

7 LANDSCAPE & VISUAL IMPACTS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 This Chapter summarises and cross-refers to the findings of the Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA) that 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 LVIA is presented in full at **Appendix 7.1**. 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 Chapter 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.

7.1.2 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 which describes the parameters of the Proposed Development.:

7.1.3 The Application Site is located within the administrative boundary of Cherwell District Council (CDC). Its location is illustrated on the Site Location Plan (see **ES Figure 1.1**).

7.2 ASSESSMENT APPROACH

Methodology

7.2.1 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** of the LVIA.

Assessment of Significance

7.2.2 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 7.1** and in the LVIA at **Appendix 7.1**.

Table 7.1 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

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

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

Legislative and Policy Framework

7.2.5 The LVIA includes review of national and local planning policy and guidance published by CDC insofar as it relates to landscape and visual matters (see **LVIA, Section 2**). Publications considered include:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG);
- Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 (Saved Policies);
- Adopted Local Plan 1996 (Saved Policies);
- Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031; and
- Draft Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2031.

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

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

7.2.7 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.

7.2.8 Many of these relate 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.

Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Character Map

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

Scoping Criteria

7.2.10 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

7.2.11 A preliminary study area of 5km from the Application Site boundary (see **LVIA, Figure 1**) has been used to review baseline conditions, to carry out site visits, and to identify and assess relevant landscape and visual receptors.

7.2.12 A series of plans showing 'screened' zone of theoretical visibility (sZTV), which take 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 **LVIA, Appendix 3**). It should be noted that the sZTV do 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.

Limitations to the Assessment

7.2.13 Extensive site studies and photography have 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.

7.2.14 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.

7.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS

7.3.1 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 identification of the landscape receptors and visual receptors / views to be assessed.

Site Description and Context

Application Site and Landscape Elements

Topography, Land Form and Drainage

7.3.2 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 **LVIA, 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.

7.3.3 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

7.3.4 The Application Site encompasses 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 **LVIA, Figure 1**). Two parcels of 'greenfield' agricultural land are included within the Application Site in accordance with Policy 5 Villages of the CDC Local Plan. Parcel 16 lies toward the southwest of the Application Site, and parcel 17 including the Sewage Works, lies to the southeast of the Application Site. A further greenfield parcel, parcel 18 lies to the west of parcel 16, outside of the allocated land. 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.

7.3.5 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 and preparation. 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 uses.

7.3.6 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.

7.3.7 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.

7.3.8 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 and residential properties off Larsen Road and Soden Road.

Green Infrastructure

7.3.9 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.

7.3.10 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.

7.3.11 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.

7.3.12 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

7.3.13 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 **LVIA, Figure 1**).

7.3.14 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.

7.3.15 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.

7.3.16 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.

7.3.17 Topographically, the landscape gently slopes to the southeast toward Gagle Brook and south toward Gallos Brook (see **LVIA, 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

7.3.18 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)

7.3.19 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.

7.3.20 The OWLS assessment classifies four landscape character types within the vicinity of the Application Site (see **LVIA, 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

7.3.21 The Application Site falls within and is surrounded on all sides by the Farmland Plateau landscape type.

7.3.22 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. This describes the landscape pattern and scale formed by large, regularly-shaped arable fields and medium-sized mixed plantations, and small fields of semi-improved grassland surrounding villages. Hedges are noted to be generally low with scattered hedgerow trees, although trees are sparse to the south of the former Air Base.

7.3.23 The influence and prominence of the former Air Base buildings in views from Cherwell Valley are also noted. 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.” Key Recommendations are made in conclusion to the Farmland Plateau landscape character description seeking to 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

7.3.24 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 characterised by arable farming and small villages with strong vernacular character, rolling topography, large blocks of ancient woodland and mixed plantations, large parklands and mansion houses, regularly-shaped arable field pattern and small villages with strong vernacular character.

7.3.25 The description of the Local Character Area C. Middleton Stoney notes that in the Application Site context ‘woodland is a strong landscape element, and large woodland blocks are associated with the parklands and estates’.

7.3.26 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 it 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

7.3.27 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. The presence of “small unspoilt villages with rural character” is also noted as a key characteristic of this LCA.

7.3.28 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.

7.3.29 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.

7.3.30 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.

7.3.31 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.

River Meadowlands

7.3.32 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 and therefore, River Meadowlands LCA has been excluded from further consideration within the assessment.

Cherwell District Landscape Assessment (1995)

7.3.33 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 (CDLA) published in November 1995. However, it should be borne in mind that subsequent to the CDLA, 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.

7.3.34 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; and Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA is located to the south east abutting the Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive junction (**LVIA, Figure 4**).

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

7.3.35 The Upper Heyford Plateau LCA is, broadly speaking, located to the east of the River Cherwell. It includes a short section of the M40 motorway and the settlements of Fritwell and Ardley. The London to Birmingham 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.

7.3.36 Broadly speaking this LCA is characterised 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."

7.3.37 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.

7.3.38 The southernmost and northernmost parts of this LCA share a similar weak field pattern and landscape with few hedges and fewer trees where fields of arable land tend to run into one another with no visual or physical interruption.

7.3.39 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 and night time light pollution on the former Air Base is visible over long.

7.3.40 Two ancient routes, the Port Way and Aves Ditch, are also noted in the CDLA as special features (see **LVIA, Figure 5**).

7.3.41 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.

7.3.42 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

7.3.43 This LCA is associated with the valley of River Cherwell to the west of the Application Site, following a narrow corridor between Banbury and Kirtlington. 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. A number of settlements, such as Steeple Aston or Middle Aston are located on the upper slopes of the valley. 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. Field pattern is mostly of medium to small scale pastoral fields, with medium to large scale arable fields localised on the valley sides, allowing for distant views across the valley.

7.3.44 Notably, Rousham Park, a Grade I Registered Park, is located on the edge of this LCA (within West Oxfordshire District) with a broad swathe of the Cherwell Valley (Rousham Conservation Area) forming a backdrop to views gained from the park.

7.3.45 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

7.3.46 Topographically, this LCA is described as gently undulating and characterised by extensive parklands and estate farmland.

7.3.47 This LCA is wooded with frequent parkland trees, dividing and enclosing the landscape and controlling distant views; exist where breaks in vegetation allows and the document states that arable cultivation is the most common land use. The surrounding countryside displays a number of characteristics typical for estate farmland such as boundary treatment and tree avenues and a patchwork of arable fields and woodlands. 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.

7.3.48 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

7.3.49 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. Therefore, other LCAs identified in the preliminary 5km study area and shown on the Landscape Character Areas Plan (see **LVIA, Figure 4**) have been excluded from the assessment.

7.3.50 Various published landscape character assessments 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

7.3.51 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. It repeats the information provided by CDLA 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 **LVIA, Figure 5**).

