon the prevailing landscape character due to their immediate landscape context and/or dispersed nature.

4.11 A few individual medium-sized structures of medium to low sensitivity in landscape terms would also be demolished/removed that would have a low magnitude of change upon the character of their immediate context only. These structures include two warehouse buildings numbers 151 and 315 in parcel 19 and 20, respectively. Notably, a number of demolitions would be required in the area to the north of Chilgrove Drive, encompassing part of the SBS including 13 of the 52 munitions bunkers, and to the northwest, two of the earth-banked petrol, oil and lubricant (POL) stores (POLs 25a and 25b). A further earth-banked POL, POL2, within parcel 10 is to be demolished as shown on the Demolition and Change of Use Plan. However, potentially POL2 may be retained and incorporated into the Green Infrastructure network. Of the buildings to be demolished, only POL2 is visible from the publicly accessible Camp Road; all others are within the core of the Technical Area or are obscured by vegetation along Chilgrove Drive.

4.12 Overall. It is considered that the magnitude of change upon land use and built form arising from demolition of such medium scale structures within parcels 10, 11, 19, 20, 22 and 23 is tempered by their immediate built context resulting in low magnitude of change. With medium to low sensitivity and low magnitude of change the significance of effect within the context of the former Air Base would be minor to negligible.

Green Infrastructure

4.13 The retention of existing vegetation where practicable within and along the boundaries of the development parcels would help ensure that the effects of the construction activity are confined to the Application Site and would potentially be experienced from very limited locations within the surrounding landscape.

4.14 Locally, areas of grassland and shrub planting would be lost during construction within all development parcels, apart from parcels 16, 17 and 18 which are in arable use and are therefore routinely disturbed by cultivation. Grassland and shrubs to be retained would be protected during construction works by the use of temporary fencing that would be implemented in accordance with the CEMPs. In terms of Green Infrastructure and landscape amenity, such features are of low sensitivity and their loss would be of a low to negligible magnitude of effect (see also **Chapter 9**: Ecology for effects upon habitats and biodiversity). With a low sensitivity and low magnitude of effect, the significance of effect during construction would be minor.

4.15 However, in order to accommodate the Proposed Development some elements of the existing vegetation would need to be removed to be agreed with Cherwell District Council's Tree Officer and itemised within AIA's that would accompany the Reserved Matters applications. Accordingly, it is assumed that tree loss would be minimised through the AIA's leading to no more than a low magnitude of change. Trees are considered to be of a high sensitivity and therefore a low magnitude of change would lead to a moderate significance of effect locally during construction; it should be noted that in due course, this effect of moderate significance would be offset and enhanced by proposed planting as described below.

4.16 The Application Site development parcels, other than Chilgrove Drive and parcel 18, are not publicly accessible. One PROW (footpath 388/4) within the southwest corner of the Application Site (parcel 18) would be affected temporarily during construction of the sports pitches, however, it is proposed to permanently divert the footpath around the southern and western edges of this parcel. The diverted footpath would remain open throughout the construction works, resulting in a low to medium magnitude of change. Public rights of way are of a high sensitivity and therefore a low to medium magnitude of change would lead to a temporary, major to moderate significance of effect (permanent effects arising from the footpath diversion are considered under operational effects, below).

4.17 The future baseline includes public access along the Port Way as it crosses the Flying Field, which would be opened prior to the start of Proposed Development construction. The reinstatement of Port Way PROW has been enabled by ongoing development within Heyford Park, and views are gained from it within the context of existing and recent developments and built form. Users of the reinstated Port Way are therefore considered to have, at most, medium sensitivity to the Proposed Development. Views of the construction activities would be gained in the context of the existing buildings with at most a medium magnitude of change occurring. Medium sensitivity and medium magnitude of change would lead to a temporary, moderate significance of effect.

4.18 Reinstatement of Aves Ditch is anticipated to occur in the early phases of the Proposed Development following construction of the realigned Chilgrove Drive and therefore the effects of construction activities upon PROW users is assessed. The reinstatement of Aves Ditch PROW will be enabled by the Proposed Development, and views are gained from it within the context of existing and recent developments and built form. Users of the reinstated Aves Ditch are therefore considered to have, at most, medium sensitivity to the Proposed Development. Views of the construction activities would be gained in the context of the new road and existing buildings with at most a medium magnitude of change occurring. Medium sensitivity and medium magnitude of change would lead to a temporary, moderate significance of effect.

Landscape Character and Designations

4.19 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.

Farmland Plateau LCA

4.20 The Application Site, apart from the junction of Chilgrove Drive with Camp Road) falls within the Farmland Plateau LCA, sub area H. Fritwell, as described in the OWLS, and displays characteristics of the Farmland (and Fritwell) Plateau a described by OWLS.

4.21 Ongoing construction of the Proposed Development would retain the key characteristics of this LCA with no direct effects beyond the former Air Base boundary to the north of Camp Road. Only three localised areas lying beyond the former Air Base boundary to the south of Camp Road would be subject to direct

effects, of which two are within the Policy Villages 5 allocated land (parcel 16 and 17); parcel 18 lies outside the Policy Villages 5 allocation. Beyond the Application Site boundary, only temporary, limited indirect effects upon views would occur during the construction phase.

4.22 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 north, south, east and west of the Application Site, Camp Road (east), B4030 Lower Heyford Road and Port Way (Kirtlington Road). Views of the construction works would be limited by orientation of view, intervening landform, vegetation and buildings.

4.23 Overall, there would be a negligible magnitude of change upon this LCA as a whole 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.

Wooded Estatelands LCA

4.24 This LCA lies to the east of the Farmland Plateau LCA, and is separated from the Application Site by woodland and a network of hedgerows with trees. No direct effects would therefore arise from ground level construction activities within the Application Site, and indirect perceptual changes would be limited by the well-treed character of this LCA to glimpses of tall construction plant such as cranes. The sensitivity of this LCA, is medium 'in the round' and the magnitude of effect would be negligible, aided by the wooded nature of this LCA which limits the availability and extent of views. The effect of construction activities on this LCA is therefore negligible.

Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA

4.25 This LCA occupies the flanks of the Cherwell Valley to the west of the Application Site. 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, other than indirect effects arising from glimpsed views of high level construction plant (cranes) seen in the context of former Air base structures, and so its perception would be largely preserved.

4.26 Overall, the construction activities would result in a negligible magnitude of change upon the Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA which is of medium sensitivity, leading to an effect of negligible significance.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

4.27 The Council's published landscape character 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 varies locally within this LCA with views gained from the south of the existing residential and associated uses, and/or ongoing construction activities, within Heyford Park. Views from the east and northeast are toward the SBS, whilst elsewhere views are limited by landform and tree and hedgerow vegetation.

4.28 Ongoing construction of the Proposed Development would retain the key characteristics of this LCA with no direct effects beyond the former Air Base boundary to the north of Camp Road. Only parcels 16 and 17 that are within the Policy Villages 5 allocation, and parcel 18 which lies outside the Policy Villages 5 allocation, would be subject to direct effects outside of the former Air Base to the south of Camp Road. Beyond the Application Site boundary, only temporary, limited indirect effects upon views would occur during the construction phase and so offsite effects would be perceptual only.

4.29 As assessed above the topography of the Application Site would be largely preserved with potential for limited changes of up to 1.5m. 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. Retained trees and hedgerows within the Application Site and around its boundaries would help to preserve the current perception of enclosure.

4.30 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 residential receptors within Heyford Park adjacent to development parcels, several of which are in turn recent additions to the landscape, whilst elsewhere topography, buildings, hedgerows and trees would limit views.

4.31 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 Lower Heyford Road, Port Way, and Camp Road. This is mostly due to the relative openness of the southern, southeast and eastern areas of the Application Site.

4.32 Overall, it is assessed that the construction activities on the largely brownfield site 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

4.33 The majority of the Application Site is separated from the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA by a strip of land which is in either agricultural use or Upper Heyford community uses (Village Hall, Recreation Ground and allotments). The western tip of the former runway is mapped as falling within this LCA, although it displays characteristics more akin to the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA; nonetheless, this area would not be subject to change as part of the Proposed Development.

4.34 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 notes particular characteristics associated with the valley floor and water meadows, which form a 'pleasingly patterned landscape' with overgrown hedgerows and hedgerow trees. Views from Rousham Park along the valley are also mentioned.

4.35 As identified during site visits there are limited opportunities to gain views towards the Application Site due to landform and vegetation cover. 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 hedgerows and amongst the tree canopies.

4.36 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.

4.37 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 negligible.

Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA

4.38 This LCA lies directly to the east of the Farmland Plateau LCA, following Aves Ditch to the south of Camp Road and therefore the Application Site boundary falls just within this LCA at the junction of Camp Road and Aves Ditch.

4.39 The proposed road junction would have very localised effects upon the character of the wider LCA arising from construction of the Proposed Development, which would be temporary in nature. The sensitivity of this LCA, is low 'in the round' and the magnitude of effect would be negligible, aided by the wooded nature of this LCA which limits the availability and extent of views. The effect of construction activities on this LCA is therefore negligible and not significant.

Night-time Character

4.40 Construction lighting would be temporary and discrete, depending upon the location and nature of the structures under construction, and therefore the visibility of lighting of individual parcels during construction would be restricted and tend to be locally visible only, seen in the context of Heyford Park and the former Air base employment uses to the north of the runway. Construction lighting design and operation would be in accordance with the principles, guidance and assumptions set out in **Chapter 4** of the ES, and would be implemented and controlled through individual CEMPs. Overall, it is considered

that effects arising from lighting of construction activities would be localised and temporary, leading to a low magnitude of effects with no greater than minor significance.

Visual Amenity

Visual Receptors

4.41 The following provides an overview of the visual amenity of residents, PROW and public roads within the study area, and the visual amenity of residents in close proximity to the development parcels which sets the context of the individual viewpoint assessments presented at **Appendix 4: Photoviews** and summarised under Representative Viewpoints. As series of computer generated visualisations have also been prepared for representative viewpoints and are presented at **Appendix 5: Photomontages**.

4.42 Established vegetation adjacent to the northern edge of the Flying Field and intervening landform (the former runway forms an intermediate 'ridge' of high ground within the Application Site) would restrict views from residential properties within Somerton, Fritwell and isolated residential properties between these settlements, PROW and roads to the north toward ground and low-level construction activities within the development parcels. Tall plant such as cranes may be visible above intervening vegetation and land form but this would comprise a very small and temporary element within the overall view leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect. With high sensitivity (residential and PROW) and medium sensitivity (roads), the magnitude and significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible and no mitigation would be required.

4.43 Views from residential properties in Ardley with Fewcott, and at Ashgrove Farm toward ground level construction activities in the eastern part of the Application Site would be screened by intervening vegetation and built form (including retained SBS bunkers). Partial views may be gained by PROW users and short sections of Camp Road (east) toward ground level construction activities in parcels 22 and 23, and the roadworks along Chilgrove Drive. Cranes and tall plant may be visible, to varying degrees, by all receptors to the east. With high sensitivity (residential) and medium sensitivity (roads), the significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible. No mitigation would be required.

4.44 Views toward low level construction activities within parcels 16, 17, 18, 32W and 34 to the south of Camp Road from residential properties (high sensitivity) within Caulcott, Lime Hollow, Field Barn, Cheesman's Barn and Fir Tree Farm, would be screened by intervening landform and hedgerows/hedgerow trees, as would views from the B4030 Lower Heyford Road (medium sensitivity). Views that may be gained by PROW users (high sensitivity) to the south of the Application Site would vary according to intervening land form, vegetation and proximity of the viewpoint leading to open, partial or screened views of ground level construction activities, leading to a medium to low magnitude of effect and moderate but not significant effects due to existing developments to the north. Footpath 388/4 would be diverted around the southern and eastern edges of parcel 18, and therefore the magnitude of effect is considered to be high, but it would be set within a landscaped corridor adjacent to sports pitches and so the residual effect would be moderate but not significant. Tall construction plant within the above-mentioned parcels and parcels to the north of Camp Road may be visible from each of these receptors, but would be seen in the context of existing Heyford Park development and former Air Base structures, leading in the round to negligible magnitude of effects and significance.

4.45 Views from residential properties in Upper and Lower Heyford, and Steeple Aston, Middle Aston, and North Aston (collectively, 'The Astons'), PROW and roads within the Cherwell Valley toward ground level construction activities in the western part of the Application Site would be screened by intervening land form, vegetation and/or built form. Views from Somerton Road toward the development parcels are screened by intervening landform. Tall plant such as cranes may be visible above intervening vegetation and land form but this would comprise a very small and temporary element within the overall view leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect. With high sensitivity (residential and PROW) and medium sensitivity (roads), the significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible and no mitigation would be required.

4.46 Residents within those parts of Heyford Park that lie adjacent to the Proposed Development parcels, and neighbouring residential properties at Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes that fall within close proximity to the development parcels, would have open and direct views of the ground level construction activities. Many of these properties have been recently constructed, or are associated with proposed cumulative site developments, and therefore are considered to have medium sensitivity to construction activities. With medium

sensitivity and high magnitude of effect the significance would be major to moderate. All construction works would be subject to CEMPs for each parcel to minimise adverse effects, including the use of solid site hoardings where appropriate.

Rousham Park

4.47 Views from Rousham House and Garden would be largely screened by intervening landform and vegetation, with limited views gained from two locations. Tall plant such as cranes would not be visible from the majority of the gardens and parkland, but they may be visible from the two identified locations above intervening vegetation and land form and would comprise a very small and temporary element within the overall view leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect. With high sensitivity, the significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible and no mitigation would be required.

Viewpoints

4.48 A detailed assessment of visual effects upon the identified viewpoints during the construction stage of the Proposed Development is included **Appendix 5**.

4.49 In summary, receptors present at eighteen of the representative comprising Viewpoints 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15-17 (including Rousham Park), and 20-24 would be subject to negligible and/or negligible (no change) effects due to the screening effect of land form, intervening vegetation and/or built form.

4.50 Viewpoint 13, which is representative of fleeting views gained by road users of medium sensitivity at the junction B4030 Lower Heyford Road/Port Way (Kirtlington Road), would experience a low magnitude of effect resulting in an effect of minor significance.

4.51 Five receptors including Viewpoints 5, 9, 12, 18 and 19 would experience a magnitude of effect ranging from low to high. The effects would be tempered by existing development within Heyford Park and the former Air Base that provides context for the proposed construction activities. Overall this would lead to moderate but not significant effects for each of these viewpoints.

