

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment



Carried out on behalf of
Cam Parish Council

November 2018

9 Silverdale Ave Worcester WR5 1PY

07976 735652 - 01905 359225

design.potterton@gmail.com - www.pottertonassociates.com

Contents

1. Introduction & background
2. Scope
3. Landscape Sensitivity Assessment
4. Findings
5. Detailed assessment sheets

Fig 01. Sites 1-15 (& A)

Fig 02. Local topography

Fig 03. Broad landscape areas

Fig 04. Assessment conclusions

1.0 Introduction & background

- 1.1 My name is Charles Potterton. I am a Chartered Member of The Landscape Institute and Director of Potterton Associates Ltd. I hold a BA Degree in Landscape Architecture (1982), a Diploma in Landscape Architecture (1983) – both from Gloucestershire College of Arts & Technology and have been practicing as a Landscape Architect since 1984. I am a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI).
- 1.2 Potterton Associates Ltd was founded in 1992, is a Registered Member of the Landscape Institute and trades as a Limited Company. During this time, I have carried out a significant number of visual impact assessments and character appraisals on a wide variety of sites primarily in Worcestershire, Herefordshire and Gloucestershire. I have also worked on a number of Neighbourhood Development plans in this general area.
- 1.3 I am Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Panel, which advises Worcester City Council on matters affecting the 11 Conservation Areas across the City. I sit on the expert panel for MADE, the Design Review Panel in Birmingham.
- 1.4 I am also employed by Swindon Borough Council as a Consultant Landscape Architect. I prepare consultation responses for planning applications that are deemed likely to have an impact on the landscape. I regularly prepare Proofs of Evidence and act as Expert Witness in Public Inquiries. In the past I have represented a number of Local Authorities including Bath and North East Somerset, Herefordshire County Council, Malvern Hills District Council, Swindon Borough Council.

1.5 During the preparation of this report, I have used the following research documents -

- National, local and strategic planning policy guidance
- 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' (3rd Edition)
- National Landscape Character Assessment (Natural England)
- Gloucestershire landscape character assessment (LDA 2006)
- Stroud Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (White Consultants Dec 2016)
- Stroud District Local Plan (Nov 2015)
- Strategic Assessment of Land Availability (SALA) Heritage Impact Appraisal SDC (May 2017)
- URS Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal (July 2013)
- Stroud District Local Plan Review Preferred Strategy Paper (Sept 2018)
- Cotswolds AONB Management Plan 2018-2023 (Consultation draft)

2.0 Scope

2.1 Cam Parish Council are in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan to help inform and shape future development. The Parish Council have already done some community work identifying key views and looking at the edges of the settlement.

2.2 Whilst there is also already some broader Stroud District level work on landscape sensitivity (2013 & 2016 see above) they require a study that provides a more local overview on the suitability, in landscape terms, for possible residential development.

2.3 In terms of the actual array of sites included in this document, we have based our work, and our site numbering, on the sites as identified in the Stroud Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (White Consultants Dec 2016) plus one further parcel entitled 'A' on the map below.




Fig 01. Sites 1-15 (& 'A')

- 2.4 The White document looked at a wide range of sites across the region and was looking specifically at the sensitivity of each site. This study combines those findings with a more local level assessment of the various landscape values and characteristics of each site.

- 2.5 It is important to note that we have not carried out a new and specific assessment of the landscape sensitivity of each site but have broadly followed the original conclusions of the 2016 study as a base to work from. In each case we have used the 'sensitivity to housing' conclusion.
- 2.6 We have used professional experience and judgement to gain an overview of the relative characteristics and sensitivity of each parcel of land. It is understood that within each parcel there may be subtly differing characteristics, but for this study we have focussed on the primary elements.
- 2.7 At the time of writing we have also seen a draft issue of the Stroud District Local Plan Review Preferred Strategy Paper (Sept 2018). This makes certain recommendations for possible residential development across the Stroud region, to include a number of sites around Cam.
- 2.8 We visited each site and have walked the relevant Public Rights of Way (PROW's) to properly understand the site and its context within the surrounding landscape, to include the Cotswolds AONB. A number of the sites are actually within the AONB itself and a number about the boundary and form important parts of the 'setting' of the AONB.
- 2.9 It is important that we are cognisant of the 'key issues' as set out in the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan 2018-2023 (Consultation draft) -
- It is important to protect the scenic beauty of the escarpment and other skylines from both inappropriate developments and inappropriate landscape management.
 - The surroundings of the AONB are also important to its landscape and scenic beauty. Views out of the AONB and into it from surrounding

areas can be very significant in this regard. The Board has published a Position Statement on development in the setting of the Cotswolds AONB.

- 2.10 The Position statement is very clear on what 'setting' means in this context –

'The Board considers the setting of the Cotswolds AONB to be the area within which development and land management proposals, by virtue of their nature, size, scale, siting materials or design can be considered to have an impact, positive or negative, on the landscape, scenic beauty and special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB'.

- 2.11 The board will also make representations and comment on any plans (Local and Neighbourhood) where impact on setting may arise.

- 2.12 The inter-relationship between topography and existing vegetation plays a vital role in the determination of which sites might cause harm to these key issues. In all cases, views 'to' and 'from' each of the sites has been considered.

- 2.13 In each case we have taken an overview of the key constraints, opportunities, sensitivity and visual context and have made a judgement as to how the development of each of the sites may affect the landscape and its appreciation.