7.3.52 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.

7.3.53 Part 7: Character Analysis, section 7.1.1 summarises the general character of the Flying Field Landscape as open grassland bisected by runways, taxiways and hardstanding. Strategically located buildings are identified including The Quick Reaction Alert Area (Area 1C), Northern Bomb Stores and Special Weapons Area (Area 5A), the Avionics Maintenance Facility Area (Area 8); and Southern Bomb Store (Area 4).

7.3.54 The Technical Site is described as the first area that is accessed off Camp Road after passing through the main gate, and includes original 1920's low-density buildings with grassland and organised tree planting. Three partially tree-lined avenues that radiate from north of the main gate and have the air of being at the hub of the airbase.

7.3.55 The Residential Zone may be divided into a number of distinct areas which form an array of very different characters, including 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.

7.3.56 It is noted that there are few significant internal views within this area although there are views from the southern boundary out over the Caulcott plateau. Main views into the airbase are noted from Somerton to Ardley road and associated footpaths to the east which give a view into the northern section of the Flying Field; and from the B4030 which gives a panoramic view of the southern boundary of the former Air Base.

RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief (2007)

7.3.57 The 'RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief' (2007) adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) by the Council is broadly consistent with the previously mentioned reports. In particular it notes that 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.

7.3.58 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 the LVIA and has not been considered further.

Night-time Character

7.3.59 A qualitative visual assessment of sky glow, glare and light intrusion has been conducted with reference to Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Notes for the reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01 (2011) and Night Lights mapping published by the Campaign for Rural England (CPRE) website (www.cpre.org.uk), to review existing light sources and their influence upon night time landscape character in terms of location and extent, type, and effects.

7.3.60 The 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.

7.3.61 Transitory vehicle lighting along the roads and lanes, was most noticeable along routes upon the elevated plateau when observed from Cherwell Valley to the west. Ardley ERF, and vehicular and 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 are illuminated by internal lighting and the top of the exhaust stack is marked by a cluster of red aviation warning lights which are seen from long distances, including from the western bluff of the Cherwell Valley.

7.3.62 The main sources of light locally around and within the Application Site includes street lighting along Somerton Road at Upper Heyford, Camp Road, and the Camp Road/B4030/Chilgrove Drive junction, and residential roads within the existing Heyford Park and isolated white security lights occur within the Flying Field. These sources contribute to sky glow although it is noted that new street lighting along Camp Road focus light downwards, minimising sky glow when compared to the older 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

7.3.63 Residential receptors fall principally within the frequently occurring settlements, but also include individual dwellings, hamlets and isolated farmsteads. Upper Heyford is the closest settlement, 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 Somerton and Ardley where landform controls the opportunity for views. The availability of views 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.

7.3.64 Residential receptors also occur adjacent to the Application Site boundary within the Heyford Park/former Air Base. The availability of views 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.

7.3.65 A number of non-residential visual receptors have been identified which include places of work, transport corridors, registered parks and gardens and PROW including recreational long-distance routes although not all of these receptors would gain views towards the Proposed Development.

7.3.66 Minor roads and 'B' roads collectively form a relatively dense road network outside of the Cherwell Valley, which includes the B430 and the B4030 lies to the south. The M40 is the only motorway in the study area to the east; to the northeast, the A43 connects with M40 junction 10 near Ardley. The A4095 connects Bicester with Kirtlington to the south, and the A4260 Oxford Road is located to the west.

7.3.67 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.

7.3.68 The nearest railway line is the main line between London Marylebone and Birmingham, just 115m to the east but it is set within cuttings. Receptors travelling along the Oxford to Banbury railway line within the Cherwell Valley to the west would theoretically have limited opportunities to view the Application Site between Lower Heyford station and Somerton Crossing but in reality, such views would be limited by the built form and vegetation. None of these receptors have therefore been considered relevant due to the limited level of theoretical visibility, and so are not considered further in this assessment.

7.3.69 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.

7.3.70 As indicated by the ZTV plans (see **LVIA, 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 the LVIA. 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.

7.3.71 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.

7.3.72 The Aves Ditch and Port Way are mentioned in several sources, including the Council's published assessment on the local landscape. Aves Ditch PRow includes a restricted byway, a bridleway and public highway along Chilgrove Drive before being truncated by the former Air Base; it is anticipated that this route would be reinstated around the eastern edge of the runaway at an early stage of the Proposed Development.

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 of bridleway to the north of Camp Road truncated by the former Air Base (see **LVIA, Figure 1**); it is anticipated that this route would be reinstated prior to construction of the Proposed Development. Other promoted long-distance walking routes falling within the study area are the Claude Duval Bridle route and Palladian Way to the southeast.

7.3.73 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 trees 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.

7.3.74 Two Sustrans National Cycle Network (NCN) routes, Route 5 (West Midlands) and Route 51 (South Midlands), lie outside of the 5km study area and so are not considered further in the LVIA.

7.3.75 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.

7.3.76 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 of the former School Huts area to the south of Camp Road.

Viewpoint Selection

7.3.77 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 screened ZTV is included at **LVIA, 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 **LVIA, Appendix 3**).

7.3.78 The assessment of landscape and visual effects is informed by a series of twenty-four representative viewpoints shown in conjunction with the. The viewpoints have been selected 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. A number of these viewpoints have been agreed with the Cherwell District Council Landscape Officer, whilst others have been added further to desk studies and field work. The viewpoint assessment is used to inform and illustrate the assessment of effects on landscape character and the assessment of effects on views.

7.3.79 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.

7.3.80 **Table 7.2** below lists the representative viewpoints to be assessed and provides information on their location, receptor type, and distance from the Application Site.

7.3.81 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 7.3** 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 7.2 Identified viewpoints looking toward Application Site