4.52 One representative viewpoint, Viewpoints 14, at Tait Drive currently overlooks the agricultural land of parcel 16, albeit through the boundary security fence with glimpses of Heyford Park development to the northwest. The proposed

construction works would be conducted in accordance with the CEMP and site hoardings are likely to be erected to screen ground level construction activities. Nonetheless, due to the close proximity and high to medium change in view experienced by this receptor of high sensitivity, it is considered that the significance of effect would be major.

Proposed Viewpoints

4.53 Six proposed viewpoints (Viewpoints A to F) within the Flying Field have been assessed. These include three future baseline viewpoints (Viewpoints B, E and F) from the reinstated Port Way and Aves Ditch PROW; the reinstated Port Way would be open to the public prior to construction, and Aves Ditch would be reinstated at an early stage of the Proposed Development. The sensitivity of these receptors is tempered by the built form and context of the former Air Base and Heyford Park and is at most, medium. The magnitude of change would be medium leading to moderate and not significant effects being experienced by these PROW users during construction.

4.54 It is assumed that the proposed viewpoints (Viewpoints A, C and D) would have limited public accessibility until completion of the construction works. The magnitude of change would be medium to negligible leading to moderate and not significant effects being experienced during construction.

Impacts, Magnitude and Significance of Effects during Operational Phase

4.55 Permanent elements of the Proposed Development, as defined on the Composite Parameter Plan (see planning application drawing P16-0631_08 Sheet No. 01) that are of most relevance to landscape and visual matters are those that relate to:

- The location and height of the proposed built 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 vacant or under-used buildings and brownfield sites with high quality mixed-use development.

4.56 Mixed use developments of the nature proposed 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 proposed structures and street lighting; and
- Relationship to the scale and nature of the existing landscape and development context.

4.57 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, Land Form and Drainage

4.58 No further changes would be made to the topography, land form or drainage regime of the Application Site post construction.

4.59 New sustainable drainage systems (SUDS), introduced as part of the construction works, would be enhanced with appropriate planting to establish new landscape elements such as ponds and swales that mature during the operation of the proposed development. These would primarily fulfil the required drainage function, but would be located, designed and integrated within the proposed Green Infrastructure to enhance amenity and ecological objectives. New landscape elements would be created by the SUDS, leading to a positive change of low magnitude, resulting in a beneficial minor significance of effect across the Application Site as a whole.

Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure

4.60 Prevailing employment uses within the Flying Field to the north of the runway would be maintained, other than localised changes of use (bringing vacant buildings into re-use), and variable temporary filming uses with the Quick Response Alert area, Northern Bomb Stores and the eastern third of the Flying Field (including the retained Southern Bomb Stores area), collectively parcels 24, 27E and 27W. The former would be in keeping with employment uses already established to the north of the runway, and the latter would expand upon existing temporary filming uses; the proposed filming uses would be subject to development and approval of specific method statements in accordance with an overarching filming strategy to be developed as part of the s.106 commitment.

4.61 Existing car processing employment uses would be retained on site centred on the southern taxiway, although the extent of this area would be rationalised and shifted further to the west (parcel 25).

4.62 Comprehensive land use changes would occur between the runway and camp Road, encompassing the Technical Area and swathes of the Flying Field, and to the south of the former Air Base on partly allocated greenfield land within parcels 16, 17 and 18. These land uses would, on the whole, expand existing residential, education, employment and service uses that comprise Heyford Park. Specifically, proposed residential, uses would be established within parcels 10, 11, 12E and 12W, 13, 16, 17, 23 and 35; other residential use would include mixed residential/employment (e.g. health care, retail and service, and offices etc.) established in parcels 20, 21 and 38; and, extra care dwellings would be provided in parcel 19.

4.63 New larger scale employment uses would be introduced within commercial scale units adjacent to and/or appended to the retained HASs within the 'Christmas Tree' area to form the Creative City (parcel 22, including Energy Facility); smaller scale employment would be provided within the existing building of parcel 37.

4.64 Education uses within parcels 32W and 32E allow for expansion of existing school place provision, whilst parcel 31 would provide a new primary school within retained and repurposed Air Base structures. Sports park provision and complementary community uses would be provided within parcels 18 and 34, respectively, to the southwest of parcel 32W.

4.65 Major recreational land uses would be provided by the creation of a Flying Field Park in parcel 28 that would provide open public access to the previously inaccessible Flying Field, and the smaller adjacent Control Tower Park (parcel 30) that would generally be open to the public but with opportunities to hold private events; the Control Tower would be refurbished accordingly for commercial and community uses.

4.66 Co-ordinated tourism uses would be established within parcel 29 to broaden the existing tourism provision of Heyford Park. A distinctive feature of this would be the construction of a 30m high Viewing Tower adjacent to the runway at the northeast corner of the Flying Field Park; a small facilities building would be provided adjacent to the tower.

4.67 Finally, parcel 33 encompasses Chilgrove Drive which would be realigned and upgraded to form a new eastern access for all vehicles; the existing Chilgrove Drive would be retained and refurbished, thus reinstating the historic Aves Ditch bridleway.

4.68 The proposed land uses, built form and infrastructure would create a high quality, cohesive urban form and would be delivered through Reserved Matters applications and associated detailed design. The proposed land uses would be sympathetic to existing patterns and scale of built form, with larger scale structures emphasising the hierarchy of spaces and overall legibility. On balance, it is considered that in terms of the effects upon landscape elements, the magnitude and significance of any adverse changes that would arise from implementation and operation of the Proposed Development would be offset by beneficial effects arising from it, leading to an overall neutral effect.

Green Infrastructure

4.69 Proposed Green Infrastructure (see **Green Infrastructure Strategy**) would provide a comprehensive network of inter-linked landscape corridors, buffers and local open spaces. Notably, the Green Infrastructure Strategy would create two substantial public open spaces for the enjoyment of the wider Heyford Park and Cherwell District community, comprising Flying Field Park and Control Tower Park which would open up public access to parts of the Flying Field for the first time.

4.70 Landscaped buffer strips and corridors would be established along the eastern end of the Flying Field (parcel 27E) and the southern boundaries of parcels 16 and 18 within which the reinstated Aves Ditch bridleway would be routed; a feature of parcel 17 would be the creation of a community orchard and allotment gardens; and a new hedgerow with strategic gaps to permit controlled eastward views across the Flying Field, and westward views across the Cherwell Valley would be established along the western side of the reinstated Port Way PROW. Existing planting along the southern edge of parcel 23 would be retained and enhanced with new native tree planting.

4.71 Additional tree and shrub planting and amenity grassland would be introduced to enhance the setting of the Proposed Development and to screen existing key structures such as the Avionics Building, northwest of parcel 10. Tree planting is also proposed along the green corridors which form the principal circulation routes within the Application Site such as Trident Way. As previously noted, SUDS

provision would be incorporated into the Green Infrastructure and designed and managed to enhance landscape amenity and biodiversity whilst fulfilling its primary drainage function.

4.72 Parcel 18 would establish a new sports park comprising a variety sports pitches and courts (e.g. football, rugby, hockey, tennis etc.). Elsewhere, informal play requirements would be fulfilled by the provision of equipped children's play facilities (various age groups) and fitness equipment appropriately located within the inter-linked landscape corridors and buffers.

4.73 As previously noted, reinstatement of Aves Ditch and Port Way and creation of a network of routes by means of the Green Infrastructure Strategy would improve connectivity to the wider PROW network.

4.74 In summary, proposed tree planting would markedly increase the number of trees within the Application Site compared to the existing situation. Provision of a comprehensive Green Infrastructure network would filter and enhance screening of views toward the Proposed Development, create a transition between with the external boundaries of the Application Site and surrounding landscape, provide enhanced recreational opportunities for the Heyford Park and wider community, and improve landscape amenity across the Application Site as a whole. Overall, this would lead to a high to medium positive magnitude of change upon Green Infrastructure elements of high to low sensitivity, resulting in a significance of major to moderate beneficial.

Landscape Character

Farmland Plateau LCA

4.75 The Proposed Development would 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', although conversely this would lead to perception of an increased development density within the former Air Base.

4.76 Proposed landscape management of existing vegetation within the Application Site and proposed new planting particularly along the eastern and southern edges (parcels 16, 17, 18, 23, 27, 33), and adjacent to the reinstated Port Way PROW 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.

4.77 The Application Site encompasses and therefore limits Proposed Development to the former Air Base, other than parcels 16, 17, 18 and 34 that lie beyond the security fence. The Green Infrastructure Strategy seeks to retain existing vegetation where appropriate (i.e. healthy, viable hedgerows and trees), including hedgerows and trees within and along the boundaries of parcels 16, 17 and 18, although short lengths of hedgerow would be removed to create road access and/or developable parcels (parcel 34). Therefore, the loss of landscape features or elements outside of the former Air Base that contribute to the character of the LCA would be negligible.

4.78 The Proposed Development limits development height and scale across the proposed parcels 10.5m and 13m, with taller commercial buildings of up to 18m high limited to parcels 22 and 35, with the latter emphasising the Village Centre and forming a gateway to the Flying Field. The 30m Viewing Tower would fulfil its function as a focal point, but its perceived height would be tempered by its relatively isolated position, land form and perspective. For much of the Application Site, the proposed residential buildings 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 be less apparent in views from the Cherwell Valley.

4.79 The Proposed Development would therefore exert both positive and negative effects upon the achievement of the Landscape Strategy for, and a low magnitude of effect upon, the Farmland Plateau. With medium sensitivity, the effects would be minor adverse and beneficial, leading to an overall neutral effect in the context of this LCA.

Wooded Estatelands LCA

4.80 The Proposed Development would not have any direct effects upon this LCA, and indirect effects would be restricted to perceptual changes gained from PROW and roads. The sensitivity of this LCA, is medium 'in the round' and the magnitude of effect would be negligible, aided by the wooded nature of this LCA which limits the availability and extent of views. The effect on this LCA is therefore negligible at Years 1 and 15.

Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA

4.81 The Proposed Development would not have any direct effects upon this LCA, and indirect effects would be restricted to potential views gained from the western flanks of the Cherwell Valley where orientation of view and locally occurring vegetation permit. The magnitude of change at Year 1 would be negligible, which would give rise to negligible significance of effects, with visibility of development parcels being tempered by distance and juxtaposition with existing development within the Application Site, the surrounding landscape, and the complexity of the wider panorama. By Year 15, proposed structure planting adjacent to the reinstated Port Way route and at the western end of the runway would be well-established, completing the vegetated horizon and screening lower parts of the Proposed Development. The effect on this LCA is therefore negligible at Years 1 and 15.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

4.82 The Proposed Development would be located within the existing boundaries of the former Air Base except for parcels 16, 17, 18 and 34 which fall within land allocated for development under Policy Villages 5, and therefore it would occupy brownfield land with smaller, localised, greenfield land parcels. In landscape character terms there would be little change with the area continuing to be characterised by built form albeit of different type, heights 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 at Heyford Park that have already influenced the character 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 and adjacent to the Application Site already characterises views gained, and influences the perception of the surrounding landscape.

4.83 There would be limited loss of agricultural land 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. This would be enhanced by proposed removal of the chain link security fence to the south of Camp Road (see planning application drawing **P16-0631_65 Existing and Proposed Fence Plan**) and establishment of landscape planting along the eastern and southern boundaries of the Application Site; adjacent to Port Way

PROW and the western tip of the runway; and, green corridors within the development.

4.84 The Proposed Development would therefore exert both positive and negative effects upon the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA at Year 1 and Year 15. With medium sensitivity overall, and low sensitivity in proximity to the Application Site boundaries, the effects would be minor adverse and beneficial, leading to an overall neutral effect in the context of this LCA.

Cherwell Valley LCA

4.85 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.

4.86 As indicated on the ZTV plans (**Appendix 3**) there would be areas within this LCA where parts of the Proposed Development could be theoretically visible. In reality, such views are generally limited to the open countryside on the upper western 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 Proposed Development adding to the current level of sky glow. This would however be seen as part of the sky glow associated with the Upper Heyford (particularly Somerton Road), Heyford Park, and the former Air Base including existing lighting along Camp Road.

4.87 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 extend the perceived envelope of the built form along the horizon. 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 Year 15 by the proposed Green Infrastructure. The magnitude of change and significance of effect at Year 1 and Year 15 is considered to be negligible.

Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA

4.88 The proposed signalised Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive road junction would have minimal direct and indirect effects upon the character of the wider LCA at Year 1, which would be well contained by the wooded nature of this LCA. By Year 15 proposed landscape planting would be well-established, thus replacing and enhancing vegetation cover appropriate to this LCA context. The sensitivity of this LCA, is medium 'in the round' and the magnitude of effect would be negligible, aided by the wooded nature of this LCA which limits the availability and extent of views. The effect on this LCA is therefore negligible at Years 1 and 15.

Night-time Character

4.89 The Proposed Development would intensify land uses within the Application Site, although this would remain within the envelope of the former Air Base to the north and south of Camp Road, and/or in accordance with Policy 5 Villages, would extend the footprint of built development into agricultural land west of Tait Drive and east of the Village Centre (south). The Proposed Development would also change the character of some areas north of Camp Road by replacing technical air base structures and spaces (Southern Bomb Stores in part, former taxiways and hangers etc.) with commercial, residential and other associated uses such as education.

4.90 The Proposed Development would require appropriate levels of external lighting to ensure safe passage along vehicular and pedestrian circulation routes, and to provide night time legibility for occupants and visitors to the site. Although the proposed development would therefore evidently give rise to additional levels of night time lighting, and be visible from surrounding areas, it would be seen within the context of, and be contiguous with, existing lighting at Heyford Park.

4.91 Low-key external and street lighting would be provided where practicable on minimum height columns with appropriate types of luminaries utilised to ensure that obtrusive light is minimised by focusing light downwards to limit sky glow, light trespass and glare. Feature lighting may be appropriate for key buildings, but this would be designed to provide emphasis at a local level whilst minimising its extent of visibility from the wider landscape.

4.92 Existing tall structures within the former Air Base that are at comparable heights to the proposed 30m high Viewing Tower including Camp Road Water Tower, Camp Road Telecoms Mast, and masts associated with the Quick Reaction Alert Area do not have red aviation warning lights, and therefore it is assumed that the proposed Viewing Tower would not need to be illuminated in this way. Nonetheless, should it require aviation warning lights, then these would be seen in the context of similar lighting on the Ardley ERF exhaust stack, and those to the south east (unconfirmed as Didcot Power Station chimney), and so would not be incongruous in this setting.

