

LANDSCAPE REBUTTAL APPEAL STATEMENT

On behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd with reference to planning appeal:

APP/B1605/W/21/3273053 Land at Oakley Farm, Cheltenham

1. This statement has been prepared by Paul Harris CMLI to assist the Inspector and other interested parties by preparing tables that compares the significance of landscape and visual effects arising from assessments made in proofs of evidence for landscape and visual matters for this appeal.
2. Landscape receptors have been listed to reflect those identified in the proofs of evidence submitted to this appeal. To achieve a reliable comparison, it has been necessary to identify the broad receptors and then set out further sub assessments of individual elements or components of those broader landscape receptors.
3. This approach has also been undertaken with a comparison of effects on views. Views have been separated into short/local, medium and long distance views and then further grouped by association with a specific location. These locations are identified in the left hand column of **Table 1**.
4. For both comparison of landscape and visual effects, I have taken the residual or permanent effects of development proposals when mitigation has been established and its effectiveness taken into consideration in assessments.
5. **Table 1** sets out visual assessments made within the submitted proofs of evidence for each representative location and includes landscape witness references to viewpoint photographs. It is accepted that not all viewpoint photographs will have been taken from the exact same location but viewpoint photographs can be considered to generally be representative of the view available from that location of and toward the appeal site, which is of course the intention of representative viewpoints.
6. Where an assessment has not been made or comments on a view referred to in such a way that it cannot fairly be used to draw an assessment comparison, this is stated in **Table 1**. This does not imply that the witness has not considered the viewpoint/visual receptor or drawn a conclusion on potential harm in their proof of evidence. I have made a professional judgement on comparability but have not attempted to 'make a round peg fit a square hole'.
7. This statement includes landscape and visual assessments were made, by the Appellant, the Cotswolds Conservation Board, Friends of Oakley Farm Pasture Slopes and Cheltenham Borough Council. The methodology and analysis behind each assessment has not been included (as these are provided in the proofs of evidence or Appellants landscape ES chapter) and only the residual or permanent landscape and visual effects after mitigation has been considered, are presented.
8. **Table 1:**

Table 1: Comparison table for viewpoint assessment

Views	View Description	CCB (John Mills)	FOFPS (Unnamed)	CBC (Stuart Ryder)	Appellant (Paul Harris)
Local/short Views		Viewpoint Reference and Predicted Significance of Visual Effects			
1. Views from Harp Hill	Views from the road experienced by road users.	Not assessed	Not assessed	Ref: SR VP2 & SR VP3 Moderate, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.3 VP 1 & Fig 6.5 VP2 Minor adverse and permanent
2. Views from residential properties on Harp Hill	Views predicted to be experienced by residents with properties facing onto the appeal site.	Not assessed	Not assessed	Ref: SR VP2 & SR VP3 Moderate, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.3 VP 1 & Fig 6.5 VP2 Minor adverse and permanent
3. Views from PRoW Cheltenham ZCH/86/1	Public right of way bordering the western boundary of the appeal site.	Viewpoint 6 Major Adverse	Fig 8 Major adverse	Ref: SR VP1 Moderate, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.7 VP3 Moderate, adverse and permanent
4. Views from Oakley Grange	Views from public accessible areas including Clearwell Gardens Road, Brockweir Road, Birdlip Road and Pillowell Road, also representative of potential residential visual receptors	Not assessed	Fig 5, Fig 6 Major adverse	SR VP4 Moderate, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.10 VP5, Fig 6.12 VP6, Fig 6.14 VP7, Fig 6.15 VP8, Fig 6.30 VP17 Moderate, adverse and permanent
Medium Views					
5. Views from Priors Road/ Sainsburys	Views from public accessible areas including car park. Also representative of potential views from residential properties.	Viewpoint 7 Moderate Adverse	No comparable assessment	Ref: MR VP1 Moderate to Moderate/ Minor, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.22 VP13, Fig 6.24 VP14, Fig 6.26 VP15 Minor adverse and permanent
6. Views from Imjin Road Playing Field	View from public accessible playing field	Not assessed	No comparable assessment	Ref: MR VP2 Moderate to Moderate/ Minor, adverse and permanent	Not assessed as local urban area views is represented by viewpoints
7. Views from Aggs Hill	View from public right of way CKFP 12	Viewpoint 4 Moderate Adverse	No comparable assessment	Ref: MR VP3 Moderate to Moderate/ Minor, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.32 VP18, Fig 6.33 VP19 Negligible
8. Views from the Cheltenham Circular Walk	Views from public right of way CFP 85	Not assessed	Not assessed	Not identified as a view	Fig 6.16 VP9, Fig 6.17 VP10 Negligible
Long Views					
9. Views from Cotswold Way and Butterfly Reserve	Views from Cotswold Way national trail and Open Access Land	Viewpoint 2 Major Adverse	POS 38 Major adverse	Ref: LR VP1& LR VP2 Moderate, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.19 VP11, Fig 6.34 VP20, Fig 6.35 VP21 Minor adverse and permanent
10. Views from Cleeve Common	Views from Cleeve Common public access land	Viewpoints 1 & 3 Major Adverse	Fig 13 POS 35, Fig 12 P1 & Fig 15 P3 (P3 Zoomed) Fig 5 Major adverse	Ref: LR VP3, LR VP4 & LR VP5 Moderate, adverse and permanent	Fig 6.21 VP12 Minor adverse and permanent
11. Views from	Views from public right of way on Nottingham Hill,	Viewpoint 5	Fig 11 POS 33	Not presented as a separate	Not presented as a separate