No.	Viewpoint Name and Distance to the Application Site	Location	Receptors
1	Footpath 367/15/10, Tusmore, 3.8km	At point where footpath crosses into second field heading southwest away from road.	PROW and road users
2	East Street, M40 overbridge, 2.5km	At northeast corner of bridge, looking west-southwest	Road users/public realm
3	Footpath 219/8/20, Fritwell, 1.7km	Footpath south of the churchyard stile, at the edge of the tree canopy, looking west-southwest	Residents and PROW in Conservation Area
4	Fritwell Road, Fewcott, 900m	Western edge of carriageway at field gate opposite Manor Farm, looking southwest	Road users/public realm in Conservation Area
5	Bridleway 109/30/10, Ardley, 800m	On bridleway to west of Station Road, south of rail overbridge, looking west.	PROW users
6	Footpath 148/3/10, Bucknell, 2.7km	On footpath, west of Middleton Road rail overbridge, looking northwest.	PROW users
7*	B4030/M40 overbridge, Linkslade, 3.4km	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, on north-eastern edge of M40 overbridge, looking northwest.	Road users
8	Heyford Road/Footpath 297/4/10, Middleton Stoney, 2.2km	On northern verge adjacent to overgrown stile, looking northwest	PROW and road users along edge of Registered Park and Garden
9	Aves Ditch Restricted Byway 289/1/20 at Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive, 0m	On byway at southern verge of junction adjacent to stile.	Existing PROW/road users/public realm
10	Footpath 289/5/40 west of Aves Ditch at Gallows Brook, 2.2km	Footpath south of Caulcott, looking north	PROW users
11	Footpath 388/4/40 northwest of Lime Hollow, 330m	North of footbridge, looking north	PROW users
12	Footpath 289/4/10 north of Caulcott, 640m	Footpath north of Caulcott, looking north	PROW users
13	Port Way/B4030 Lower Heyford Road junction, 900m	Port Way at field entrance north of B4030 junction.	Road/PROW users in Conservation Area
14	Tait Drive, Heyford Park, 0m	Verge at southern end of Tait Drive looking northwest	Existing residents
15	Somerton Road/Mill Lane (Barley Mow PH) junction, 300m	South western pavement at junction of Somerton Road and Mill Lane, adjacent to the Barley Mow pub.	Residents/road users in village
16	Rousham Park, Dying Gladiator Statue, 2.5km	North east and behind of the sculpture, looking northeast.	Visitors to Registered Park and Garden in Conservation Area

No.	Viewpoint Name and Distance to the Application Site	Location	Receptors
17*	The Dickredge, Steeple Aston, 2.2km	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, at eastern end of lane before field gate, looking east.	Residents and PROW users
18	Footpath 364/6/20, Steeple Aston, 1.7km	Footpath north of The Eyecatcher and Cow Lane, looking east.	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, 2.2km	Representative of Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, from close to footpath northeast of Fir Lane, looking southeast	PROW users/occupants of Middle Aston House
20	Middle Aston Lane, south of North Aston, 2.7km	From the grass verge near Warren Lodge, looking southeast.	Road and PROW users
21	St Mary's Walk/Footpath 310/12/10, North Aston, 2.8km	From upper edge of car parking area south of St Mary's Church, looking southeast.	Residents and road users in Conservation Area
22*	Water Street, Somerton, 1.6km	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, from southern edge of road midway between River Cherwell and Oxford Canal adjacent to field gate, looking south	Road users
23	Ardley Road, Somerton, 800m	From Fritwell Road where a field gate permits glimpsed southwest views.	Road users
24*	Mill Lane, Kirtlington, 5.5km	Draft Neighbourhood Plan Appendix C View, from northern edge of carriageway where hedge dips locally, looking north-northeast.	Users of bridleway and track

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

Table 7.3 Proposed Representative Viewpoints within Application Site

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

7.4 ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

7.4.1 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 **ES Figure 4.2: 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

7.4.2 The construction phase would require removal of the existing disused buildings, and structures to be demolished as shown on as shown on **ES Figure 4.1: 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.

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

- Temporary construction compound(s), site office, cabins and lighting;
- Demolition of buildings and structures listed in Schedule 1;

- Removal of non-retained vegetation and protective fencing to retained vegetation;
- Excavation, groundworks and utilities;
- Temporary storage of materials, vehicles, and machinery;
- Vehicle and plant movements (including cranes);
- Construction of buildings and structures; and
- Reinstatement of areas following completion of construction phase.

7.4.4 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 housing/school sites. Construction activity and the resulting effects would be temporary in nature.

Landscape Elements

Topography, Land Form and Drainage

7.4.5 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 but this 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. 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 relationship with the surrounding landscape would be unchanged.

7.4.6 Existing drainage features and structures would be retained and protected where practicable. Their value in terms of landscape elements is low and therefore localised removal would lead to no more than negligible magnitude of change, resulting in a negligible significance of effect (see also **ES Chapter 8: Ecology** for assessment of ecological effects).

Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure

7.4.7 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.

7.4.8 Demolition of various buildings and structures would be necessary to enable implementation of the Proposed Development (see **ES Figure 4.1**). 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. Some of the northern HASs would be subject to a change of use in keeping with ongoing employment activities within the Flying Field.

7.4.9 Miscellaneous small structures would be removed that are of low sensitivity, many of which 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.

7.4.10 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. Overall, it is considered that the magnitude of change upon land use and built form arising from demolition of such medium scale structures 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 would be minor to negligible.

Green Infrastructure

7.4.11 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.

7.4.12 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. Vegetation to be retained would be protected during construction 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 8: 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.

7.4.13 The extent of existing vegetation that would need to be removed is to be agreed with the CDC 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.

7.4.14 At present the Application Site, other than Chilgrove Drive, and parcel 18 which is crossed by footpath 388/4) is not publicly accessible. The footpath would be affected temporarily during construction and would be permanently diverted around the edges of parcel 18. 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.

7.4.15 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.

7.4.16 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

Farmland Plateau LCA

7.4.17 The Application Site, apart from the junction of Chilgrove Drive with Camp Road falls within and displays characteristics of the Farmland Plateau LCA, sub area H. Fritwell, as described in the OWLS. Ongoing construction 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.

7.4.18 The perception of construction activities would have little effect on the appreciation of the surrounding agricultural landscape with views generally limited to the users of public footpaths located immediately to the north, south, east and west of the Application Site, Camp Road, B4030 Lower Heyford Road and Port Way. Views of the construction works would be limited by orientation of view, intervening landform, vegetation and buildings. Overall, there would be a negligible magnitude of change upon this LCA arising from construction of the Proposed Development, which would be temporary in nature. The sensitivity of this LCA is medium 'in the round' and low around the Application Site and construction effects are therefore negligible.

Wooded Estatelands LCA

7.4.19 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 to glimpses of tall construction plant such as cranes. The sensitivity of this LCA, is medium 'in the round' and the magnitude and significance of effect would be negligible.

Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA

7.4.20 This LCA occupies the flanks of the Cherwell Valley would be generally screened or restricted by the rising topography. 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. 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

7.4.21 The CDLA 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. No direct effects would arise from construction of the Proposed Development 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. Only temporary, limited indirect effects upon views would occur during the construction phase and so offsite effects would be perceptual only.

7.4.22 Topography 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 would help to preserve the current perception of enclosure.

7.4.23 Other characteristics of this LCA would also be retained with limited indirect effects resulting from the visibility of the construction activities across the landscape. Views of the construction traffic and activities within the Application Site would be generally limited to 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. 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.

7.4.24 Overall, it is assessed that the temporary construction activities on the largely brownfield site in the context of established built form would result in a negligible magnitude of change. 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

7.4.25 The majority of the Application Site is separated from the Upper Heyford Plateau LCA by land which is in either agricultural or community uses. 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.