4.93 Night time views of operational lighting within the Application Site from the north are limited by dense vegetation immediately to the north, with occasional luminaires and bulkhead lights visible from the Somerton to Fewcott and Ardley road, although it is likely that such road users would be concentrating upon immediate road conditions along this narrow lane during hours of darkness. It is considered that from some parts of the surrounding landscape to the north including the villages of Somerton and Fritwell, up to approximately 1.5km away, there would be indirect effects on night time character arising from a slight increase in sky glow, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect.

4.94 Luminaires within the Proposed Development would not be directly visible from viewpoints within the settlements of Fewcott with Ardley, or isolated properties such as Nevilles Farm, Ashgrove Farm and Ashgrove Cottages to the east, although there would be indirect effects on night time character arising from a slight increase in sky glow. At most, these receptors would experience a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect. Night time views from other receptors to the east of the M40 including Stoke Lyne and Bucknell would be dominated by obtrusive lighting associated with the M40/A43, Cherwell Valley Services and Ardley ERF, and therefore there would be negligible effects arising from the Proposed Development.

4.95 Night time views of operational lighting within parcels 16 and 17 of the Application Site would be visible from limited sections of Port Way, Lower Heyford Road, Greenway and a few properties within Caulcott to the south, although this would be seen within the context of existing lighting within residential areas of Heyford Park. Further, the effects upon road users is tempered by context as it is likely that such road users would be concentrating upon immediate road

conditions during hours of darkness. It is therefore considered that from some parts of the surrounding landscape to the south, up to approximately 1.5km, there would be direct and indirect effects on night time character arising from views to proposed street lighting and a slight increase in sky glow, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect.

4.96 The Proposed Development and associated lighting would not be openly visible from the floor of the Cherwell Valley, being screened by landform and intervening vegetation. New uses to the north of Camp Road (i.e. parcels 10, 12, 21 etc.) would extend the lit envelope when seen in night time views from the elevated western bluff of Cherwell Valley including from some parts of the villages of Steeple Aston, Middle Aston and North Aston. However, this effect would be mitigated in part by its juxtaposition with Heyford Park and would be seen against sky glow emanating from the M40/A43 junction and Cherwell Valley Services and Ardley ERF. Views from most properties within Upper Heyford are screened from the Proposed Development by built form, landform and intervening vegetation. However, some properties along Somerton Road may experience direct effects from views to proposed lighting in parcel 10, although such views are gained within the context of existing street lighting along Somerton Road and Camp Road; strategic landscape buffers would also be established around the perimeters of, and within, the Application Site which over time would filter and limit the extent of operational lighting visible. Lighting levels within the Flying Field would remain similar to existing. It is considered that for some properties along Somerton Road at Upper Heyford there would be direct effects on night time character arising from views to proposed lamp columns with at most a negligible magnitude of change leading to a negligible effect. From some parts of the elevated landscape to the west including the villages of Steeple Aston, Middle Aston and North Aston, there would be indirect effects on night time character arising from slight increase in sky glow, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect.

4.97 Land at the southwest corner (parcel 18) of the Application Site is the proposed location of outdoor sports pitches. At present, the type of pitches is undefined and there is no proposal to provide dusk or night-time lighting to the pitches; however, it is possible that at some future date a night time facility may be required. For the purposes of the night time landscape character assessment, it is therefore assumed that one illuminated pitch is provided for evening use during dark winter months, and that this would be located towards the northeast part of

parcel 18 to minimise light trespass effects upon the wider landscape. Provision of an illuminated pitch in this location would also, in visual and landscape character terms, group the facility with existing lighting against the backdrop of Heyford Park residential area and school; the sports pitch lighting would be suitably designed to minimise potential effects of light trespass and glare upon existing and proposed residences and other neighbouring uses. An illuminated sports pitch would give rise to additional levels of night time lighting, and would potentially be visible from the landscape to the south and west of the Application Site, including Rousham House and Gardens. It would, however, be seen against the backdrop of existing lighting and sky glow emanating from Heyford Park and other sources within the vicinity (M40/A43 junction, Cherwell Valley Services and Ardley ERF) but would be seasonal and limited in terms of operating times and frequency. It is considered that from some parts of the surrounding landscape, up to approximately 1km, there would be indirect effects on night time character, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect.

4.98 Land within the former Quick Reaction Alert Area, Northern Bomb Stores, eastern part of the Southern Bomb Stores and the eastern end of the former runway are proposed to be used as Filming Activity areas. Filming Activity would be temporary, and may at times include night time filming. Temporary lighting within the Filming Activity Areas is assumed to be low-level (less than 10m height), localised and short term, which is unlikely to be visible from extensive areas of surrounding landscape, but may be apparent from the immediate surroundings. Although the Proposed Development would give rise to additional levels of night time lighting, and be visible from the immediate surroundings, it would form a discrete pocket of light, which would be short-lived and infrequent, and during filming events only. It is considered that from some parts of the surrounding landscape, up to approximately 1km, there would be indirect effects on night time character, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effects.

Visual Amenity

Visual Receptors

4.99 The following provides an overview of the visual amenity of residents, PROW and public roads within the study area, and the visual amenity of residents in close proximity to the development parcels during operation of the Proposed Development, which sets the context of the individual viewpoint assessments

presented at **Appendix 4: Photoviews** and summarised under Representative Viewpoints.

4.100 Proposed structures of up to 18m height would not be visible from residential properties within Somerton, Fritwell and isolated residential properties between these settlements, PROW, and roads to the north of the Application Site due to the screening effects of landform and intervening vegetation adjacent to the northern edge of the Flying Field. The top of the 30m Viewing Tower would potentially be visible above the intervening tree canopy, but this would have a negligible magnitude effect on views gained. With high sensitivity (residential and PROW) and medium sensitivity (roads), the significance of residual effects upon receptors to the north during operation would be negligible and no mitigation would be required.

4.101 Views from residential properties in Ardley with Fewcott, and at Ashgrove Farm to the east of the Application Site would be screened by intervening vegetation and built form (including retained SBS bunkers). Partial views may be gained locally by PROW users (see **Viewpoint 5**) and short sections of Camp Road (east) toward 18m and 13m high development in parcels 22 and 23, respectively, and street furniture associated with Chilgrove Drive may be glimpsed. Retention and enhancement of the existing tree belt to the south of the SBS and proposed landscape planting along the north eastern, eastern and south-eastern end of the runway (parcel 27) would soften and filter any views gained. With high sensitivity (residential) and medium sensitivity (roads), the significance of effects and residual effects with the operational development in place would be negligible.

4.102 At Year 1, limited views may be gained of 10.5m and 13m high development in parcels 16, 32W and 34 from a few residential properties in Caulcott. Views may also potentially be gained from isolated residential properties including Lime Hollow, Field Barn, Cheesman's Barn and Fir Tree Farm where permitted by intervening landform and hedgerows/hedgerow trees, as would glimpsed and fleeting views from the B4030 Lower Heyford Road. Views that may be gained by PROW users to the south of the Application Site would vary according to intervening land form, vegetation and proximity of the viewpoint leading to open, partial, or screened views of the development, resulting in medium to low magnitude of effect and minor effects at Years 1 and 15 due to existing developments to the north. Users of the diverted route of footpath 388/4 around the southern and eastern edges of parcel 18, would experience a medium

magnitude of change at Year 1 and effects of major significance. However, these effects would be mitigated by its setting within a landscape corridor permitting occasional views of the sports pitches and new development beyond, and connection to the reinstated Port Way PROW route and so, on balance, the magnitude of effect at Year 15 is considered to be negligible leading to negligible residual significance.

4.103 No views would be gained of development of 5m to 30m high from residential properties in Upper Heyford or Lower Heyford. Potential views may be gained of 10.5m to 30m high buildings (the proposed 5m structure adjacent to the Viewing Tower would not be apparent) from localised properties within The Astons; such views would be subject to and controlled by orientation of view, and intervening land form, built form and vegetation. No views would be gained by users of Somerton Road due to intervening landform, although new tree planting at the western end of the runway and adjacent to the reinstated Port Way would be seen. Views gained from PROW and other roads within the Cherwell Valley toward the Proposed Development would generally be screened by intervening land form, vegetation and/or built form, although localised views may provide more direct views to the interior of the Application Site (see **Viewpoint 19**). Views from Rousham House and Registered Garden (also see below) would be largely screened by intervening landform and vegetation leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect. With high sensitivity (residential, PROW and Rousham House and Garden) and medium sensitivity (roads), the significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible at Year 1 and Year 15 and so no mitigation would be required, although planting adjacent to the reinstated Port Way route and western end of the runway would enhance visual screening from this direction.

4.104 Views from residential properties at Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes that fall within close proximity to the development parcels, would have open and direct views of the Proposed Development. Many of these properties have been recently constructed, or are associated with proposed cumulative site developments, and therefore are considered to have no more than medium sensitivity to the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development would deliver high quality urban design integrated within Green Infrastructure and therefore the magnitude of effect at Year 1 would be at most, medium, reducing to negligible at Year 15 as the proposed landscape matures. With medium sensitivity and medium magnitude of effect, the significance would

be moderate at Year 1, reducing to negligible at Year 15. However, the residual effect is considered to be neutral due to the quality of the like-development seen in the context of existing Heyford Park and/or the former Air Base urban form.

Rousham Park

4.105 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.

4.106 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 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.

4.107 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 Site cannot generally be gained. Views from the kitchen garden and the walled garden are enclosed and inward looking with no connectivity with the agricultural landscape surrounding Rousham Park.

4.108 There are two very limited locations within Rousham Park where narrow views of part of the former Air Base may be gained, and where the 10.5m high development within parcel 10 would be just discernible to the naked eye. The site visit confirmed that such views can be gained from the very localised top corner of the Arcade as illustrated by Viewpoint 16 (see **Appendix 4: Photoviews**), and on the approach to Heyford Bridge. Elsewhere land form and 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 treed 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 dominate and characterise the view.

4.109 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 negligible and not significant in landscape and visual terms. Heritage effects are assessed in **Chapter 13: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage** of the ES.

Viewpoints

4.110 A detailed assessment of visual effects upon the identified viewpoints during the operational stage of the Proposed Development is included at **Appendix 4: Photoviews** 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 over various seasons including summer months when the level of enclosure is generally higher due to trees and other vegetation being in leaf, and hence visibility tends to be lower as a result. In winter the visibility of the Proposed Development may be slightly higher following leaf-fall from deciduous vegetation.

4.111 Receptors present at Viewpoints 1 – 8, 10, 11, 13, 15 – 18 and 20 - 24 would be subject to negligible or negligible (no change) significance of effect at Year 1 and Year 15.

4.112 The existing Aves Ditch bridleway is blocked adjacent to Viewpoint 9, to the south of Camp Road, and is only accessible with some difficulty by pedestrians, with the PROW emerging directly onto a 4-way junction with very poor visibility. The Proposed Development would open up the bridleway and provide a dedicated, signal-controlled equestrian crossing. PROW users that would experience views from Viewpoint 9, which lies adjacent to the Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive junction, would experience a medium magnitude of change at Year 1 arising from the new junction and loss of some hedgerows and tree cover along Camp Road and at the junction (trees and hedgerows would be retained along the old Chilgrove Drive route), leading to a moderate but not significant effect. However, this would be offset by the provision of the crossing and landscape planting scheme, leading to

a long-term effect of low beneficial by Year 15. Overall, it is considered that the significance of effect upon Viewpoint 9 would be neutral.

4.113 Viewpoint 19 takes in a sweeping panorama of the Cherwell Valley and Upper Heyford Plateau upon which the Application Site sits. At Year 1 10.5 and 13m high developments would be visible, which would in turn largely screen views of 18m development in parcel 22. By Year 15, proposed structure planting adjacent to the reinstated Port Way bridleway and at the western end of the runway would be well-established across the former runway, completing the vegetated horizon and screening lower parts of the Proposed Development. The magnitude of change at Year 1 and Year 15 would be low, which would give rise to moderate but not significant effects, being tempered by distance and juxtaposition with existing development within the Application Site and surrounding landscape, and the complexity of the wider panorama.

4.114 Receptors located at Viewpoints 12 (PROW) and 14 (Tait Drive residents) would experience effects of major significance at Year 1, reducing to moderate at Year 15. At Year 1, the proposed 10.5m and 13m high development within parcels 16, 32 and 34 (and to a lesser degree, parcel 18 sports park) would be seen from Viewpoint 12 behind and above the intervening hedgerow. The 18m commercial development and the Viewing Tower would be just discernible to the northwest, although this would appear to be lower than the closer residential development due to the effects of perspective and landform; the magnitude of change would be medium at Year 1 reducing to low at Year 15 as proposed landscape planting matures. The Proposed Development would change the current Viewpoint 14 outlook from agricultural land seen through chain link security fencing to a modern high quality residential development at Year 1 with private gardens and landscaping. Views would be direct and open with development seen in the context of and from existing residential development. Views of agricultural land would be lost but this would be offset against the positive change to a well-designed residential area benefitting from a comprehensive Green Infrastructure Strategy with green corridors; adverse effects would be tempered by removal of the oppressive foreground security fence.

Proposed Viewpoints

4.115 The Proposed Development would increase the availability of controlled public access to heritage features within the Flying Field, including the Avionics Building, Quick Response Alert area, and northern Bomb Stores Scheduled Monuments.

Proposed viewpoints have therefore been assessed at each of these locations and are referred to as Viewpoints A, C and D, respectively.

4.116 The Flying Field context and primary focus of each of these Scheduled Monuments would be maintained with the Proposed Development in place at Year 1 and Year 15, and intervisibility between each of these key Cold War structures would remain as existing. The Proposed Development to the south of the runway would be evident to varying degrees but would be seen in the context of, and as infill to, the former Air Base structures and Heyford Park development. The proposed Viewing Tower would be established as a new landmark structure and would be most apparent from Viewpoint D, leading to moderate but not significant effects at Years 1 and 15. The effects upon Viewpoints A and C would be moderate at Year 1, reducing to negligible by Year 15.

4.117 Controlled views would be gained from the reinstated Port Way PROW across the Flying Field toward the Proposed Development to the southeast, and from the reinstated Aves Ditch PROW toward the south and southwest. The Proposed Development to the south of the runway would be evident to varying degrees but would be seen in the context of, and as infill to, the former Air Base structures and Heyford Park development. The proposed Viewing Tower would be established as a new landmark structure, south of the runway. The effect upon Viewpoints B, E and F would be neutral at Year 1 and Year 15, as the proposed scheme would complement the scale, landform and pattern of the Flying Field landscape.

5. MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT

Mitigation by Design

5.1 Extensive design and refinement of the Development Parameters has been undertaken to deliver sympathetic land uses and massing. The 30m high Viewing Tower and associated 5m high building are set away from the residential development. Commercial, community, and higher density residential development is restricted to a maximum of 13m above future ground level, which emphasises and improves orientation and legibility around the Village Centre. Development parcels and/or the edges of the taller 13m high development parcels where they lie adjacent to existing residential uses are restricted to a maximum of 10.5m above future ground level.

5.2 Over time the proposed planting indicated on the Composite Parameter Plan (see planning application drawing P16-0631_08 Sheet No. 01) and the Green Infrastructure Strategy would help to integrate the Proposed development into its landscape setting and screen and filter views from the surrounding landscape, particularly in views from the east, south and west. Broadly, the proposed planting consists of retention of existing vegetation (as appropriate) enhanced by loose belts of trees and informal groups of trees and shrubs arranged along the boundaries of the eastern end of the runway (north, east and south); the southern boundary of Southern Bomb Stores; flanking the realigned Chilgrove Drive; a community orchard/allotments south of parcel 17; along the southern and western boundaries of parcels 16 and 18; and intermittent hedgerow planting along the western edge of the reinstated Port Way route. A comprehensive scheme of landscape planting would also be established within the Application Site itself along green corridors, helping to integrate the Proposed Development with the proposed and existing landscape framework.

5.3 Landscape elements and resources, 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 prior to the commencement of demolition and construction in accordance with Arboricultural Impact Assessments that will be prepared as part of the Reserved Matters applications for each parcel.

Additional Mitigation

5.4 During the construction phase of the Proposed Development, consideration will be given by means of CEMP's for each parcel, to the appropriate positioning of construction compounds to limit or reduce their visibility from surrounding areas, including occupied residential developments and the Heyford Park Free School within Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm, Duvall Park Homes, Field Barn and Cheesman's Barn.

5.5 Site hoarding will be used to reduce or remove sight of the works from nearby receptors. The perception of movement and clutter within the Application Site would be reduced but the overall effects would remain unchanged due to proximity.

5.6 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 to the east of parcel 32W are easily identifiable within the views gained from receptors located to the south due to their relatively light colours. In contrast the existing built form within the Land South of Camp Road site (west of parcel 32W), 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 receptors. Such mitigation measures would have a limited effect upon close-range views where the effects are determined by the scale and height of the Proposed Development. Conversely, the replacement of vacant structures and underused sites with high quality built form and Green Infrastructure will have a positive effect on close range views.

Enhancements

5.7 The Green Infrastructure Strategy sets out landscape enhancements that would be delivered by the Proposed Development including increased tree cover; selection of appropriate native and ornamental plant species to enhance amenity and biodiversity; creation of a comprehensive network of formal and informal public spaces with appropriate equipped play spaces and fitness equipment trails; and improved access and connectivity provided by a network of new pedestrian paths and cycleways linking to the adjacent Heyford Park and PROW outside of the Application Site. The PROW network would be enhanced through reinstatement of Aves Ditch long distance route including a dedicated equestrian crossing of Camp Road.

6. CUMULATIVE AND IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS

6.1 **Chapter 2** of the ES that accompanies the planning application sets out the 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."**

6.2 A location plan showing the cumulative development sites to be assessed are set out on **Figure 2.1 of the ES**. In relation to the landscape and visual assessment of the Proposed Development, the cumulative sites can be geographically grouped according to distance, orientation and proposed land use and are summarised as follows:

Group A: Within or Close to Heyford Park:

- Village Centre North, Heyford (Application 17/00895/F);
- Land South West of Camp Road, Heyford (Application 16/02446/F);
- Pye Homes, Upper Heyford (Application 15/01357/F); and
- Parcel 15, Heyford Park Masterplan.

Group B: Within or Close to Bicester:

- North West Bicester (Application 10/01780/Hybrid (Exemplar/Elmsbury));
- North West Bicester (Application 14/01384/OUT – Application 1);
- North West Bicester (Application 14/01641/OUT – Application 2);
- North West Bicester (Application 14/02121/OUT – Himley Village);
- Land at Whitelands Farm, Kingsmere (Application 06/00967/OUT)
- Network Bicester (Application 14/01675/OUT; and
- Bicester Gateway 16/02505/OUT.

Landscape Elements

Topography, Land Form and Drainage

6.3 It is envisaged that effects upon topography, land form and drainage would be mitigated by each cumulative development as part of the planning application and Reserved Matters applications. Notwithstanding, the effects upon such landscape elements would be very localised and cumulative effects resulting from construction of the cumulative sites would be no more than negligible. No further effects upon topography and land form would occur during operation of the cumulative sites. However, the construction of surface level SUDS infrastructure would create new landscape (and ecological) features leading to minor beneficial effects.

Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure

6.4 Two of the Group A cumulative sites, Land South of Camp Road and Village Centre North fall within the former Air Base and would require demolition of various buildings and structures to enable construction of the proposed development. The former lies at the southwest corner of the former Air Base adjacent to Port Way, and the latter falls within the Technical Area. Collectively, the magnitude of change upon land use and built form arising from demolition of these structures is tempered by their immediate built context and, in the case of Land South of Camp Road, the derelict condition of those structures. Pye Homes and Parcel 15 sites lie adjacent to and would be in keeping with the former Air Base and ongoing Heyford Park development.

6.5 The Group A sites would each deliver land uses that complement Heyford Park and the Heyford Masterplan, through high quality development and built form; overall the magnitude of change arising from Group A sites would be negligible. With medium to low sensitivity and negligible magnitude of change, the significance of cumulative effects upon land use, built form and infrastructure would be negligible.

6.6 The Group B sites would not be experienced in the context of built form, land use and infrastructure of the Application Site and this would therefore lead to no change.

Green Infrastructure

6.7 It is envisaged that effects upon existing vegetation, open space and PROW would be minimised and mitigated by each cumulative development (Group A and Group B sites), and that cohesive Green Infrastructure strategies would be delivered as part of the planning application and Reserved Matters applications. Notwithstanding, the effects upon such landscape elements would be very localised and cumulative effects resulting from construction of the cumulative sites would be no more than negligible.

Landscape Character

Farmland Plateau LCA

6.8 Each of the Group A cumulative sites falls within the Farmland Plateau LCA and therefore they have the potential for creating additional direct and perceptual effects in cumulation with the Proposed Development. However, Village Centre

North and Land South of Camp Road sites fall within, and Parcel 15 and Pye Homes site are contiguous with, the former Air Base boundary. Whilst they have the potential to influence the qualities of this LCA, they would be 'read' as part of the former Air Base which is synonymous with the Heyford Park development and so negligible effects would accrue. Accordingly, the significance of cumulative effects upon the Farmland Plateau LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group A sites would be negligible.

6.9 The Group B sites lie to the east and southeast of the Farmland Plateau LCA boundary and is separated visually and physically from it by the Wooded Estatelands LCA, and so it would not influence the perceptual qualities of this landscape. Accordingly, there would be no cumulative effects arising upon this LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites.

Wooded Estatelands LCA

6.10 The Group A sites, Village Centre North and Land South of Camp Road lie within the neighbouring Farmland Plateau LCA and are separated from the Wooded Estatelands LCA by existing development within Heyford Park; they would not directly or perceptually affect this LCA. Parcel 15 and Pye Homes lie to the northwest of this LCA and whilst they have potential to influence perceptual qualities, they would be 'read' as part of the Heyford Park development and so negligible effects would accrue. Accordingly, there would at most be negligible cumulative effects upon the Wooded Estatelands LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group A sites.

6.11 The Group B sites lie in part within the Wooded Estatelands LCA on the northwest edge of Bicester. Due to distance and the well-wooded nature of the Wooded Estatelands LCA, the Proposed Development would not influence the wider perceptual qualities of this landscape type. Accordingly, there would be no cumulative effects arising upon this LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites, resulting in a negligible cumulative effect at construction, and Years 1 and 15 of operation.

Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA

6.12 The Group A sites lie within the Farmland Plateau LCA and so would have no direct effect upon the Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA. Further, Village Centre North, Parcel 15 and Pye Homes would be separated by existing Heyford

Park development so would not lead to any cumulative perceptual effects. The Land South of Camp Road site lies within the boundary of the former Air Base and would replace existing derelict structures and underused land. It may potentially be seen in cumulation with development parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34 when viewed from the west, but the significance of additional indirect cumulative effects in the context of Heyford Park and the former Air Base would be negligible during construction, Year 1 and Year 15 operation.

6.13 The Group B sites lie approximately 7km to the east and southeast of the Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA boundary and would not influence the perceptual qualities of this landscape. Accordingly, there would be no cumulative effects arising upon this LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

6.14 Each of the Group A cumulative sites falls within the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA and therefore they have the potential for creating additional direct and perceptual effects in cumulation with the Proposed Development. However, Village Centre North and Land South of Camp Road sites fall within, and Parcel 15 and Pye Homes site are contiguous with, the former Air Base boundary. Whilst they have the potential to influence the qualities of this LCA, they would be 'read' as part of the former Air Base which is synonymous with the Heyford Park development and so negligible effects would accrue. Accordingly, the significance of direct cumulative effects upon the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group A sites would be negligible.

6.15 The Group B sites lie to the east and southeast of the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA boundary and is separated visually and physically from it by the Wooded Estatelands LCA, and so it would not influence the perceptual qualities of this landscape. Accordingly, there would be no cumulative effects arising upon this LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites.

Cherwell Valley LCA

6.16 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.

6.17 The Group A sites lie within the neighbouring Farmland Plateau LCA and so would have no direct effect upon the Cherwell Valley LCA. Village Centre North, Parcel 15 and Pye Homes lie within or would be physically separated from this LCA by existing Heyford Park development so would not lead to any cumulative perceptual effects. The Land South of Camp Road site lies within the boundary of the former Air Base and would replace existing derelict structures and underused land. It may potentially be seen in addition to development parcels 16, 32W and 34 when viewed from the Cherwell Valley, but the significance of indirect cumulative effects upon the Cherwell Valley LCA in the context of Heyford Park and the former Air Base would be negligible during construction, Year 1 and Year 15 operation.

6.18 The Group B sites lie approximately 7km to the east and southeast of the Cherwell Valley LCA boundary and would not influence the perceptual qualities of this landscape. Accordingly, there would be no cumulative effects arising upon the Cherwell Valley LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites.

Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA

6.19 The Group A sites, Village Centre North and Land South of Camp Road lie within the neighbouring Upper Heyford Plateau LCA and are separated from the Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA by existing development within Heyford Park; they would not directly or perceptually affect this LCA. Parcel 15 and Pye Homes lie to the northwest of the Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive junction which falls within the periphery of this LCA, and whilst they have potential to influence perceptual qualities, they would be 'read' as part of the Heyford Park development and so negligible effects would accrue. Accordingly, there would at most be negligible cumulative effects upon the Oxfordshire Estate Woodlands LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group A sites.

6.20 The Group B sites lie in part within the Oxfordshire Estate Woodlands LCA on the northwest edge of Bicester. Due to distance and the well-wooded nature of this LCA, the Proposed Development would not influence the wider perceptual qualities of this landscape type. Accordingly, there would be no cumulative effects arising upon this LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites, resulting in a negligible cumulative effect at construction, and Years 1 and 15 of operation

Night Time Character

6.21 Group A cumulative sites fall within or are contiguous with the former Air Base boundary which makes up a large proportion of the Application Site. Whilst Group A sites have the potential to influence night time character, the additional light levels would be indistinguishable being 'read' as part of the former Air Base which is synonymous with the Heyford Park development. It is assumed for the purposes of this assessment that the Group A sites would be subject to comparable design and environmental controls as the Proposed Development, thus minimising sky glow and light spillage. Accordingly, negligible additional or in-combination Group A effects would accrue and the significance cumulative effects upon the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development would be negligible.

6.22 The Group B sites are physically separated by more than 7km from the Proposed Development on the urban edge of Bicester and so would not influence the night-time character of the Application Site.

Visual Receptors

6.23 Potential effects upon visual receptors would only occur in close proximity to the cumulative sites where they are intervisible with any given parcel within the Proposed Development. This therefore limits potential effects upon visual receptors to the vicinity of the Group A sites; there would be no intervisibility with Group B sites due to distance and intervening landscape elements, and so no cumulative effects would arise.

6.24 Village Centre North lies within the core of Heyford Park and the Proposed Development. It would be seen in the context of, and from, retained former Air Base structures and recent Heyford Park developments. It would not be discernible from viewpoints external to Heyford Park and it would be in keeping with the character of the Proposed Development leading to a neutral cumulative effect.

6.25 Visual receptors to the north of the Application Site would not experience intervisibility with any of the Group A cumulative sites during construction or operation and therefore the significance of effect would be negligible (no change).

6.26 Group A sites, Village Centre North and Land South of Camp Road, would not visible from PROW and road receptors to the east, leading to negligible (no

change) significance of effect. During construction and operation there is potential for cumulative effects to be experienced by these visual receptors where views of parcels 13, 21 and 22 may be experienced to varying degrees in cumulation with Parcel 15 and the consented Pye Homes site. However, the effects would be localised and 'read' as part of the former Air Base which is synonymous with the Heyford Park development. The magnitude of change and significance of effects upon receptors to the east during construction would be minor to negligible. The magnitude of cumulative effects during operation would be moderate at Year 1 and minor beneficial by Year 15, leading to an overall neutral significance.

6.27 During construction and operation, glimpsed views of Land South of Camp Road may potentially be gained from limited sections of PROW (including the reinstated Port Way within the Flying Field) and the B4030 Lower Heyford Road in cumulation with, but largely screened by, parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34. The effects would be localised and 'read' as part of the former Air Base and Heyford Park development. Other Group A sites would not be visible from this direction of view. The magnitude of change and significance of effects upon receptors to the south during construction and operation would be negligible.

6.28 Very localised glimpses of parcels 16 and 18 may be gained in combination with Land South of Camp Road site from receptors to the west during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. No other Group A sites would be visible from this direction of view. The effects would be localised and 'read' as part of the former Air Base and Heyford Park development. The magnitude of change and significance of effects upon receptors to the south during construction and operation would be negligible.

