

APPENDIX B

Footnote References

- Page 2. Appellant's Built Heritage Statement Extract para. 3.19
- Page 3. Appellant's Built Heritage Statement Extract para. 4.4
- Page 4. Appellant's Environmental Statement Extract para. 8.2.7
- Page 5. Appellant's Environmental Statement Extract Table 8.5
- Page 6. Appellant's Environmental Statement Extract Table 8.1 – 8.3
- Page 7. Troubled Waters. David A O'Connor. Page 192.

Appellant's Built Heritage Statement Extract of para. 3.19

The wider setting is made up of the surrounding open landscape. The building, whilst small, is raised up and therefore visible from a number of locations in the landscape. It marks the importance of the reservoir. From the asset there are views available of both the surrounding hillside and the town of Cheltenham. This demonstrates its connection to the natural landscape, which provides water to the Reservoir, and the human built landscape, which the reservoir was constructed to serve. It therefore contributes to the significance of the asset. The Site itself forms a part of the open landscape and creates a buffer between the reservoir and the edge of built development. It also provides a degree of rurality to the asset due to the open nature of the fields which form the Site and this makes the asset stand out as it is isolated within a largely rural landscape. It therefore contributes positively to the understanding and significance of the asset.

Appellant's Built Heritage Statement Extract of para. 4.4

The Pavilion at Hewlett's Reservoir stands out in the landscape and is a focal point due to its raised position and general isolation. It appears as a pavilion for a country house and therefore has a grand character. As with the reservoirs themselves, development will be kept to the north of the pavilion, however the more exposed and raised nature of the pavilion means that there will be slightly more impact on its overall significance. The isolation of the pavilion will be impacted and therefore so too will the statement it makes. However, the significance of the asset principally derives from its connection to the rest of the Reservoir Complex, rather than its rural location. In addition, the architectural and aesthetic qualities of the asset will not be impacted. It is therefore considered that the proposed development will result in a less than substantial degree of harm, and within this spectrum of less than substantial harm the overall harm will be minor.

Appellant's Environmental Statement Extract of para. 8.2.7

The sensitivity of the receiving environment, together with the magnitude of change, defines the significance of the effect as set out in **Table 8.3**.

The effect outlined below represents the effect without mitigation.

Impacts of Major adverse and Moderate Adverse significance of effect are considered to equate to significant impacts in the context of the EIA Regulations. Assessment of the effect of development on the setting of heritage assets follows GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition) guidance issued by Historic England in December 2017.

Appellants Environmental Statement Extract of part Table 8.5

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Cultural Heritage

Receptor/ Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect	Sensitivity Value	Magnitude of Effect	Geographical Importance	Significance of Effects	Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects
(HB1)							of the Proposed Development and the heritage asset	
No 2 Reservoir (HB2)	Erosion of rural setting surrounding the asset	Permanent, Indirect	High	Low	United Kingdom	Minor Adverse	Provision of buffer of rural space between the edge of the Proposed Development and the heritage asset	Minor Adverse
Pavilion at Hewlett Reservoir (HB3)	Erosion of rural setting surrounding the asset	Permanent, Indirect	High	Low	United Kingdom	Minor Adverse	Provision of buffer of rural space between the edge of the Proposed Development and the heritage asset	Minor Adverse
Gates, Gatepiers and Boundary Walls at Hewlett Reservoir (HB4)	Erosion of rural setting surrounding the asset	Permanent, Indirect	High	Low	United Kingdom	Minor Adverse	Provision of buffer of rural space between the edge of the Proposed Development and the heritage asset	Minor Adverse
Stone Lodge at Hewlett Reservoir (HB5)	Erosion of rural setting surrounding the asset	Permanent, Indirect	Low	Low	Local	Minor Adverse	Provision of buffer of rural space between the edge of the Proposed Development and the heritage asset	Minor Adverse
Agricultural Buildings at	No further effect	N/A	Low	N/A	Local	N/A	N/A	N/A

JANUARY 2020 | P18-0847

LAND AT OAKLEY FARM, CHELTENHAM

Appellants Environmental Statement. Extracts of Tables 8.1,8.2 & 8.3

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Cultural Heritage

Table 8.1: Criteria for Appraisal of Magnitude of Effect on Heritage Resources

Magnitude	Definition
High	Total loss or major/substantial alteration to key elements/features of the baseline (pre-Development) conditions such that the post-Development character/composition/attributes will be fundamentally changed.
Medium	Loss or alteration to one or more key elements/features of the baseline conditions such that post-Development character/composition/attributes of the baseline will be materially changed.
Low	A minor shift away from baseline conditions. Change arising from the loss/alteration will be discernible/detectable but not material. The underlying character/composition/attributes of the baseline condition will be similar to the pre-Development circumstances/situation.
Negligible	Very little change from baseline conditions. Change barely distinguishable, approximating to a 'no change' situation.