7.4.26 Landscape effects would be limited to the perceptual qualities of the Cherwell Valley LCA. The CDLA notes particular characteristics associated with the valley floor and water meadows, and views from Rousham Park along the valley. As identified during site visits there are views towards the Application Site due to landform and vegetation cover. The perception of construction activities would be limited due to the distance and vegetation cover. Some taller elements (cranes) may be potentially visible, seen above hedgerows and amongst the tree canopies.

7.4.27 Views from the eastern part of this LCA would be generally screened or restricted by the rising topography, and any change introduced by the construction phase would

have little influence over the character of the River Cherwell LCA and its perception would be largely preserved resulting in a negligible magnitude of change and negligible significance of effect.

Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA

7.4.28 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 Chilgrove Drive. Construction of the proposed road junction would have very localised temporary effects upon the character of the wider LCA. The sensitivity of this LCA, is low 'in the round' and the magnitude and significance of effect would be negligible, aided by the wooded nature of this LCA which limits the availability and extent of views.

Night-time Character

7.4.29 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 would be restricted and tend to be locally visible only, seen in the context of Heyford Park and Flying Field employment uses. Lighting design and operation would be in accordance with the principles set out in **Chapter 4** of the ES, and would be implemented and controlled through individual CEMPs. Overall, effects arising from construction lighting would be localised and temporary, leading to a low magnitude of effects with no greater than minor significance.

Visual Amenity

Visual Receptors

7.4.30 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 **LVIA, Appendix 4: Photoviews** and summarised under Representative Viewpoints. A series of photomontages have also been prepared (see **LVIA, Appendix 6: Photomontages**).

7.4.31 Established vegetation adjacent to the northern edge of the Flying Field and intervening landform of the runway 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. Tall plant may be visible but this would comprise a very small and temporary element within the overall view leading to no more than a negligible magnitude of effect and so the significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible.

7.4.32 Views from residential properties in Ardley with Fewcott, and at Ashgrove Farm toward ground level construction 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.

7.4.33 Views toward low level construction activities to the south of Camp Road from residential properties 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. Views 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 ground level construction activities, resulting in medium to low magnitude of effect and moderate but not significant effects due to existing development context. Footpath 388/4 would be diverted around the edges of parcel 18, and therefore the magnitude of effect is considered to be high, but it would be set within a landscaped corridor and so the residual effect would be moderate but not significant. Tall construction plant 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.

7.4.34 Views from 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 would be screened by intervening land form, vegetation and/or built form. Views from Somerton Road are screened by intervening landform. Tall plant 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 and so the significance of effects and residual effects during construction would be negligible.

7.4.35 Residents within Heyford Park adjacent to the Proposed Development, and neighbouring residential properties at Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes, 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

7.4.36 Views from the majority of Rousham House and Garden would be screened by intervening landform and vegetation with limited views gained from two locations toward tall plant, which would comprise a very small and temporary element within the overall view leading to no more than a negligible magnitude and significance of effect.

Viewpoints

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

7.4.38 In summary, receptors present at eighteen of the 24 representative viewpoints 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.

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

7.4.40 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.

7.4.41 Viewpoint 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, it is considered that the significance of effect would be major.

Proposed Viewpoints

7.4.42 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.

7.4.43 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

7.4.44 Permanent elements of the Proposed Development, as defined on the Composite Parameter Plan (see **ES Figure 4.2**) 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.

7.4.45 Mixed use developments of the nature proposed tend to give rise to effects within the landscape by virtue of their individual form and overall mass of the built form, and 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.

Landscape Elements

Topography, Land Form and Drainage

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

7.4.47 Newly constructed sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) would be landscaped to establish new ponds and swales that would mature during the operation of the Proposed Development. These would fulfil drainage requirements, but would be integrated within the proposed Green Infrastructure to enhance amenity and ecological objectives, 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

7.4.48 Prevailing employment uses within the Flying Field to the north of the runway would be maintained, other than localised changes of use, and variable temporary filming uses with the Quick Response Alert area, Northern Bomb Stores, and the eastern third of the Flying Field and retained Southern Bomb Stores (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 specific method statements in accordance with an overarching filming strategy to be developed as part of the s.106 commitment.

7.4.49 Existing car processing employment uses would be retained on site centred on the southern taxiway, although this would be shifted further to the west (parcel 25).

7.4.50 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 in parcels 20, 21 and 38; and, extra care dwellings in parcel 19.

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

7.4.52 Education uses within parcels 32W and 32E allow for expansion of the existing school(s), whilst parcel 31 would provide a new primary school within retained Air Base structures. A sports park and community uses would be provided within parcels 18 and 34, respectively.

7.4.53 Creation of a Flying Field Park in parcel 28 would provide open public access to the previously inaccessible Flying Field, and Control Tower Park (parcel 30) would generally be open to the public but with opportunities to hold private events; the Control Tower would be refurbished.

7.4.54 Co-ordinated tourism uses would be established within parcel 29, and 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 also be provided.

7.4.55 Finally, parcel 33 (Chilgrove Drive) would be realigned and upgraded to form a new eastern access; the existing road would be retained, thus reinstating the historic Aves Ditch bridleway.

7.4.56 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

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

7.4.58 Landscaped buffer strips and corridors would be established along the eastern end of the Flying Field along 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. A new hedgerow with strategic gaps to permit views across the Flying Field and the Cherwell Valley would have been established pre-construction along 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.

7.4.59 Additional landscape planting would enhance the setting of the Proposed Development and screen existing key structures such as the Avionics Building. Tree planting is also proposed along the principal circulation routes such as Trident Way. As previously noted, SUDS provision would be designed and managed to enhance landscape amenity and biodiversity whilst fulfilling its primary drainage function.

7.4.60 The new sports park would provide a variety sports pitches and courts. Elsewhere, informal and equipped children's play facilities and fitness equipment would be appropriately located within landscape corridors and buffers. Reinstatement of Aves Ditch and creation of a network of routes would improve connectivity to the wider PROW network, including the previously reinstated Port Way PROW.

7.4.61 In summary, proposed tree planting would markedly increase the number of trees within the Application Site compared to existing. Provision of a comprehensive Green Infrastructure network would filter and enhance screening of views toward the Proposed Development, create a transition between 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

7.4.62 The Proposed Development would help to fulfil some of the Landscape Strategy guidelines set out within the OWLS, by establishing tree belts around the former Air Base and maintain the sparsely settled rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development in and around the existing Heyford Park settlement, although conversely, this would lead to perception of an increased development density within the former Air Base.

7.4.63 Proposed landscape management of existing vegetation and proposed new planting particularly along the eastern and southern edges, and adjacent to the

reinstated Port Way PROW would also contribute to the Key Recommendations of OWLS by maintaining and strengthening Farmland Plateau hedgerows and tree belts.