6.29 Groups of residential receptors lie adjacent to the Proposed Development in close proximity to Parcel 15 and Pye Homes (Larsen Road, Trenchard Circus, Letchmere Farm, and properties within Duvall Park Homes nearest to Camp Road); and Land South of Camp Road (Tait Drive). During construction and operation, the magnitude of cumulative effects experienced by residents in proximity to these Group A sites would be low to negligible with an overall neutral significance of effect.

6.30 As previously described, vantage points within the Grade 1 Rousham Park 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 (part of parcel 10). Whilst the majority of the Group A sites

and all of the Group B sites are not intervisible with parcel 10 when viewed from Rousham House and Gardens, the Land South of Camp Road site would lie within the foreground of parcel 10 and would screen it wholly from view. The overall magnitude of effect is 'no change', resulting in a negligible (no change) significance of effect when considering the cumulative sites.

Viewpoints

6.31 As noted above, potential effects upon visual receptors, and therefore representative Viewpoints, would only occur in close proximity to the cumulative sites where they are intervisible with any given parcel within the Proposed Development. This therefore limits potential effects upon visual receptors to a few Viewpoints that either lie within the vicinity of the Group A sites and/or those that the Visual Assessment has shown would have views of development parcels in close proximity to Group A sites; Viewpoints 1 to 8, 10, 11, and 14 to 24 have no intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites and therefore the significance of effect during construction and operation would be negligible (no change). Three remaining viewpoints, Viewpoints 9, 12 and 13 would potentially experience cumulative visual effects.

6.32 Viewpoint 9 would experience limited intervisibility with Parcel 15 and Pye Homes in cumulation with parcels 21, 22, 23 and the realigned Chilgrove Drive during construction and operation; development of the Pye Homes site would screen views of parcels 12E and 13. The effects would be localised and 'read' as part of the former Air Base and Heyford Park development, and the magnitude of change would range from medium at construction and Year 1, reducing to negligible at Year 15 and proposed roadside planting matures. For Viewpoint 9, the residual cumulative effect would be negligible.

6.33 Glimpsed views of Land South of Camp Road may be gained from the PROW at Viewpoint 12 in cumulation with, but partly screened by, parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34. The magnitude of change would be low during construction and at Year 1, and the effect would be tempered by juxtaposition with Heyford Park development giving a moderate but not significant effect. Proposed tree belt planting implemented as part of the Green Infrastructure to parcels 16 and 18 would mature by Year 15, reducing the residual cumulative effect to negligible.

6.34 Very localised, glimpsed, views of Land South of Camp Road may be gained from Viewpoint 13 at the junction of B4030 Lower Heyford Road and Port

Way/Kirtlington Road in cumulation with parcels 16 and 18. The magnitude of effect would be negligible during construction, and low at Year 1 as the parcels are developed. Proposed tree belt planting implemented as part of the Green Infrastructure to parcels 16 and 18 would mature by Year 15, reducing the residual cumulative effect to negligible.

6.35 There would be potential intervisibility between the proposed Viewpoints A to F and one Group A cumulative site (Village Centre North). However, this would be indistinguishable within the context of the proposed Development and former Air base structures, leading to a negligible effect.

6.36 There would be no intervisibility between any of the representative and proposed Viewpoints and Group B sites due to distance and intervening landscape elements, and so no cumulative effects would arise.

7. SUMMARY

Introduction

7.1 This LVIA has described and evaluated the established baseline of the Application Site as it relates to landscape elements, landscape character, night time character, visual receptors, representative viewpoints, and cumulative effects in combination with other identified development sites. Potential effects resulting from construction and operation of the Proposed Development and the residual effects following the implementation of mitigation measures are also summarised.

7.2 Consideration has been given to published documents and has focused on the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy (OWLS) and Cherwell District Landscape Character Assessments. 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 in agreement with Cherwell District Council's Landscape Officer.

7.3 The Application Site covers approximately 457 hectares of land occupying much of the c.520 hectares of the former RAF Upper Heyford Air Base (the former Air Base) site, in Oxfordshire. The LVIA has been prepared with reference to the planning application drawings and schedules which describe the parameters of the Proposed Development.

Baseline Conditions

7.4 The Application Site encompasses, broadly speaking, the irregular-shaped land parcel of the former Air Base, but excludes areas of completed and ongoing residential and associated development within Heyford Park or areas subject to separate planning applications. Two parcels of 'greenfield' agricultural land are also included within the Application Site in accordance with Policy 5 Villages of the Cherwell District Council Local Plan.

7.5 The former Flying Field is not publicly accessible, with many of the former Air Base buildings and hard standings being in employment use. Built form to the north of Camp Road is complex and large scale, comprising utilitarian military structures of the Flying Field and Technical Area. The area to the south of Camp Road is in residential and education use and is characterised by domestic scale houses and bungalows. Due to its scale and former functions, the Application Site comprises a varied built form and scale, circulation routes, and spaces.

7.6 Several Landscape Character Assessments (LCAs) that occur within the 5km study area have been subject to assessment including three of relevance described within OWLS: Farmland Plateau LCA; Wooded Estatelands; and Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides. Cherwell District Landscape Assessment identifies three further relevant LCA's: Upper Heyford Plateau LCA; Cherwell Valley LCA; and Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA. The Farmland Plateau LCA overlaps with the Heyford Plateau LCA and they collectively form the host LCA covering the Proposed Development. The Application Site just clips the Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA at the junction of Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive. Other published studies have also informed the LVIA including Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Character Map.

7.7 Visual receptors include residential properties in and around Heyford Park, the fringes of the former Air Base and surrounding villages, users of Public Rights of Way (PROW), and road users. Upper Heyford is the closest settlement. Other settlements are more distant, and so tend to experience greater or lesser degrees of views towards the Application Site subject to intervening land form, built form and vegetative screening, which is one of the key characteristics of the host and surrounding LCAs.

7.8 A number of historic parks are located in the surrounding landscape, of which Rousham Park (Grade I) the most relevant due to its proximity and elevation.

7.9 Twenty-four representative viewpoints have been assessed at varying distances and locations to represent different type of receptors and consider local landscape character and visual effects of the Proposed Development. A further six viewpoints have been identified within the Flying Field which are representative of proposed viewpoints that would be created or would be more publicly accessible than at present.

7.10 The summary of the assessment upon landscape elements, landscape character, night time character, visual receptors, representative viewpoints, and cumulative effects is included in **Appendix 6: Summary of Landscape Effects and Appendix 7: Summary of Visual Effects.**

Likely Significant Effects

7.11 The LVIA assumes as a 'worst case' that the whole of the Application Site will be developed simultaneously with the proposed built form at varying development heights ranging from 5m, 10.5m, 13m, 18m and 30m in height (with + or – 1.5m development platform) as shown on planning application drawings. The construction phase would require removal of the existing disused buildings, and structures to be demolished as shown on as shown on planning application drawings and accompanying schedules.

7.12 The planning application seeks outline permission for the Proposed Development and therefore development of each parcel would be subject to approval of detailed design under Reserved Matters applications. Similarly, the extent of vegetation removal would be subject to Arboricultural Impact Assessments to be submitted in support of the Reserved Matters applications, which would guide detailed design and minimise tree loss.

7.13 Construction activity would extend over the development parcels and would be seen in the context of the built form already present within the Flying Field, Technical Area and adjoining old and new housing and both Heyford Park Free School sites. The construction activity would be temporary in nature, therefore the resulting effects from such activity would likewise be temporary.

7.14 With a low sensitivity and low magnitude of change there would be a negligible and not significant effect on topography and land form as the perception of the relatively flat terrain and its relationship with the surrounding landscape would be unchanged. No further changes would be made to the topography, land form or drainage regime of the Application Site post construction.

7.15 Existing drainage features and structures, comprising engineered water holding tanks, would be retained where practicable, and protected throughout the construction phase. The value of these tanks in terms of landscape elements is low, resulting in a negligible significance of effect during construction. New sustainable drainage systems (SUDS), would primarily fulfil the required drainage function, but would be located, designed and integrated within the proposed Green Infrastructure to enhance amenity and ecological objectives, resulting in a beneficial minor significance of effect across the Application Site as a whole.

7.16 With the exception of the relocated car processing area, the land use within proposed development parcels would be temporarily changed to construction sites and compounds during the construction phase. Demolition of buildings and structures would be confined to the Technical Area, Southern Bomb Stores and Christmas Tree area and north of Camp Road; no buildings or structures would be demolished to the north of the former runway. Demolition of buildings that have a small footprint, mass and height are of low sensitivity. Many of these structures are not visible from publicly accessible locations and, even collectively, their loss would lead to a negligible magnitude of change upon the prevailing landscape character. A few individual medium-sized structures of medium to low sensitivity in landscape terms would also be demolished/removed that would have a low magnitude of change upon the character of their immediate context only. Of the buildings to be demolished, only one is openly visible from the publicly accessible Camp Road; all others are within the core of the Technical Area or are obscured by vegetation along Chilgrove Drive. Overall, it is considered that the magnitude of change upon land use and built form arising from demolition of medium scale structures is tempered by their immediate built context and their loss would be of minor to negligible significance.

7.17 Comprehensive land use changes would occur between the runway and Camp Road, encompassing the Technical Area and swathes of the Flying Field, and to the south of the former Air Base on partly allocated greenfield land. The proposed land uses, built form and infrastructure would create a high quality, cohesive urban form and would be delivered through Reserved Matters applications and associated detailed design. The proposed land uses would be sympathetic to existing patterns and scale of built form, with larger scale structures emphasising the hierarchy of spaces and overall legibility. On balance, it is considered that in terms of the effects upon landscape elements, the magnitude and significance of any adverse changes that would arise from implementation and operation of the

Proposed Development would be offset by beneficial effects arising from it, leading to an overall neutral effect.

7.18 Tree loss would be minimised through the Arboricultural Impact Assessments but would lead to a moderate significance of effect locally during construction; it should be noted that in due course, this effect of moderate significance would be offset and enhanced by proposed planting. Grassland and shrubs to be retained would be protected during construction in accordance with the Construction Environment Management Plans. In terms of Green Infrastructure and landscape amenity. With a low sensitivity and low magnitude of effect, the significance of effect during construction would be minor.

7.19 Proposed Green Infrastructure would provide a comprehensive network of inter-linked landscape corridors, buffers and local open spaces including two substantial public open spaces comprising Flying Field Park and Control Tower Park which would open up public access to parts of the Flying Field for the first time. Proposed tree planting would markedly increase the number of trees within the Application Site compared to the existing situation and would enhance screening of views toward the Proposed Development, create a transition between with the Application Site and surrounding landscape, provide enhanced recreational opportunities, and improve landscape amenity leading to a major to moderate beneficial effect.

7.20 One public footpath within the southwest corner of the Application Site would be permanently diverted, but would remain open throughout the construction works, resulting in a temporary, major to moderate significance of effect.

7.21 The effects of the Proposed Development upon each of the considered LCAs during the construction stage have been assessed as negligible and not significant. The operational phase would also result in negligible or neutral effects with the character of each LCA prevailing.

7.22 The Proposed Development would 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’, although conversely this would lead to perception of an increased development density within the former Air Base.

7.23 The Proposed Development limits development height with taller commercial buildings emphasising the Village Centre and forming a gateway to the Flying Field. The Viewing Tower would fulfil its function as a focal point. The Proposed Development would therefore exert both positive and negative effects upon the achievement of the Landscape Strategy, leading to an overall neutral effect in the context of the host LCAs. With regard to other assessed LCAs, the operational phase would result in negligible or neutral effects with the character of each LCA prevailing.

7.24 Construction lighting would be temporary and discrete and therefore the lighting of individual parcels during construction would tend to be seen in the context of Heyford Park and the former Air Base to the north of the runway, leading to low magnitude of effects with no greater than minor significance.

7.25 External lighting is required during operation to ensure safe circulation, and to provide night time legibility for occupants and visitors to the site. It is assumed that one illuminated pitch is provided within the Sports Park which would potentially be visible from the landscape to the south and west of the Application Site, including Rousham House and Gardens. It would, however, be seen against the backdrop of existing lighting and sky glow emanating from Heyford Park and other sources within the vicinity (M40/A43 junction, Cherwell Valley Services and Ardley ERF) but would be seasonal and limited in terms of operating times and frequency. Proposed lighting would be designed and operated in accordance with a Lighting Strategy. There would be indirect effects on night time character, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect.

7.26 Proposed Filming Activity would be temporary, and may at times include night time filming, which is unlikely to be visible from extensive areas of surrounding landscape, but may be apparent from the immediate surroundings. It would be managed in accordance with a Filming Activity Strategy. Filming Activity lighting would be short-lived and infrequent, leading to indirect effects on night time character, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effects.

7.27 Established vegetation and intervening landform restricts views from residential properties within Somerton, Fritwell, isolated properties, PROW and roads to the north toward ground and low-level construction activities within the development parcels, although tall plant such as cranes may be visible. Overall, the significance of effects during construction would be negligible and no mitigation would be required. The significance of residual effects upon receptors to the north

during operation would be negligible with only the top of the Viewing Tower potentially visible; no mitigation would be required.

7.28 Views from residential properties to the east in Ardley with Fewcott, and at Ashgrove Farm toward ground level construction activities would be screened by intervening vegetation and built form. Partial views may be gained by PROW users and short sections of Camp Road. Cranes and tall plant may be visible, to varying degrees, by all receptors to the east, the significance of effects during construction would be negligible and the significance of effects and residual effects upon these receptors with the operational development in place would be negligible.

7.29 Views toward low level construction activities from receptors to the south including properties within Caulcott, Lime Hollow, Field Barn, Cheesman's Barn and Fir Tree Farm, would be screened by intervening landform and hedgerows/hedgerow trees. Views that may be gained by PROW users to the south would vary leading to open, partial or screened views of ground level construction activities, leading to moderate but not significant effects due to existing developments to the north. Footpath 388/4 would be diverted, but it would be set within a landscaped corridor and so the construction effect would be moderate but not significant. Tall construction plant north of Camp Road may be visible, but would be seen in the context of Heyford Park and former Air Base structures, leading in the round to negligible magnitude of effects and significance. Limited views may be gained of 10.5m and 13m high development at the southwest of the Application Site resulting in medium to low magnitude of effect and minor effects at Years 1 and 15 due to existing developments to the north. On balance, the magnitude of effect at Year 15 on users of Footpath 388/4 is considered to be negligible leading to negligible residual significance.