Nottingham Hill	north west of Cleeve Common.			viewpoint as view is represented by long distance views 10 above from Cleeve Common	viewpoint as view is represented by long distance views 9 and 10 above from Cleeve Common & Cotswold Way.
		Moderate Adverse	Major adverse		
12. Views from footpaths on the escarpment /toward Southam	View from public right of way on escarpment east of Southam village	Not assessed	Not assessed	Ref: LR VP6 Moderate, adverse and permanent	Not presented as a separate viewpoint as view is represented by long distance views 9 and 10 above from Cleeve Common & Cotswold Way.

9. **Table 1** illustrates that less comparable visual assessments have been submitted by Cotswold Conservation Board and Friends of Oakley Farm Pasture Slopes than by the Appellant and the Council's landscape witness. Where a comparable visual assessment has been included by the third parties then their predicted residual visual effects are generally seen to be greater than those assessed by the Council's landscape witness or the Appellant.

10. **Table 1** also illustrates a greater correlation between the Council's assessment and that of the Appellant with a number of assessments agreeing the significance of residual visual effect. These include local or short distance views from Oakley Grange into the appeal site and from public right of way CFP 86 which extends along the western boundary of the appeal site.

11. It is accepted that there is less agreement on the significance of visual effects on visual receptors that experience medium distance views into the appeal site. There is also disagreement on the significance of visual effects on long distance views but the extent of that difference does not fall outside of a realistic range for professional judgement.

12. Part of the Council's case is that proposed mitigation would be more harmful than helpful in mitigating the landscape and visual effects of development proposals. It is my view that some of the differences between the Council's visual assessment and that of the Appellant may arise from the weight given to the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

13. To conclude, a comparison of visual assessments submitted to this appeal identifies a broad range of significance of visual effects are made across local/short/ medium and long distance views toward or into the appeal site. **Table 1** illustrates that there is a narrower margin of disagreement between the Appellants assessment and that of the Council's landscape witness. With regard to local/short views from Oakley Grange and PRoW CFP86 there is agreement on the residual/permanent visual effects. On longer views into the appeal site the difference between assessments reflects reasonable differences in professional judgement which are influenced by the interpretation of the appeal proposals and in particular the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

14. **Table 2** sets out a broad comparison of landscape effects.