7.4.64 The Application Site encompasses and therefore limits Proposed Development to the former Air Base, other than allocated parcels that lie beyond the security fence. The Green Infrastructure Strategy seeks to retain existing vegetation where appropriate, 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.

7.4.65 The Proposed Development limits development height and scale across the proposed parcels to 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.

7.4.66 The Proposed Development would therefore exert low magnitude positive and negative effects upon the achievement of the Farmland Plateau Landscape Strategy, leading to an overall neutral effect.

Wooded Estatelands LCA

7.4.67 The Proposed Development would have only indirect effects upon this LCA 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 its wooded nature which limits the availability and extent of views. The effect on this LCA is therefore negligible.

Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA

7.4.68 The Proposed Development would have only indirect effects upon this LCA which would be restricted to potential views gained from the western flanks of the Cherwell Valley. The magnitude of change and significance of effect at Year 1 would be negligible, 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 complete the vegetated horizon, screening lower parts of the Proposed Development. The effect on this LCA is therefore negligible at Years 1 and 15.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

7.4.69 The Proposed Development would be located within the former Air Base except for parcels 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 CDLA does not consider recent changes within the former Air Base and 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.

7.4.70 There would be limited loss of agricultural land or any other landscape elements that contribute to the character of this LCA. The current level of enclosure and the topography of this LCA would also prevail, enhanced by proposed removal of the chain link security fence south of Camp Road (see **ES Figure 4.5 Existing and Proposed Fence Plan**) and new planting in accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

7.4.71 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, the effects would be minor adverse and beneficial, leading to an overall neutral effect.

Cherwell Valley LCA

7.4.72 The landscape effects upon this LCA would be limited to its perceptual qualities only. As indicated on the ZTV plans (**LVIA, 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 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. 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. The perceptual qualities identified by the CDLA 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 that would be associated with Upper Heyford (Somerton Road), Heyford Park, and the former Air Base including Camp Road.

7.4.73 Views from the higher ground within this LCA include the built form of the former Air Base. The Proposed Development would be seen in this context and would extend the perceived 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 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

7.4.74 The new Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive junction would have minimal direct and indirect effects, which would be well contained by the wooded nature of this LCA. By Year 15 proposed planting would be well-established appropriate to this LCA context. The sensitivity of this LCA, is medium and the magnitude and significance of effect would be negligible at Years 1 and 15.

Night-time Character

7.4.75 The Proposed Development would intensify land uses within the former Air Base and parcels in accordance with Policy 5 Villages. The Proposed Development would also change the character of some areas north of Camp Road by replacing technical air base structures and spaces with commercial, residential and other associated uses.

7.4.76 The Proposed Development would require appropriate levels of external lighting to ensure safety and security for occupants and visitors to the site. Although it would 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.

7.4.77 Low-key external and street lighting would be appropriately designed to ensure that obtrusive light is minimised to limit sky glow, light trespass and glare. Feature lighting may be appropriate for key buildings, but this would provide emphasis at a local level whilst minimising visibility from the wider landscape.

7.4.78 Existing tall structures within the former Air Base that are at comparable heights to the proposed 30m high Viewing Tower 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 so would not be incongruous in this setting.

7.4.79 Night time views from the north are limited by dense vegetation immediately to the north, with occasional 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. 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.

7.4.80 Proposed lighting would not be directly visible from 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 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 would be dominated by lighting associated with the M40/A43, Cherwell Valley Services and Ardley ERF; negligible effects would arise from the Proposed Development.

7.4.81 Operational lighting within parcels 16 and 17 would be visible from limited sections of Port Way, Lower Heyford Road, Greenway and a few properties within Caulcott to the south, 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. 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.

7.4.82 The proposed 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 Astons. However, this effect would be mitigated 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 but some properties along Somerton Road may experience direct effects from views to proposed lighting in parcel 10, gained within the context of existing street lighting along Somerton Road and Camp Road; strategic landscape buffers would filter and limit the extent of operational lighting visible. Lighting levels within the Flying Field would remain similar to existing. For some properties along Somerton Road there would be direct effects arising from views to proposed lamp columns with at most a negligible magnitude of change and negligible effect. From some parts of the elevated landscape to the west including The Astons, there would be indirect effects arising from slight increase in sky glow, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect.

7.4.83 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, for the purposes of the night time landscape character assessment, it is assumed that one illuminated pitch is provided for evening use during dark winter months, and that this would be located towards the northeast to minimise effects upon the wider landscape. This location would also, in visual and landscape character terms, group the facility with existing lighting of Heyford Park; the sports pitch lighting would be designed to minimise potential effects on neighbouring uses. It would give rise to additional levels of lighting, and may be visible from the south and west, 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 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.

7.4.84 Land within the proposed Filming Activity areas would be temporary, and may at times include temporary lighting which is assumed to be low-level, localised and short term; it is unlikely to be visible from extensive areas of surrounding landscape, but may be apparent 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

7.4.85 The following provides an overview of the visual amenity of receptors during operation of the Proposed Development, which sets the context of the individual viewpoint assessments presented at **LVIA, Appendix 4: Photoviews** and summarised under Representative Viewpoints.

7.4.86 Proposed structures of up to 18m height would not be visible from residential properties within Somerton, Fritwell, isolated residential properties, PROW, and roads to the north of the Application Site due to the screening effects of landform and intervening vegetation. 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. The significance of residual effects upon receptors to the north during operation would be negligible and no mitigation would be required.

7.4.87 Views from residential properties in Ardley with Fewcott and Ashgrove Farm would be screened by intervening vegetation and built form. Partial views may be gained locally by PROW users (see **LVIA, Appendix 4, Viewpoint 5**) and short sections of Camp Road toward 18m and 13m high development in parcels 22 and 23, respectively, and street furniture associated with Chilgrove Drive may be glimpsed. The enhanced tree belt to the south of the SBS and proposed landscape planting along the edges of the runway (parcel 27) would soften and filter any views gained. The significance of effects and residual effects with the operational development in place would be negligible.

7.4.88 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 Lime Hollow, Field Barn, Cheesman's Barn and Fir Tree Farm, 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 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, 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 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.

7.4.89 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; such views would be subject to and controlled by orientation of view, and intervening land form, built form and vegetation. No views of built development would be gained by users of Somerton Road. Views gained from PROW and other 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 (see **LVIA, Appendix 4, Viewpoint 19**). Views from Rousham House and Registered Garden (see below) would be 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.

7.4.90 Properties at Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes that fall within close proximity 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. 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

7.4.91 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.

7.4.92 The informal pleasure grounds and features 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 the 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.

7.4.93 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.