7.30 Views from residential properties in Upper and Lower Heyford, and Steeple Aston, Middle Aston, and North Aston (collectively, 'The Astons'), PROW and roads within the Cherwell Valley toward ground level construction activities in the western part of the Application Site would be screened by intervening land form, vegetation and/or built form. Views from Somerton Road are screened by landform. Cranes may be visible above intervening vegetation and land form leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect and significance. No views would be gained of development of 5m to 30m high from residential properties in Upper Heyford or Lower Heyford. Potential views may be gained of 10.5m to 30m high buildings

from localised properties within The Astons subject to orientation of view, and intervening land form, built form and vegetation. Views gained from public rights of way and roads within the Cherwell Valley would generally be screened by intervening land form, vegetation and/or built form, although localised views may provide more direct views to the interior of the Application Site. Views from Rousham House and Registered Garden would be largely screened by intervening landform and vegetation leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect. The significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible at Year 1 and Year 15 and so no mitigation would be required, although planting adjacent to the reinstated Port Way route and western end of the runway would enhance visual screening from this direction.

7.31 Residents within Heyford Park adjacent to the Proposed Development parcels, and neighbouring residential properties at Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes that fall within close proximity to the development parcels, would have open and direct views of the ground level construction activities. Many of these properties have been recently constructed, or are associated with proposed cumulative site developments, and therefore are considered to have medium sensitivity to construction activities leading major to moderate effects. Adherence to CEMPs would minimise adverse effects. The Proposed Development would deliver high quality design leading to overall neutral residual effects due to the quality of the like-development seen in the context of existing Heyford Park and/or the former Air Base urban form.

7.32 Tall plant such as cranes would not be visible from the majority of Rousham House and Registered Garden, but may be visible from two very localised locations which would comprise a very small and temporary element within the overall view leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect. A small portion of the Proposed Development would be just discernible to the naked eye as a relatively small element on the horizon at a distance of over 2km. 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 negligible and not significant in landscape and visual terms.

7.33 During the construction stage receptors at seventeen viewpoints would be subject to negligible and/or negligible (no change), including receptors at Rousham Park. Receptors at one viewpoint would experience minor effects. Five receptors would

be subject to moderate but not significant effects (due to the existing development context that is experienced) and one viewpoint would be subject to temporary, major effects.

7.34 During operation, receptors at 20 of the 24 viewpoints, including Rousham Park, would be subject to negligible (no change) or negligible effects. One viewpoint would be subject to moderate but not significant effects (due to the existing development context) and two viewpoints would be subject to moderate effects. One viewpoint adjacent to the proposed Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive junction would experience neutral effects as initial adverse effects are replaced by beneficial features.

7.35 The Proposed Development would increase the availability of controlled public access to heritage features within the Flying Field, including the Avionics Building, Quick Response Alert area, and Northern Bomb Stores Scheduled Monuments. Proposed viewpoints have therefore been assessed at each of these locations. The Flying Field context and primary focus of each of these Scheduled Monuments would be maintained with the Proposed Development in place, and intervisibility between each of these key Cold War structures would remain as existing. The Proposed Development to the south of the runway would be evident to varying degrees but would be seen in the context of, and as infill to, the former Air Base structures and Heyford Park development. The proposed Viewing Tower would be established as a new landmark structure and would be most apparent from the Northern Bomb Stores, leading to moderate but not significant effects. The effects upon the Avionics Building and Quick Response Alert area would be moderate at Year 1, reducing to negligible by Year 15 due to proposed landscape planting within parcel 10.

7.36 Controlled views would be gained from the reinstated Port Way PROW across the Flying Field toward the Proposed Development to the southeast, and from the reinstated Aves Ditch PROW toward the south and southwest. The Proposed Development to the south of the runway would be evident to varying degrees but would be seen in the context of, and as infill to, the former Air Base structures and Heyford Park development. The proposed Viewing Tower would be established as a new landmark structure, south of the runway. The effect upon Viewpoints along Port Way and Aves Ditch would be neutral, as the proposed scheme would complement the scale, landform and pattern of the Flying Field landscape.

7.37 The potential for cumulative visual effects to arise between the Proposed Development and the Group A cumulative sites 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. However, the visual assessment concludes that only negligible or negligible (no change) cumulative effects would be experienced by all 24 existing viewpoints and the six proposed viewpoints. There would be no cumulative effects arising from the Group B sites for any of the assessed landscape or visual attributes.

Mitigation and Enhancement

7.38 Site hoardings will be used to reduce or remove sight of the works from nearby receptors and the perception of movement and clutter in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plans.

7.39 Arboricultural Impact Assessments would be prepared for each development parcel to guide design and thus minimise tree loss.

7.40 Proposed planting, in accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy would help to integrate the Proposed Development with the existing landscape framework, fulfilling Landscape Strategy guidelines published by Oxfordshire County Council. Further, it would deliver enhanced tree planting within the Application Site and create two new public parks providing access to the Flying Field for the first time.

Cumulative Effects

7.41 The potential for cumulative visual effects to arise between the Proposed Development and the Group A cumulative sites 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. However, the visual assessment concludes that only negligible or negligible (no change) cumulative effects would be experienced by all 24 viewpoints.

7.42 There would be no cumulative effects arising from the Group B sites for any of the assessed landscape or visual attributes.

Conclusion

7.43 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 and landscape amenity. Careful siting and proposed development parcels and height restrictions ensure that the effect upon landscape character views are minimised. 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 closest proximity to the Application Site. The residual effects upon Rousham Registered Park and Garden, and upon surrounding villages and isolated residential properties would be negligible. The intervisibility and interrelationship between the most sensitive Cold War receptors within the Flying Field would be maintained with the Proposed Development in place.

7.44 **Appendix 6** provides a summary of landscape effects, mitigation and residual effects and **Appendix 7** provides a summary of visual effects, mitigation and residual effects.

FIGURE 1

SITE LOCATION PLAN

FIGURE 2

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS PLAN

FIGURE 3

TOPOGRAPHY PLAN

FIGURE 4

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS

FIGURE 5

EXISTING FEATURES PLAN

APPENDIX 1

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This Appendix 1 'Methodology' details the methodology used for the assessment of the Proposed Development as described in Chapter 4 of this ES.

The assessment has been undertaken with regard to the current best practice, as outlined in published guidance:

- 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Third Edition' published in April 2013 by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment;
- GLVIA3 Statement of Clarification 1/13 – Landscape Institute (2013);
- 'An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment' – Natural England (2014);
- 'The Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment' - (2004) Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment; and
- 'Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual assessment' (2011) - Landscape Institute Advise Note 01/11.

The study area for the assessment extends to 5 km from the Application Site boundary. Whilst there may be the potential for effects of the Proposed Development to extend beyond this limit, it is considered that any such effect is unlikely to be significant as the visual perception of the Proposed Development within the landscape diminishes with ever increasing distance and the Proposed Development where visible is seen as increasingly smaller component of a wider composite landscape.

The significance of effects which are likely to occur as a result of the Proposed Development are determined through a combination of the sensitivity of the landscape character, landscape element or visual receptor and the magnitude of change that they would experience. **Table 4** sets out the Significance of Effects Matrix and identifies which effects are considered significant or potentially significant.

Landscape Character Assessment Methodology

The landscape character assessment sets out the landscape baseline under two categories (GLVIA3, page 71):

- Landscape elements and features.
- Landscape character and key characteristics, including landscape value.

The assessment then identifies landscape receptors before assessing the sensitivity of the receptors and the magnitude of the effects on those receptors. Combining sensitivity of the receptor and magnitude of effect leads to an assessment of the significance of landscape effects arising from the Proposed Development.

The landscape assessment evaluates the effects of the Proposed Development on individual landscape elements and features, such as topography, trees and hedges which have been identified within the study area in the baseline survey. The assessment considers the sensitivity of these landscape resources and identifies the magnitude of change that the Proposed Development would create. The sensitivity of an individual landscape element or feature reflects factors such as its quality, value, contribution to landscape character and the degree to which the element can be replaced. An element or feature may be more sensitive in one location than another. Therefore it is not possible to simply place different types of landscape elements or features into sensitivity bands.

Where individual landscape elements or features have been affected professional judgement has been used to give an objective evaluation of its sensitivity. Justification is given for this evaluation where necessary.

Sensitivity of landscape features is determined by a combination of the value that is attached to a landscape feature or element and the susceptibility of the landscape feature/element to changes that would arise as a result of the Proposed Development – see Pages 88-90 of GLVIA3. Both value and susceptibility are assessed as high, medium or low. Professional judgement has been used to determine the magnitude of direct physical impacts on individual existing landscape features as detailed below in **Table 1**.

The assessment considers the sensitivity of the landscape character and the magnitude of change which would result from the Proposed Development. The sensitivity of landscape character is an expression of the landscape's ability to accommodate change. It varies depending on factors such as the existing land use, pattern and scale of the landscape, complexity, the degree of openness, condition, the value placed on the landscape and any designations that may apply. In most cases the landscape components in the immediate surroundings strongly influence the landscape character more so than distant elements or features. However, at elevated viewpoints it is possible to feel a sense of exposure or remoteness due to the absence of nearby features.

Sensitivity is determined by a combination of the value that is attached to a landscape and the susceptibility of the landscape to changes that would arise as a result of the Proposed Development – see Pages 88-90 of GLVIA3. Both value and susceptibility are assessed as high, medium or low.

Landscape value is considered in terms of factors such as the condition and quality of the landscape, the scenic quality, the rarity of the landscape in the locality and at a larger scale, the representativeness of the landscape, any particular conservation interests that may be present in the landscape, the recreation or amenity value of the landscape, its perceptual aspects such as wildness or tranquillity, and any associations that may exist between the local landscape and historical people or events. This list is not necessarily exhaustive or definitive (GLVIA3, Box 5.1, page 84).

The significance of effects on landscape character and landscape elements and features is determined by combining the sensitivity of the landscape character, elements or features with the magnitude of change. Those effects identified as being major and / or moderate may be regarded as significant effects with respect to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

Table 1 Sensitivity of Landscape Features, Character and Views

		VALUE		
		HIGH	**MEDIUM**	**LOW**
SUSCEPTIBILITY	**HIGH**	High	High	Medium
	MEDIUM	High	Medium	Low
	LOW	Medium	Low	Low

Tables 2 – 5 set out the criteria and significance thresholds for measuring the effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape character and landscape elements and features (the landscape resource) of the Application Site and surrounding area together with the definition of significance. The nature of the effects can be either, adverse or beneficial.

Unless otherwise stated the effects of the Proposed Development are assessed to be of an adverse nature.

Table 2 Generic Criteria for Sensitivity

HIGH	Areas that exhibit a strong positive character with valued elements or features that combine to give unity, richness and harmony. These are landscapes that may be considered to be of particular importance to conserve and which may be particularly sensitive to change in general and which may be detrimental if change is inappropriate. High quality or nationally recognised landscapes such as AONBs and National Parks.
MEDIUM	Areas that exhibit positive character but which may have evidence of past alteration to/degradation/erosion of elements or features resulting in areas of more mixed character. Potentially sensitive to change in general; again change may be detrimental if inappropriate but it may require special or particular attention to detail. Regionally or locally recognised landscapes such as SLAs.
LOW	Areas generally negative in character with few, if any valued elements or features. Scope for positive enhancement.

Table 3 Criteria for Magnitude of Change for Landscape Character and Landscape Resource Receptors

HIGH	Total loss or major alteration to (an) existing landscape character, element or feature characteristic to the Application Site or a specific landscape type / area.
MEDIUM	Partial loss or alteration to (an) existing landscape character element or feature characteristic to the Application Site or a specific landscape type / area.
LOW	Minor loss or alteration to part of (an) existing landscape character, element or feature characteristic to the Application Site or a specific landscape type / area.
NEGLIGIBLE / NO CHANGE	No notable loss or alteration to (an) existing landscape character, element or feature characteristic to the Application Site or a specific landscape type / area.

Table 4 Significance Matrix of Effects for Landscape Character and Landscape Resource Receptors

Magnitude of Change	Sensitivity of Receptor			
	High	**Medium**	**Low**	**Negligible**
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Negligible
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
Low	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

Table 5 Definition of Significance criteria for Landscape Character and Landscape Resource Receptors

MAJOR ADVERSE EFFECT	The proposed scheme would result in effects that are at complete/considerable variance with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape that cannot be fully mitigated; would permanently degrade, diminish or destroy the integrity of valued characteristic features, elements and/or setting; would cause a very high quality landscape of recognised value to be permanently changed and its quality diminished.
MODERATE ADVERSE EFFECT	The proposed scheme would be out of scale with the landscape or at odds with the local pattern and landform; will leave an adverse impact on a landscape of recognised quality.
MINOR ADVERSE EFFECT	The proposed scheme would not quite fit into the landform and scale of the landscape; affect an area of recognised landscape quality.
NEUTRAL / NOT SIGNIFICANT	The proposed scheme would complement the scale, landform and pattern of landscape, maintain existing landscape quality.
MINOR BENEFICIAL EFFECT	The proposed scheme has the potential to improve the landscape quality and character; fit in with the scale, landscape and the pattern of the landscape; enable the restoration of valued characteristic elements or features partially lost through other land uses.
MODERATE BENEFICIAL EFFECT	The proposed scheme would have the potential to fit in very well with the landscape character; improve the quality of the landscape through removal of damage caused by existing lands uses.
MAJOR BENEFICIAL EFFECT	The proposed scheme would fit in very well with the landscape character and would significantly improve the quality of the landscape through removal of damage caused by existing land uses.

Visual Assessment Methodology

The comprehensive visual assessment identifies the visual effects that the Proposed Development would have upon the visual amenity of receptors located within the surrounding landscape and townscape. The visual assessment is based on the Proposed Development detailed in the parameters plans and assesses the change in the view that would result if the scheme were to be constructed.

The assessment has examined views which would be observed from public locations of which some are representative or illustrative of views from residential properties. Three visual assessments have been made (a) during the construction phase; (b) during the operational phase at year one and (c) during the operational phase at year fifteen. A year-one assessment considers the effect that the Proposed Development would have upon views after completion and before the proposed planting would have a significant mitigating effect. The second visual assessments consider views after 15 years, taking into account vegetation growth during the intervening period. The visual assessment is based on the site visit supported by photographs and photomontages.

The sensitivity of receptor groups depends on factors such as duration of view, the angle at which they would see the Application Site and the nature of the viewer e.g. resident, tourist or worker. The sensitivity of receptors is established based on the value attached to a particular view and susceptibility of receptors to a particular type of development. In general residential receptors, tourists, recreational users of public rights of way and receptors gaining views from recognised vantage points are considered to attach a higher value to their views than people travelling along highways or at places of work.