Landscape receptor	Description	CCB (John Mills)	FOFPS (Unnamed)	CBC (Stuart Ryder)	Appellant (Paul Harris)
Significance of landscape effect					
1. Cotswolds Escarpment 2d Coopers Hill to Winchcombe	District landscape character type (LCT) - generally	Medium/ high magnitude of change Moderate/ Major adverse permanent effect	(Para. 7.1 of proof) adopts the landscape assessment of the Council.	Small magnitude of change Moderate adverse permanent effect	Low/ negligible magnitude of change Minor adverse permanent effect
Sub elements where assessed separately					
1a Contextual AONB area	District landscape character type – element closest to the appeal site	Assessment included in 1 above			Assessment included in 1 above
1b AONB Special Quality – Escarpment	District landscape character type – specific element	Assessment included in 1 above		Medium magnitude of change Major/ moderate adverse permanent effect	Assessment included in 1 above
1c AONB Special Quality – Ridge and furrow	District landscape character type – specific element	Assessment included in 1 above		Medium magnitude of change Major/ moderate adverse permanent effect	Assessment included in 1 above
2. Oakley Farm Pasture Slopes LCA 7.1 (Site)	Local landscape character area (site generally)	Medium/ high magnitude of change Moderate/ Major adverse permanent effect	(Para. 7.1 of proof) adopts the landscape assessment of the Council.	Large magnitude of change Major adverse permanent effect	Medium magnitude of change Moderate adverse permanent effect
Sub elements where assessed separately					
2a Sloping landform	Local landscape character area - element	Assessment included in 2 above		Large magnitude of change Major adverse permanent effect	Medium magnitude of change Minor adverse permanent effect
2b Pasture land	Local landscape character area - element	Assessment included in 2 above		Medium/ Large magnitude of change Moderate/ Major adverse permanent effect	Assessment included in 2a
2c Ridge and furrow field pattern	Local landscape character area - element	Assessment included in 2 above		Medium magnitude of change Moderate/ Major adverse permanent effect	Assessment included in 2a
2d Internal hedgerows	Local landscape character area - element	Assessment included in 2 above		Large magnitude of change Major adverse permanent effect	Assessment included in 2e
2e Boundary hedgerows	Local landscape character area - element	Assessment included in 2 above		Small magnitude of change	Low magnitude of change

				Minor adverse permanent effect	Minor beneficial permanent effect
2f Mature trees	Local landscape character area - element	Assessment included in 2 above		Small magnitude of change Moderate adverse permanent effect	Low magnitude of change Minor adverse permanent effect
3. Residential margins	Local landscape receptor			Assessment in 3a and 3b below	Low magnitude of change Minor adverse permanent effect
Sub elements where assessed separately					
3a Residential margins – Oakley Grange	Local landscape receptor - element			Medium/ Small magnitude of change Moderate/ Minor permanent effect	Assessment in 3 above
3b Residential margins – Wessex Drive	Local landscape receptor - element			Medium magnitude of change Moderate/ Minor permanent effect	Assessment in 3 above
3c Residential margins – Harp Hill	Local landscape receptor - element			Assessment in 4 below ?	Assessment in 4 below
3d Residential margins – Battledown Hill	Local landscape receptor - element			Medium magnitude of change Moderate permanent effect	Assessment in 4 below
4. Harp Hill Road corridor				Medium/ small magnitude of change (entrance) Moderate/ Minor adverse permanent effect	Medium magnitude of change Minor adverse permanent effect
5. Hewlett's Reservoir		Assessment included in 1 above		Medium magnitude of change Moderate adverse permanent effect	Negligible magnitude of change Negligible effect

15. The comparison of landscape effects illustrates that with regard the significance of landscape effect on the district Escarpment landscape character type, there is a broad disagreement in view between all parties who have provided their own assessment. With regard to the significance of landscape effect on the site Oakley Farm Pasture Slopes, there is closer agreement.

16. It is also illustrated through **Table 2** that a number of landscape receptor components or elements are assessed individually such as internal and external site hedges, pasture and slope of

the broader Oakley Farm Pasture Slopes and the escarpment and ridge and furrow special qualities of the AONB within the broader Escarpment landscape LCT. A comparison of the significance of effect of the development proposals on these landscape character components /elements has not been possible. This is because not all the parties have taken this approach but instead have considered these elements as part of the broader key receptors of the district Escarpment LCT and the Oakley Farm Pasture Slopes LCA (the appeal site). The individual character elements, however, are useful to illustrate the potential variation in landscape sensitivity within the broader landscape character areas which form the main landscape receptors being considered at this appeal.