7.4.94 There are two very limited locations within Rousham Park where narrow views of part of the former Air Base may be gained. The site visit confirmed that views can be gained from the very localised top corner of the Arcade as illustrated by Viewpoint 16 (see **LVIA, Appendix 4, Viewpoint 16**), 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 horizon. Its boundary vegetation would help to assimilate it into the view and the perceived landscape with the landscape features surrounding the receptor continuing to characterise the view.

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

Viewpoints

7.4.96 A detailed assessment of representative viewpoints during the operational stage of the Proposed Development is included at **LVIA, 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.

7.4.97 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.

7.4.98 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 at 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.

7.4.99 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.

7.4.100 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

7.4.101 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.

7.4.102 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 to negligible 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.

7.4.103 Controlled views would be gained from the reinstated Port Way PROW (Viewpoint B) across the Flying Field toward the Proposed Development to the southeast, and from the reinstated Aves Ditch PROW (Viewpoints E and f) 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.

7.5 MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT

Mitigation by Design

7.5.1 Extensive refinement of the Development Parameters has delivered 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.

7.5.2 Over time the proposed planting indicated on the Composite Parameter Plan (see **ES Figure 4.2**) and the Green Infrastructure Strategy 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 enhanced by loose belts of trees and informal groups of trees and shrubs arranged along the boundaries of the eastern end of the runway; the southern boundary of Southern Bomb Stores; the realigned Chilgrove Drive; community orchard/allotments south of parcel 17; along the southern and western boundaries of parcels 16 and 18; and intermittent hedgerow planting along 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.

7.5.3 Landscape elements and resources to be retained will be protected throughout the construction phase to ensure their long-term viability for re-use. 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

7.5.4 During the construction phase, 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, including neighbouring occupied residential developments.

7.5.5 Site hoardings will 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.

7.5.6 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. 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

7.5.7 The Green Infrastructure Strategy sets out landscape enhancements that would be delivered by the Proposed Development including increased tree cover; selection of appropriate plant species to enhance amenity and biodiversity; creation of a comprehensive network of public spaces with 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 PROWs including Port Way. The PROW network would be enhanced through reinstatement of Aves Ditch long distance route, including a dedicated equestrian crossing of Camp Road.

7.6 CUMULATIVE AND IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS

7.6.1 **Chapter 2** of the ES 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.

7.6.2 A location plan showing the cumulative development sites to be assessed are set out on **ES Figure 2.1**. For the LVIA, the cumulative sites have been 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

7.6.3 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

7.6.4 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.

7.6.5 The Group A sites would each deliver land uses that complement Heyford Park and Heyford Park Masterplan through high quality development and built form; overall the magnitude of change and effects arising from Group A sites would be negligible.

7.6.6 The Group B sites would not be experienced in the context of built form, land use and infrastructure of the Application Site.

Green Infrastructure

7.6.7 Effects upon existing vegetation, open space and PROW would be minimised and mitigated by each cumulative development (Group A and Group B sites), and cohesive Green Infrastructure strategies would be delivered as part of the planning applications 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

7.6.8 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.

7.6.9 The Group B sites lie to the east and southeast of the Farmland Plateau LCA boundary and are separated visually and physically from it by the Wooded Estatelands LCA, and so it would not influence the perceptual qualities of this landscape. Accordingly, no cumulative effects would arise.

Wooded Estatelands LCA

7.6.10 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.

7.6.11 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, no cumulative effects would arise upon this LCA from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites.

Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA

7.6.12 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.

7.6.13 The Group B sites lie approximately 7km to the east and southeast of the Farmland Slopes and Valley Sides LCA boundary and no cumulative effects would arise.

Upper Heyford Plateau LCA

7.6.14 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 and Heyford Park 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.

7.6.15 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 there would be no cumulative effects.

Cherwell Valley LCA

7.6.16 None of the identified cumulative developments are within this LCA therefore any effects would be limited to the perceptual qualities of this landscape.

7.6.17 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.

7.6.18 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 and so no cumulative effects would arise.

Oxfordshire Estate Farmlands LCA

7.6.19 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.

7.6.20 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 from construction or operation of the Proposed Development in combination with the Group B sites.

Night Time Character

7.6.21 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.

7.6.22 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

7.6.23 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.

7.6.24 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.

7.6.25 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).

7.6.26 Group A sites, Village Centre North and Land South of Camp Road, would not be 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.

7.6.27 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.

7.6.28 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.

7.6.29 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.

7.6.30 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 and so the former Air Base and its environs (and hence the Group A cumulative sites) as a whole are not visible. The magnitude of effect is 'no change', resulting in a negligible (no change) significance of effect when considering the cumulative sites.

Viewpoints

7.6.31 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.

7.6.32 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.

7.6.33 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.

7.6.34 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.

7.6.35 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 construction and operation of the proposed development and former Air base structures, leading to a negligible effect.

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

7.7 SUMMARY

Introduction

7.7.1 The 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. The Assessment has been conducted in accordance with best practice set out in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (2013). Consideration has been given to published Landscape Character Assessments (LCA's). The effects upon visual amenity have been assessed based on a number of viewpoints and visual receptors identified in agreement with CDC's Landscape Officer.

7.7.2 Consideration has been given to published documents and has focused on the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy (OWLS) and Cherwell District Landscape 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.

Baseline Conditions

7.7.3 The Application Site encompasses 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 included within the Application Site in accordance with Policy 5 Villages of the Cherwell District Council Local Plan.

7.7.4 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.

7.7.5 Several Landscape Character Areas (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.

7.7.6 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 to the north, east, south and west 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.

7.7.7 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.

7.7.8 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.

7.7.9 The summary of the assessment upon landscape elements, landscape character, night time character, visual receptors, representative viewpoints, and cumulative effects is included in **Table 7.4: Summary of Landscape Effects** and **Table 7.5: Summary of Visual Effects**.

Likely Significant Effects

7.7.10 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 the parameter plans. The construction phase would require removal of the existing disused buildings, and structures to be demolished as shown on as shown on parameter plans and accompanying schedules.

7.7.11 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.

7.7.12 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.

7.7.13 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.

7.7.14 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, 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.

7.7.15 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 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. 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.

7.7.16 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.

7.7.17 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 and Environmental 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.

7.7.18 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.

7.7.19 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.

7.7.20 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.

7.7.21 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.

7.7.22 The Proposed Development limits heights 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.

7.7.23 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 a low magnitude of effects with no greater than minor significance.

7.7.24 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 hangars etc.) with commercial, residential and other associated uses such as education. External lighting is required 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 but would be seasonal and limited in terms of operating times and frequency. There would be indirect effects on night time character, with at most a low magnitude of change, and a minor level of effect.

7.7.25 Proposed Filming Activity would be temporary, and may at times include night time filming, which is unlikely to be visible from extensive areas of the surrounding landscape, but may be apparent from the immediate locale. It 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.

7.7.26 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.

7.7.27 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.

7.7.28 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 negligible leading to negligible residual significance.