Determining levels of magnitude depends on how prominent, or noticeable, the development would be in the landscape. This is affected by factors such as distance, angle of view, visual screening, the focus of the view and the nature and scale of other landscape features within the view. In order to establish the magnitude of change the assessment needs to consider such factors as scale and size of the visual effects, their duration and reversibility. The assessment of magnitude of change would also consider the degree of contrast and integration of the Proposed Development into the landscape perceived, its scale, mass and colour. With regard to the Proposed Development the duration of effects would be long term and considered, at this stage, not reversible.

The significance of effects on visual receptors is determined by combining the sensitivity of the visual receptor with the magnitude of change. Those effects identified as being of major significance may be regarded as significant effects with regard to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

Tables 6 – 9 below set out the criteria and significance thresholds for visual receptors. Effect on visual amenity is determined by the relationship between the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of change that would result from the Proposed Development. Effects may be adverse, beneficial or neutral.

Unless otherwise stated the effects of the Proposed Development are assessed to be of an adverse nature.

Table 6 Criteria for Sensitivity

HIGH	For example, residential properties and public rights of way.
MEDIUM	For example, sporting and recreational facilities, places of worship, public open space.
LOW	For example, industrial, highway users and commercial premises.

Table 7 Criteria for Magnitude of Change

HIGH	A major change in the view which has a defining influence on the overall view.
MEDIUM	Some change in the view that is clearly visible and forms an important but not defining element in the view.
LOW	Some change in the view that is not prominent but visible to some visual receptors.
NEGLIGIBLE / NO CHANGE	No change or negligible change in views.

Table 8 Significance Matrix of Effects for Visual Receptors

Magnitude of Change	**Sensitivity of Receptor**				
		High	**Medium**	**Low**	**Negligible**
	High	Major	Major	Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
	Low	Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

Table 9 Definition of Significance Criteria for Visual Effects

MAJOR ADVERSE EFFECT	Where the scheme would cause a significant deterioration in the existing view.
MODERATE ADVERSE EFFECT	Where the scheme would cause a noticeable deterioration in the existing view.
MINOR ADVERSE EFFECT	Where the scheme would cause a barely perceptible deterioration in the existing view.
NEUTRAL / NOT SIGNIFICANT	No discernible improvement or deterioration in the existing view.
MINOR BENEFICIAL EFFECT	Where the scheme would cause a barely noticeable improvement in the existing view.
MODERATE BENEFICIAL EFFECT	Where the scheme would cause a noticeable improvement in the existing view.
MAJOR BENEFICIAL EFFECT	Where the scheme would cause a significant improvement in the existing view.

Table 9 gives the overall degree of significance threshold for visual receptors. Effects are determined by the relationship between the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of change that would result from the Proposed Development.

Photographs have been taken digitally using a 50mm fixed focal length lens with a full frame camera Canon 5D II on a static tripod. All of the representative viewpoints have been taken at 1.7m above ground level. Viewpoints include, where relevant, residential properties, highways, public footpaths, bridleways, recreation and places of work.

Plans showing Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) (see **Appendix 3**) have been prepared for the purpose of the assessment which are based on the extent of the built form associated with the Proposed Development.

APPENDIX 2

MID CHERWELL
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
EXTRACTS

APPENDIX 3

ZONE OF THEORETICAL VISIBILITY METHODOLOGY AND MAPPING

APPENDIX 4

PHOTOVIEWS

APPENDIX 5

PHOTOMONTAGES

APPENDIX 6

SUMMARY OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
CONSTRUCTION								
Landscape Elements								
Topography, Land Form and Surface Drainage Features	Changes to the contours to accommodate foundations and building platforms, in part on previously disturbed/man-made ground	Permanent	Low	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Changes limited by detailed design. Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible
Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure	Removal of identified buildings and structures within Flying Field and Technical Area of the Conservation Area between southern edge of runway and Camp Road. Removal of chain link security fences south of Camp Road only.	Permanent	Medium to Low	Low to Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Minor to Negligible
Green Infrastructure	Trees, grassland and shrubs would be retained as far as practical and incorporated as part of the proposed Green Infrastructure.	Temporary	Low (amenity Grassland and Shrubs) High (Trees)	Low to Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible (amenity Grassland and Shrubs) Moderate - (Trees)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP. Loss of vegetation minimised through reserved Matters and AIA's	Moderate (Not Significant) to Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	POS Direct, short-term effect upon users of footpath 388/4	Temporary/ Permanent	High	Medium to Low	Local	Major to Moderate	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP.	Major to Moderate
Landscape Character and Designations								
Farmland Plateau LCA	Limited change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined local to Application Site – Minimal effect on LCA as a whole. Located predominantly on a brownfield land.	Temporary	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required for the wider LCA. Localised effects to in proximity to Application Site reduced by adherence to CEMP	Negligible
Wooded Estatelands LCA	Minimal indirect perceptual effects, well confined by woodland and hedgerow cover.	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required for the wider LCA. Localised effects to in proximity to Application Site reduced by adherence to CEMP	Negligible
Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA	Indirect - Limited level of inter-visibility and therefore limited change to the perceptual qualities; distance, and context provided by the built form of the	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	former Air Base and settlements within Cherwell Valley							
Upper Heyford Plateau LCA	Limited change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined local to Application Site – Minimal effect on LCA as a whole. Located predominantly on a brownfield land.	Temporary	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required for the wider LCA. Localised effects to in proximity to Application Site reduced by adherence to CEMP	Negligible
Cherwell Valley LCA	Indirect - Limited level of inter-visibility and therefore limited change to the perceptual qualities, distance, and context provided by the built form of the former Air Base	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible
Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA	Limited change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined local to Application Site – Minimal effect on LCA as a whole.	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Night-time Character	Temporary task lighting during winter months, and security lighting to construction compounds	Temporary	Medium - Low	Low	Local	Minor	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP (working hours/lighting operation)	Minor
Landscape Designations	None within study area	Temporary	High	No change	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible (No change)
OPERATION								
Landscape Elements								
Topography, Land Form and Surface Drainage Features	No further effect upon Topography and Land Form. Ecological ponds and surface water SUDS create new landscape elements	Permanent	Low	Low - positive	Local	Minor Beneficial	Drainage features incorporated into Green Infrastructure network to enhance amenity and ecological value	Minor Beneficial
Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure	Comprehensive change of land uses between runway and Camp Road establishes cohesive urban form. Changed uses from agricultural to residential and sports park in parcels 16, 17 and 18 south of Camp Road.	Permanent	Medium to Low	High to High (Positive)	Local	Major to Major Beneficial	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Neutral

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Green Infrastructure	Comprehensive scheme of landscape planting proposed, linked where practicable and desirable, to increase tree cover and hedge/shrub planting within and around Application Site. Retained grassland managed to enhance and balance biodiversity and amenity goals.	Permanent	Low (amenity Grassland) High (Trees)	High – to Medium positive	Local	Major to Moderate Beneficial	Implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategy and Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.	Major to Moderate Beneficial
	Comprehensive network of new POS created including substantial publicly accessible park, play space, community orchard and allotments. Increased connectivity with wider PROW network though reinstatement of Port Way and Aves Ditch long-distance routes as public bridleways and	Permanent	High	High - positive	Local	Major Beneficial	No mitigation required. Creation of POS network and increased access forms major enhancement of existing site.	Major Beneficial

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	greater permeability within Application Site. Permanent diversion of footpath 388/4.							
Landscape Character and Designations								
Farmland Plateau LCA	Limited change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined local to Application Site – Minimal effect on LCA as a whole. Improved transition between development and countryside.	Permanent	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Medium	Local	Minor to Minor Positive	High quality urban design and implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategy create transition at site edges	Neutral
Wooded Estatelands LCA	Minimal perceptual indirect effects, well confined by woodland and hedgerow cover.	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Green Infrastructure Strategy creates transition at site edges	Negligible
Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA	Indirect - Limited level of inter-visibility enhanced by proposed Green Infrastructure and therefore limited change to the perceptual qualities, distance, and	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	High quality urban design and implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategy create transition at site edges	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	context provided by the built form of the former Air Base.							
Upper Heyford Plateau LCA	Limited change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined local to Application Site – Minimal effect on LCA as a whole. Improved transition between development and countryside.	Permanent	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Medium	Local	Minor to Minor Positive	High quality urban design and implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategy create transition at site edges	Neutral
Cherwell Valley LCA	Indirect - Limited level of inter-visibility enhanced by proposed Green Infrastructure and therefore limited change to the perceptual qualities, distance, and context provided by the built form of the former Air Base.	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	High quality urban design and implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategy create transition at site edges	Negligible
Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA	Negligible change to its perceptual qualities, generally well confined local to Application Site – Minimal effect on	Permanent	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	High quality urban design and implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategy create	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	LCA as a whole. Improved transition between development and countryside.						transition at site edges	
Night-time Character	Intensity of use and change in land use patterns may lead to additional levels of night time lighting (sky glow and light spillage) in context of existing Heyford Park.	Permanent	Medium - Low	Low	Local	Minor	Preparation and adherence to an External Lighting Strategy	Minor
	Filming Activity	Temporary	High – Low	Low	Local	Minor	Preparation and adherence to a Filming Activity Strategy	Negligible
Landscape Designations	None within study area	Temporary	High	No change	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible (No change)
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS								
Landscape Elements								
Topography, Land Form and Surface Drainage Features	Construction Effects very localised and mitigated by each development	Permanent	Low	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Changes limited by detailed design. Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible
	Operation No further effect upon Topography and Land Form.	Permanent	Low	Low - positive	Local	Minor Beneficial	Surface-level drainage features incorporated into Green	Minor Beneficial

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	Ecological ponds and surface water SUDS create new landscape elements						Infrastructure network to enhance amenity and ecological value	
Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure	<u>Construction</u> Further demolitions within the former Air Base is tempered by their immediate built context and, in the case of Land South of Camp Road, the derelict condition of those structures. Pye Homes and Parcel 15 sites lie adjacent to and would be in keeping with the former Air Base and ongoing Heyford Park development.	Permanent	Medium to Low	Low to Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible
	<u>Operation</u> The Group A sites would each deliver land uses that complement Heyford Park, through high quality development and built form. The Group B sites would not be experienced in the	Permanent	Medium to Low	High to High (Positive)	Local	Major to Major Beneficial	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Neutral

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	context of built form, land use and infrastructure of the Application Site.							
Green Infrastructure	Assumed that any loss of trees and/or vegetation during construction would be offset and compensated for by proposed Green Infrastructure in accordance with Policy and best practice	Permanent	Low to High	Low to High	Local	Moderate to Minor	Construction works conducted in accordance with CEMP's. Loss of vegetation minimised through Reserved Matters and AIA's. Compensatory measures and enhancements delivered through GI Strategies	Negligible
Landscape Character and Designations								
Farmland Plateau LCA	All Group A sites fall within this LCA, but all are within or contiguous with former Air Base and would be 'read' in this context during construction and operation	Permanent	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Wooded Estatelands LCA	No direct cumulative effects from Group A or Group B sites. Indirect potential effects from views toward Parcel 15, Pye Homes in combination with parcels 12E, 22, 23 and 33 (Chilgrove Drive) during construction and operation	Permanent	Medium	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Negligible to Negligible (No change)
Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA	Indirect potential effects from views toward Land South of Camp Road in combination with parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34 during construction and operation. No direct or indirect cumulative effects from remaining Group A or Group B sites.	Permanent	Medium	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Negligible to Negligible (No change)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Upper Heyford Plateau LCA	All Group A sites fall within this LCA, but all are within or contiguous with former Air Base and would be 'read' in this context during construction and operation. No direct or indirect cumulative effects from Group B sites.	Permanent	Medium (overall) Low (around the Application Site)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Negligible
Cherwell Valley LCA	Indirect potential effects from views toward Land South of Camp Road in combination with parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34 during construction and operation. No direct or indirect cumulative effects from remaining Group A or Group B sites.	Permanent	Medium	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Negligible to Negligible (No change)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA	No direct cumulative effects from Group A or Group B sites. Indirect potential effects from views toward Parcel 15, Pye Homes in combination with parcels 12E, 22, 23 and 33 (Chilgrove Drive) during construction and operation	Permanent	Medium	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Negligible to Negligible (No change)
Night-time Character	All Group A sites fall within the former Air Base boundary or are contiguous with it. Additional lighting would be indistinguishable from existing sky glow or lights spillage No direct or indirect cumulative effects from Group B sites.	Permanent	Medium - Low	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	Local	Negligible to Negligible (No change)	Adherence to CEMP and best practice design as part of Reserved Matters appclaitions	Negligible to Negligible (No change)
Landscape Designations	None within study area	Permanent	High	No change	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible (No change)