Table 8.2: Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Heritage Resources

Sensitivity	Definition
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World Heritage Sites - Scheduled Monuments and archaeological sites of demonstrable schedulable quality and importance - Protected Wreck Sites - Registered Battlefields - Grade I and II* listed buildings - Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens - Grade II listed buildings - Conservation areas
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local Authority designated archaeological or built heritage assets and their settings - Grade II registered parks and gardens - Undesignated archaeological or built heritage assets of demonstrable regional importance
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Archaeological or built heritage assets with specific and substantial importance to local interest groups - Sites whose importance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations
Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sites with no surviving archaeological or historical component

Table 8.3: Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effect

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

Troubled Waters. David A O'Connor. Page 192.

Agency to manage it and provide flood alleviation measures through the use of its permissive powers. By this time, the drop in water demand as a result of the closure of the Brewery, the escalating cost of modernising the outdated filtering system at Dowdeswell, together with the increased capacity available from Mythe, had persuaded Severn Trent that Dowdeswell was no longer required. After Privatisation in 1989, the rapid decline of the works there led to a decision to abandon Dowdeswell as a source of supply. The prospect of turning the Reservoir into a balancing facility as part of the Flood Alleviation Scheme was now apparent and in 1999 the Environment Agency took over the Reservoir and its dam to provide storage capacity for flood water in the upper reaches of the Chelt. This, with other measures taken in the town, increased the capacity of the Flood Alleviation Scheme to cater for the one in a hundred year flood event. Dowdeswell Reservoir has become Dowdeswell Water, a designated Local Nature Reserve. The new role involved lowering the top water level by some fourteen feet to provide sufficient empty capacity to hold flood water up to a 100 year flood event. Since this means that the top levels of the embankment will dry out, the process is irreversible and Dowdeswell cannot become a reservoir again. Much of the catchment area has been sold off. The Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust took over management of the wetlands and the woods at Lineover, though the old collecting tanks can still be found amidst the vegetation.

At Hewletts, No.1, the small original 1824 reservoir, became the preferred source of supply to the Cheltenham Brewery in its various guises. The Northfield Springs water was considered superior to river water for the brewing process. The Reservoir was the smallest of the four, holding 413,000 gallons. Under an old agreement, the maximum available to the Brewery was 100,000 gallons a week but in the 1960s the West Country Brewery was taking as much as three times this amount. Moreover, the Battledown and Harp Hill area, which was also supplied from Northfield Springs, was beginning to develop. In November 1961 the whole supply from Northfield Spring was taken and the Reservoir continued to fall. The only solution was to provide the facility to supply the Battledown area with additional Severn water when necessary. For this a small tank reservoir was required at Northfield Springs, fed by pumping from No.3 Reservoir. The Brewery was asked to pay half the cost. However, by the end of the sixties a small tank was insufficient. Some land was purchased from Mr Albert Mitchell of Glenfall and the small Northfield Reservoir, holding 15,000 gallons, was built just up the hill from Hewletts. It receives water from a submersible pump installed in No 3 Reservoir. In 1964 a new 6-inch main was laid from No. 3 to the bottom of Harp Hill to ensure a bigger supply to the Brewery and to the Battledown and Harp Hill area, the Brewery again being asked to provide half the cost. When the then Whitbread Brewery closed in the 1990s, No. 1 was abandoned and is no longer in use. No. 2 Reservoir, built in 1839, is still in good condition and remains in use, though it has one-seventh of the capacity of No. 3 Reservoir. Until the latter was covered, No.2 was the receiving point for the two trunk mains supplying the Cheltenham area. No. 3 was built in 1847 as an open reservoir for hill water, which it was still receiving in 1962. However, it was found that the already treated water pumped from Mythe deteriorated rapidly in an open reservoir and it made no sense to leave it uncovered. In 1966 a concrete roof containing a waterproof membrane was placed over this large reservoir, which was then turfed over. It is now one of the largest in the Severn Trent area and supplies at least half of Cheltenham's water. The large uncovered No. 4 Reservoir, built in 1857, was abandoned in 1965 after many months in which bacteriological pollution made it unusable. It was subsequently totally demolished in the 1990s, allegedly because of its dangerous proximity to GCHQ, located just below it. However, it was also clear that the expense of covering could not be justified. The Lodge at Hewletts, built in 1824, remains occupied but the water supply operations are controlled remotely from the Midlands. Northfield springs now run much as they did before 1824, untroubled by collecting pipes; disused tanks may still be found, though no longer attacked by "*evil disposed persons*" intent on sabotage.