7.7.29 Views from residential properties in Upper and Lower Heyford, and Steeple Aston, Middle Aston, and North Aston, 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 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 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 PROW and other 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 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.

7.7.30 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.

7.7.31 Tall plant such as cranes would not be visible from the majority of Rousham House and Registered Garden, but they may be visible from two 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 seen as a relatively small element on the horizon at a distance of over 2km. Considering Rousham Park and 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.

7.7.32 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.

7.7.33 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. Effects experienced by users of the reinstated Port Way and Aves Ditch would be neutral.

7.7.34 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.

7.7.35 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 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 the Northern Bomb Stores, leading to moderate but not significant effects at Years 1 and 15. The effects upon the Avionics Building and QRA would be moderate at Year 1, reducing to negligible by Year 15, as proposed planting within parcel 10 matures.

7.7.36 Six proposed viewpoints within the Flying Field have been assessed. These include three future baseline viewpoints 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. The remaining proposed viewpoints would have limited public accessibility during development, and so moderate but not significant would arise from the demolition or construction works upon them.

7.7.37 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 the PROW users would be moderate to moderate beneficial at Year 1 and Year 15, as the proposed scheme would complement the scale, landform and pattern of the Flying Field landscape leading to an overall neutral effect.

Mitigation and Enhancement

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

7.7.39 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.

7.7.40 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.

Conclusion

7.7.41 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.

7.7.42 **Table 7.4** provides a summary of landscape effects, mitigation and residual effects and **Table 7.5** provides a summary of visual effects, mitigation and residual effects.

Table 7.4 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								
<i>Landscape Elements</i>								
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	High to Low	Low to Negligible	Local	Moderate to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP. Loss of vegetation minimised through Reserved Matters and AIA's	Moderate (Not Significant) to Negligible
	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

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
<i>Landscape Character and Designations</i>								
Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy and Cherwell District Landscape Assessment Landscape Character Areas	Host LCA's - (Farmland Plateau and Upper Heyford Plateau LCA's) Limited change to perceptual qualities, generally well confined locally to the Application Site and immediate surroundings	Temporary	Medium	Low/Low – positive to Negligible	Local	Minor/Minor – positive to Negligible	Localised effects to in proximity to Application Site reduced by adherence to CEMP	Neutral to Negligible
	Neighbouring LCA's	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required for the wider LCA's.	Neutral to Negligible
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								
<i>Landscape Elements</i>								
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

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
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
Green Infrastructure	Comprehensive scheme of landscape planting proposed, increased 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 parks, play space, community orchard and allotments. Increased connectivity with wider PROW network through reinstatement of Aves Ditch long-distance route as public	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

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	bridleway and greater permeability within Application Site. Permanent diversion of footpath 388/4.							
<i>Landscape Character and Designations</i>								
Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy and Cherwell District Landscape Assessment Landscape Character Areas	Host LCA's (Farmland Plateau and Upper Heyford Plateau LCA's) - Limited change to perceptual qualities, generally well confined locally to the Application Site and immediate surroundings enhanced by proposed Green Infrastructure	Permanent Indirect	Medium	Medium to Negligible	Local	Minor/Minor – positive to Negligible	High quality urban design and implementation of Green Infrastructure Strategy create transition at site edges	Neutral to Negligible
	Neighbouring LCA's	Permanent Indirect	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required for the wider LCA's.	Negligible
Night-time Character	Intensity of, 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 Indirect	Medium - Low	Low	Local	Minor	Preparation and adherence to an External Lighting Strategy	Minor
	Filming Activity - Rousham would not be affected due to geographical relationship with proposed filming areas.	Temporary Indirect	High – Low	Low to Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	Preparation and adherence to a Filming Activity Strategy	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
Landscape Designations	None within study area	Permanent	High	No change	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible (No change)
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS								
<i>Landscape Elements</i>								
Topography, Land Form and Surface Drainage Features	<u>Construction</u> Effects very localised and mitigated by each development	Permanent	Low	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Limited by detailed design. Works in accordance with CEMP	Negligible
	<u>Operation</u> 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	SuDS incorporated into Green Infrastructure network to enhance amenity and ecological value	Minor Beneficial
Land Use, Built Form and Infrastructure	<u>Construction</u> Further demolition is tempered by the immediate built context 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	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	Neutral

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	the context of the Application Site.						form	
Green Infrastructure	Assumed that any loss of vegetation during construction would be offset and compensated for by proposed Green Infrastructure	Permanent	Low to High	Low to High	Local	Moderate to Minor	Adherence to CEMP and design as part of Reserved Matters applications and AIA's. Compensatory measures through GI Strategies	Negligible
<i>Landscape Character and Designations</i>								
Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy and Cherwell District Landscape Assessment Landscape Character Areas	Host LCA's (Farmland Plateau and Upper Heyford Plateau LCA's) - All Group A sites fall within these LCA's, 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	Minor/Minor – positive to Negligible	High quality design delivered through Reserved Matters applications to achieve cohesive and appropriate settlement sympathetic to existing pattern and scale of built form	Neutral to Negligible
	Neighbouring LCA's Indirect potential effects on views from the east and west toward closest development parcels during construction and operation. No direct or indirect cumulative effects from	Permanent Indirect	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	Negligible to Negligible (No change)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	remaining Group A or Group B sites.						form. None required for the wider LCA's.	
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 lighting. No direct or indirect cumulative effects from Group B sites or Filming Activity	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 applications. Preparation and adherence during operation to an External Lighting Strategy.	Negligible to Negligible (No change)
Landscape Designations	None within study area	Permanent	High	No change	Local	Negligible	N/A	Negligible (No change)

Table 7.5: 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								
<i>Visual Receptors</i>								
Distant Residential receptors (to north, east, south and west)	Low-level construction activities not visible, but tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation	Temporary Indirect	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Residential receptors in 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
Users of nearby PROW (to north and west)	Tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation and landform	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Users of nearby PROW (to east and south)	PROW in close proximity - Partial views gained of ground and high-level construction activities in closest parcels.	Temporary	High	High - Footpath 388/4 Medium to Low – All other PROW	Local	Major - Footpath 388/4 Moderate - All other PROW (but not significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP including site hoardings to screen views where necessary	Moderate (but not significant)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

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 (to north, east, south and west)	Tall plant (cranes) may be visible above intervening vegetation and landform.	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Rousham Park	Tall plant (cranes) may be glimpsed above and between intervening vegetation and landform from limited locations	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible
<i>Representative Viewpoints –Toward Application Site</i>								
Viewpoints 1-4, 6–8, 10, 11, 13-17, 20-24	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	Low to Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	None required	Minor to Negligible/ Negligible (no change)
Viewpoints 5, 9, 12, 18 and 19	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High to Medium	Medium to Low	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoint 14	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	High	High to Medium	Local	Major	Erection of site hoardings. Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Major
<i>Proposed Viewpoints – Within Application Site</i>								
Viewpoints A, C and D	Refer to Photoviews – no viewpoint during construction	Temporary	Medium	Medium to Negligible	Local	Moderate	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
Viewpoints B, E and F	Refer to Photoviews	Temporary	Medium	Medium	Local	Moderate	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