APPENDIX 7

SUMMARY OF VISUAL EFFECTS

APPENDIX 7: SUMMARY OF VISUAL EFFECTS

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
CONSTRUCTION								
Visual Receptors								
Residential receptors (to north)	Somerton, Fritwell, and isolated properties in between - Ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Residential receptors (to east)	Ardley with Fewcott, Ashgrove Farm - Ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Residential receptors (to south) (distant)	Caulcott, Lime Hollow, Field Barn, Cheesman's Barn, Fir Tree Farm - Ground and low-level construction	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation							
Residential receptors (to south) in close proximity (Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes)	Construction activities within close proximity or adjacent to existing residential properties	Temporary	Medium	High	Local	Major	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP including site hoardings to screen views where necessary	Major to Moderate
Residential receptors (to west)	Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford, Rousham, The Astons - Ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Users of nearby PROW (to north)	Ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	(cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation and landform							
Users of nearby PROW (to east)	PROW in close proximity - Partial views gained of ground and high-level construction activities in parcels 22 and 23, and roadworks along Chilgrove Drive.	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (but not significant)	None required	Moderate (but not significant)
Users of nearby PROW (to south)	Footpath 388/4 crosses parcel 18. Other PROW in close proximity - Partial views gained of ground and high-level construction activities in parcels 16, 17, 18, 32W and 34. Cranes may be visible in parcels north of Camp Road.	Temporary	High	High - Footpath 388/4 Medium to Low – All other PROW	Local	Major - Footpath 388/4 Moderate - All other PROW	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP including site hoardings to screen views where necessary	Moderate (but not significant)
Users of nearby PROW (to west)	Ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	visible above intervening vegetation and landform							
Road users (to north)	Ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation and landform	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Road users (to east)	Limited views gained from Camp Road to east of Chilgrove Drive. Elsewhere ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation and landform	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Users of nearest roads (to south)	Fleeting, glimpsed views from B4030 Lower Heyford Road and Port Way (Kirtlington Road)	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	toward parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34. Elsewhere, Ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation and landform							
Users of nearest roads (to west)	Somerton Road screened by landform. Overall, ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation and landform	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Rousham Park	Overall, ground and low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be glimpsed above and between intervening	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	vegetation and landform							
Representative Viewpoints –Toward Application Site								
Viewpoint 1	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 2	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 3	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 4	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High (Residential) Medium (Road Users)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 5	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	None required	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint 6	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium (PROW) Low (Road)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 7	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)
Viewpoint 8	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 9	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Medium	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint 10	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 11	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 12	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Viewpoint 13	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Low	Local	Minor	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Minor
Viewpoint 14	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	High to Medium	Local	Major	Erection of site hoardings. Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Major
Viewpoint 15	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High (Residents) Medium (Road Users)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 16	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 17	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 18	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint 19	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint 20	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 21	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 22	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High (Residential) Medium (Road Users)	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Viewpoint 23	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 24	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High (PROW) Medium (Road Users)	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)
Proposed Viewpoints – Within Application Site								
Viewpoint A	Refer to Photoviews – no viewpoint during construction	Temporary	Medium	Medium to Negligible	Local	Moderate to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint B	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Medium	Local	Moderate	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint C	Refer to Photoviews – no viewpoint during construction	Temporary	Medium	Medium to Negligible	Local	Moderate to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint D	Refer to Photoviews – no viewpoint during construction	Temporary	Medium	Medium to Negligible	Local	Moderate to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint E	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Medium	Local	Moderate	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Viewpoint F	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Medium	Local	Moderate	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
OPERATION								
Visual Receptors								
Residential receptors (to north)	Somerton, Fritwell, and isolated properties in between - No change arising from development up to 18m. Top of 30m Viewing Tower potentially visible but largely screened by boundary vegetation	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Residential receptors (to east)	Ardley with Fewcott, Ashgrove Farm – Proposed Development (5m to 30m) not visible due to intervening landform and vegetation	Permanent	High	Negligible (no change) (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible (no change)
Residential receptors (to south) (distant)	At Year 1 - Limited view of 10.5m and 13m development in parcels 16, 32W and 34 from some	Permanent	High	Low to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Year 1 - Moderate to Negligible Year 15 –	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	houses within Caulcott, Lime Hollow, Field Barn, Cheesman's Barn, and Fir Tree Farm. Seen in context of Heyford Park and former Air Base structures. No views to parcels north of Camp Road (incl. 5m to 30m).					Minor to Negligible	Site and along southern boundary will filter and screen views	
Residential receptors (to south) in close proximity (Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes)	Direct views to new high quality residential development of similar height and scale to existing development in parcels 10, 11, 12E, 13, 16, and 17 and employment in parcels 20, 21 and 22 including Energy Facility. New development seen in context of recent Heyford Park development and/or former Air Base structures.	Temporary	Medium	Medium (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Proposed building heights restricted to 10.5m or 13m adjacent to existing residential properties. Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries of, and within, Application Site	Neutral

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Residential receptors (to west)	No views to parcels (incl. 5m to 30m) from Upper or Lower Heyford, or Rousham. Potential distant views (incl. 10.5m to 30m) from localised properties within the Astons but likely to be screened by unmapped vegetation and built form.	Permanent	High	Low to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Year 1 – Minor to Negligible Year 15 – Minor to Negligible	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site and along southern boundary will filter and screen views	Negligible
Users of nearby PROW (to north)	Top of 30m Viewing Tower may be visible, but remainder of Application Site would be screened by intervening vegetation and landform.	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Users of nearby PROW (to east)	Views of new development in parcels 22 and 23, and Chilgrove Drive partly filtered by existing tree belts. New buildings seen in context of	Permanent	High	Low to negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Year 1 – Minor to Negligible Year 15 – Negligible	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site and around eastern end of	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	existing structures.						runway and south of SBS will filter and screen views	
Users of nearby PROW (to south)	Footpath 388/4 diverted around edge of parcel 18 within landscaped setting. Other PROW in close proximity - partial views gained of new buildings and structures in parcels 16, 17, 18, 32W and 34. Development north of Camp Road barely perceptible.	Permanent	High	Medium - Footpath 388/4 Low – all other PROW	Local	Footpath 388/4 Year 1 – Major Year 15 – Negligible All other PROW – Minor (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site including network of informal paths and along southern boundary will filter and screen views	Footpath 388/4 – Neutral All other PROW - Negligible
Users of nearby PROW (to west)	Some views toward new buildings (including Viewing Tower) but controlled by local landform and aspect, intervening built form and vegetation, and seen in context of other development	Permanent	High	Low to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Minor to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site and adjacent to reinstated Port Way will filter and screen views	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	in wide panorama.							
Road users (to north)	Development <13m not visible. Potential for 18m and 30m development to be visible locally from Somerton to Ardley/Fritwell roads above tree canopy	Permanent	Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Road users (to east)	Views of new development in parcels 22 and 23, and Chilgrove Drive partly filtered by existing tree belts. New buildings seen in context of existing structures.	Permanent	Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site and along eastern end of runway will filter views	Negligible
Users of nearest roads (to south)	Fleeting, glimpsed views from B4030 Lower Heyford Road toward parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34 at Year 1 softened by proposed landscape planting by Year 15	Permanent	Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site and along southern boundary will filter and screen views locally	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Users of nearest roads (to west)	Somerton Road screened by landform. Overall, views screened by intervening vegetation and landform	Permanent	Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site and along western boundary and adjacent to reinstated Port Way will filter and screen views	Negligible
Rousham Park	Proposed Development not visible	Permanent	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Representative Viewpoints – Toward Application Site								
Viewpoint 1	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 2	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 3	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 4	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High (residential) Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
			(Road Users)					
Viewpoint 5	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Low (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Retention, enhancement and extension of existing tree belt south of SBS Proposed tree planting around site periphery	Negligible
Viewpoint 6	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium (PROW) Low (Road Users)	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 7	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)
Viewpoint 8	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Retention, enhancement and extension of existing tree belt south of SBS Proposed tree planting	Negligible
Viewpoint 9	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium (Year 1) Low Beneficial (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Year 1) Minor	Tree and hedgerow retention and enhancement along Chilgrove	Neutral

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
						Beneficial (Year 15)	Drive and proposed new boundary planting. Provision of dedicated road crossing.	
Viewpoint 10	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 11	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Low (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Proposed GI including tree planting, community orchard and allotments	Negligible
Viewpoint 12	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Medium (Year 1) Low (Year 15)	Local	Major (Year 1) Moderate (Year 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along southern boundary of Application Site	Moderate
Viewpoint 13	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along southern boundary of Application Site	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Viewpoint 14	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	High (Year 1) Medium (Year 15)	Local	Major (Year 1) Moderate (Year 15)	High quality design and GI planting	Moderate
Viewpoint 15	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High (Residential) Medium (Road Users)	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 16	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 17	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible (No change)
Viewpoint 18	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Low (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Minor (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 19	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Low (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Moderate (but not significant) (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries and within development parcels	Moderate (but not significant)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Viewpoint 20	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Low (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate to Minor (Not Significant) (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries and within development parcels	Negligible
Viewpoint 21	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 22	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High (PROW) Medium (Road Users)	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)
Viewpoint 23	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible
Viewpoint 24	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High (PROW) Medium (Road Users)	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Proposed Viewpoints – Within Application Site								
Viewpoint A	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Improved public access to viewpoint. High quality design and GI planting	Negligible
Viewpoint B	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium to Medium (Positive)	Local	Moderate to Moderate Beneficial	Creation of new publicly accessible viewpoint. Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries	Neutral
Viewpoint C	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Improved public access to viewpoint. High quality design and GI planting	Negligible
Viewpoint D	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium to Negligible	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Years 1 and 15) To Negligible	Improved public access to viewpoint. High quality design and GI planting	Moderate (Not Significant) To Negligible
Viewpoint E	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium to Medium (Positive)	Local	Moderate to Moderate Beneficial	Creation of new publicly accessible viewpoint.	Neutral

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
							Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries	
Viewpoint F	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium to Medium (Positive)	Local	Moderate to Moderate Beneficial	Creation of new publicly accessible viewpoint. Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries	Neutral
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS								
Visual Receptors – Cumulative Effects Group A Sites								
Residential, PROW and Road Users receptors (to north)	Construction No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Temporary	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible (No change)	None required	Negligible (No change)
	Operation No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Permanent	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible (No change)	None required	Negligible (No change)
Residential, PROW and Road Users receptors (to east)	Construction PROW in close proximity to east and south - Partial views gained of ground and high-level construction activities in cumulation with	Temporary	High (Residential and PROW) Medium (Road Users)	Low to Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Minor to Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	parcels 22 and 23, and roadworks along Chilgrove Drive in cumulation with Pye Homes and parcel 15 Land South of Camp Road and Village Centre North sites not intervisible as screened by Heyford Park							
	<u>Operation</u> Pye Homes and Parcel 15 limited and very localised intervisibility with Chilgrove Drive, parcels 12, 21, 22 and 23; would be perceived as part of Heyford Park from PROW and Camp Road (east) Land South of Camp Road and Village Centre North sites not intervisible as screened by Heyford Park	Permanent	High (Residential and PROW) Medium (Road Users)	Low to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Year 1) Minor Beneficial (Year 15)	None required. Boundary planting would be delivered as part of Pye Homes/Parcel 15	Neutral

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Residential receptors to the south (Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes)	Parcels 10, 11, 16, 17, and 20 would not be seen in cumulation with any Group A sites (parcel 16 will screen views from Tait Drive toward Land South of Camp Road). Residential parcels 12E, 13, and employment parcels 21 and 22 (including Energy Facility) may been seen in part from a few residential properties at Letchmere Farm and Trenchard Circus in cumulation with Parcel 15/Pye Homes. Parcel 13 will largely screen views from Larsen Road to Pye Homes/Parcel 15 permitting slot views only between buildings.	Temporary	Medium	Low to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Minor to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed building heights restricted to 10.5m or 13m adjacent to existing residential properties. Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries of, and within, Application Site	Neutral

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
PROW and Road Users receptors (to south)	Construction Glimpsed views of Land south of Camp Road potentially gained from a few sections of PROW and Lower Heyford Road in cumulation with, but largely screened by, parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34.	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible
	Operation Glimpsed views of Land south of Camp Road potentially gained from few locations in cumulation with, but largely screened by, parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34; would be perceived as part of Heyford Park Village Centre North, Pye Homes and Parcel 15 sites not intervisible as screened by Heyford Park	Permanent	High (Residential and PROW) Medium (Road Users)	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along southern boundary, sports park and within development parcels	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Residential, PROW and Road Users receptors (to west)	Construction May be very localised glimpsed views of parcels 16 and 18 in association with Land South of Camp Road. Other Group A cumulative sites not intervisible as screened by intervening land form, built form and/or vegetation	Temporary	High to Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible
	Operation May be very localised glimpsed views of parcels 16 and 18 in association with Land South of Camp Road. Other Group A cumulative sites not intervisible as screened by intervening land form, built form and/or vegetation	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along western boundary of sports park and within development parcels	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Rousham Park	Construction No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Temporary	High	No change	National	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)
	Operation No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Permanent	High	No change (Years 1 and 15)	National	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible (No change)
Representative Viewpoints –Toward Application Site – Cumulative Effects Group A Sites								
Viewpoint 9	Construction Pye Homes and Parcel 15 limited intervisibility with Chilgrove Drive, parcels 21, 22 and 23; would be perceived as part of Heyford Park. Pye Homes would screen views to parcels 12 and 13.	Temporary	Medium	Medium	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
	Operation Pye Homes and Parcel 15 limited and very localised intervisibility with Chilgrove Drive, parcels 21, 22 and 23; would be perceived as part of	Permanent	Medium	Medium (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Tree and hedgerow retention and enhancement along Chilgrove Drive and proposed new boundary	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	Heyford Park from PROW and Camp Road (east). Pye Homes would screen views to parcels 12 and 13. Land South of Camp Road and Village Centre North sites not intervisible as screened by Heyford Park						planting.	
Viewpoint 12	<u>Construction</u> Glimpsed views of Land South of Camp Road potentially gained from Viewpoint 12 in cumulation with, but partly screened by, parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34 Construction activity on other Group A and Group B cumulative sites not intervisible as screened by intervening land form, built form	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	and/or vegetation							
	Operation Glimpsed partial views of Land south of Camp Road potentially gained from a few sections of PROW and B4030 Lower Heyford Road in cumulation with, but partly screened by, parcels 16, 18, 32W and 34 at Year 1, but screened by Year 15 as proposed landscape planting to parcels 16 and 18 matures.	Permanent	High	Low (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along western boundary of sports park and within development parcels	Negligible
Viewpoint 13	Construction May be very localised glimpsed views of low level construction activity in parcels 16 and 18 in association with Land South of Camp Road. Construction activity on other Group A cumulative sites not intervisible as	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	screened by intervening land form, built form and/or vegetation							
	Operation May be very localised glimpsed views of parcels 16 and 18 in association with Land South of Camp Road at Year 1, but screened by Year 15 as proposed landscape planting to parcels 18 matures. Other Group A cumulative sites not intervisible as screened by intervening land form, built form and/or vegetation	Permanent	Medium	Low (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Local	Minor (Year 1) Negligible (Year 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along western boundary of sports park and within development parcels	Negligible
All other Viewpoints (1 – 8, 10, 11, and 14 – 24)	Construction No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Temporary	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	Operation No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Permanent	High to Medium	No change (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible (No change)
Representative Viewpoints – Within Application Site – Cumulative Effects Group A Sites								
Viewpoint A - F	No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites during construction or operation	Permanent	High	No change	Local	Negligible (No change)	None required	Negligible (No change)
Visual Receptors, Representative Viewpoints Toward and Within the Application Site – Cumulative Effects Group B Sites								
Visual Receptors, Representative Viewpoints Toward and within the Application Site	Potential intervisibility with one Group A site (VCN) but this would be indistinguishable within Proposed Development and former Air Base context. No intervisibility with other Group A or Group B cumulative sites during construction or operation.	Temporary, (Construction) Permanent (Operation)	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible (No change)	None required	Negligible (No change)