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								
<i>Visual Receptors</i>								
Residential receptors (to north)	Somerton, Fritwell, and isolated properties in between. Top of viewing tower potentially visible	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 not visible	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 closest parcels from some houses to the south Seen in context of Heyford Park and former Air Base structures.	Permanent	High	Low to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Year 1 - Moderate to Negligible Year 15 – Minor to Negligible	Proposed Green Infrastructure within Application Site and along southern boundary will filter and screen views	Negligible
Residential receptors (to south) in close proximity (Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes)	Direct views to new high quality residential and employment development of similar height and scale to 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

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

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)	Potential distant views 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 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 partly filtered by existing tree belts. New buildings seen in context of existing structures.	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 runway and south of SBS will filter and screen views	Negligible
Users of nearby PROW (to south)	Footpath 388/4 diverted within landscaped setting. Other PROW in close proximity - partial views gained of new buildings and structures.	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

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

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 nearby PROW (to west)	Views controlled by local landform and aspect, intervening built form and vegetation, and seen in context of other development in wide panorama.	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
Road users (to north)	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 partly filtered by existing tree belts 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 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
Users of nearest roads (to west)	Somerton Road screened by landform. Overall, 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	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
							reinstated Port Way will filter and screen views	
Rousham Park	Very small part of Proposed Development visible from two localised places	Permanent	High	Negligible	National	Negligible	Retention and enhancement of boundary vegetation within parcels	Negligible
<i>Representative Viewpoints – Toward Application Site</i>								
Viewpoints 1-8, 10, 11, 13, 15-18, 20-24	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	High to Medium	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible/ Negligible (no change)
Viewpoint 9	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium (Year 1) Low Beneficial (Year 15)	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Year 1) Minor Beneficial (Year 15)	Tree and hedgerow retention and enhancement along Chilgrove Drive and proposed new boundary planting. Provision of dedicated road crossing.	Neutral
Viewpoints 12 and 14	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 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)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
<i>Proposed Viewpoints – Within Application Site</i>								
Viewpoints A and 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
Viewpoints B, E and F	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium (Positive)	Local	Moderate to Moderate Beneficial	Creation of new publicly accessible viewpoint. Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries	Neutral
Viewpoint D	Refer to Photoviews	Permanent	Medium	Medium to Negligible	Local	Moderate (Not Significant) (Years 1 and 15)	Improved public access to viewpoint. High quality design and GI planting	Moderate (Not Significant) to Negligible
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS								
<i>Visual Receptors – Cumulative Effects Group A Sites</i>								
Residential, PROW and Road Users receptors (to north)	<u>Construction</u> No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Temporary	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible (No change)	None required	Negligible (No change)
	<u>Operation</u> No intervisibility with Group A cumulative sites	Permanent	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible (No change)	None required	Negligible (No change)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

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 east)	<u>Construction</u> PROW in close proximity to east and south - Partial views gained of construction activities in cumulation with in cumulation with Pye Homes and parcel 15.	Temporary	High (Residential and PROW) Medium (Road Users)	Low to Negligible	Local	Minor to Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Minor to Negligible
	<u>Operation</u> Pye Homes and Parcel 15 only - limited and very localised intervisibility perceived as part of 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
Residential receptors to the south (Heyford Park, Letchmere Farm and Duvall Park Homes)	Nearest residential and employment parcels may be seen in part from a few residential properties in cumulation with Parcel 15/Pye Homes. Parcel 13	Temporary	Medium	Low to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Minor to Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Building heights restricted adjacent to existing residential properties. Proposed GI structure planting along boundaries of, and within, Application Site	Neutral
PROW and Road Users receptors (to south)	<u>Construction</u> Glimpsed views of Land South of Camp Road potentially gained from a few sections of PROW and Lower Heyford	Temporary	High	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

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. <u>Operation</u> Glimpsed views of Land South of Camp Road potentially gained from few locations but would be perceived as part of 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
Residential, PROW and Road Users receptors (to west)	<u>Construction</u> May be very localised glimpsed views in cumulation with Land South of Camp Road construction only.	Temporary	High to Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible
	<u>Operation</u> May be very localised glimpsed views in association with Land South of Camp Road.	Permanent	High	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Local	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	Proposed GI structure planting along western boundary and within development parcels	Negligible
Rousham Park	<u>Construction</u> No intervisibility with Group A or B cumulative sites.	Temporary	High	No change	National	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)
	<u>Operation</u> No intervisibility with Group A or B cumulative sites.	Permanent	High	No change (Years 1 and 15)	National	Negligible (Years 1 and 15)	None required	Negligible (No change)
<i>Representative Viewpoints –Toward Application Site – Cumulative Effects Group A Sites</i>								
Viewpoint 9	<u>Construction</u> Pye Homes and Parcel 15 limited	Temporary	Medium	Medium	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	intervisibility would be perceived as part of Heyford Park.							
	<u>Operation</u> Pye Homes and Parcel 15 limited and very localised intervisibility with would be perceived as part of Heyford Park.	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 planting.	Negligible
Viewpoint 12	<u>Construction</u> Glimpsed views of Land South of Camp Road construction in cumulation with closest parcels.	Temporary	High	Low	Local	Moderate (Not Significant)	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Moderate (Not Significant)
	<u>Operation</u> Glimpsed partial views of Land South of Camp Road potentially gained from a few sections of PROW and B4030 Lower Heyford Road at Year 1, but screened by vegetation by Year 15.	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	<u>Construction</u> Very localised glimpsed views of construction activity in association with	Temporary	Medium	Negligible	Local	Negligible	Works conducted in accordance with CEMP	Negligible

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

7.Landscape & Visual Impact

Receptor / Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effect	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
	Land South of Camp Road.							
	<u>Operation</u> May be very localised glimpsed views of closest parcels with Land South of Camp Road at Year 1, but screened by vegetation by Year 15.	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)	<u>Construction and Operation</u> No intervisibility with Group A or B cumulative sites	Temporary	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible	None required	Negligible (No change)
<i>Representative Viewpoints – Within and Toward Application Site – Cumulative Effects Group A and B Sites</i>								
Viewpoints A - F	Potential intervisibility with one Group A site (Village Centre North) but this would be indistinguishable within Proposed Development context. No intervisibility with other Group A or B cumulative sites during construction or operation.	Permanent	High to Medium	No change	Local	Negligible/ Negligible (No change)	None required	Negligible/ Negligible (No change)