- 2.14 We have considered the likely effects if the site were to be developed in isolation or be developed sequentially along with a neighbouring site. This is a very important point of discussion because the development of one site may then mean that the development of its neighbour might

be totally logical and not harmful, whereas if the second site were to be developed first and in isolation, then it would be totally incongruous and harmful.

- 2.15 This study was carried out during the period August to October 2018 and carried out in accordance with GLVIA3 methodology. Professional judgement plays an important role in the LVA process as the assessment of landscape character and visual amenity is both a subjective and objective process. However, the appraisal process provides a narrative to explain the judgement reached.
- 2.16 The assessment of the nature of the change depends on the degree to which the development -
- Compliments, respects and fits into the existing scale, landform and pattern of the landscape context and visual composition
 - Enables enhancement, restoration or retention of the landscape character and visual amenity and delivers policy aspirations
 - Affects strategic and important views in addition to the visual context and the experience of the visual receptors.
- 2.17 It is accepted that the change from undeveloped to developed will always cause a change in the baseline character of the site itself. This study is focussed on the effect the development might have on the character of the wider landscape.
- 2.18 With respect to visual impact, it is important to note that all receptors are human beings and it is the impact on their enjoyment of the view that is important. In terms of the sensitivity of receptors, we have based our work on the assumption that they are generally those using the very

extensive PROW network in and around the area and have their attention focussed on the landscape. As a result, their sensitivity to visual change will be high.

2.19 Overall, our conclusions will be translated into three main categories as follows -

- **GREEN** Generally flat / not prominent in the view = development potential
- **AMBER** Elevated / sloping but relatively discrete = some limited development potential
- **RED** Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential

3.0 Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

3.1 We visited each site during August and September 2018 and walked a variety of the various PROW's on and around the sites. We also drove along all the roads and visited the key vantage points which may be affected by the development of any of these sites.

3.2 Our findings are set out on the following pages. We have included an OS map extract, with contours to illustrate the topographical context and a single photograph that underlines or encapsulates, in our opinion, the key characteristic for each site.

3.3 We have based our work around the land parcels as assessed in the White report. As part of our work it is necessary to have an understanding of the broader configuration of the area, both in terms of topography and in terms of the resulting character.




Fig 02. Local topography

- 3.4 We looked carefully at the topography of the area and have highlighted some of the key contours in order to identify the broad configuration of the landscape. It is generally the topography of an area that dictates land use and this in turn shapes the spread of development. It will also shape future growth.
- 3.5 Generally speaking, built development has spread along the southern side of the river and follows primary communication routes. More difficult terrain is used for woodland or sheep grazing and higher quality, flatter land has been used for other forms of agriculture where bigger machinery can be used and access is easier.

- 3.6 Using the combination of topography and land use we can also see how the land around Cam can be divided into key landscape parcels with each having different characteristics that will influence potential future development.
- 3.7 As part of our assessment work we made certain recommendations where we consider that a bigger land parcel should be further sub-divided - primarily because of key differences in sensitivity or character which makes one part more or less suitable for development and this is illustrated on the map extract included for each site.
- 3.8 In the case where we consider that some very limited development might be acceptable, we have illustrated these general locations on the plan for each 'site'.
- 3.9 On the following pages we have included a base map showing the site boundary, a division line sub-dividing the site if we felt that was necessary and a single photograph that encapsulates the main character of that area. We then include a table for each site to cover the following key headings –
- a broad description
 - sensitivity
 - landscape features
 - constraints and opportunities
 - discussion points
 - conclusions

4.0 Findings

- 4.1 Whilst we have referred to a number of documents as outlined at the start of the report, we have not relied wholly on these. We have used site based assessment and our own professional judgement throughout.
- 4.2 We have not included any smaller windfall sites in the discussion and have only looked at the suite of sites as presented by Cam Parish Council and as studied in the White Sensitivity Report.
- 4.3 These sites cover a wide range of size, shape, elevation and orientation. Generally speaking, topography and existing vegetation combine to mean that some sites are discrete and some development may be logical.
- 4.4 The location of a particular parcel of land in relative context to the existing settlement(s) is a major factor and, as explained, in some cases, development of that parcel might be wholly incongruous and harmful when done in isolation, but when considered in context of a newly developed adjacent site, then it might then be logical and not harmful.
- 4.5 Our comments are generally only made on the merits of that individual site but, where relevant and pertinent, we do refer to the adjacent site(s).
- 4.6 In each case, these are very important considerations, both in terms of underlying character but also as they are important considerations in respect to any potential development.




Fig 03. Broad landscape areas

- 4.7 Taking an overview of the wider landscape around Cam, we are able to sub-divide the area into 5 broad areas as illustrated above. In general terms the landscape can be divided into the following -

Area A. Generally flat or very gently sloping. Located away from elevated ground, good connectivity and easily contained within existing road boundaries. Suited for new development but need to be cognisant of existing PROW routes and recreation facilities.

Area B. Criss-crossed by extensive PROW network. Overlooked directly from key landmark features and forms important part of the setting of the AONB. New development generally unacceptable with the possible exception of very limited roadside, ribbon development but must avoid coalescence with Upthorpe.

Area C. Inside the AONB and very sensitive. Extensive views out, especially to the north and west. Small and sloping sites that would be very harmful if developed.

Area D. 'Urban' area of Cam. Some limited infill and windfall sites possible.

Area E. Cotswold AONB. Extremely sensitive and, in general terms, no development potential.

4.8 The White Report concluded generally as follows -

Cam

3.11. The preferred direction for housing growth for Cam is to the north/north east and east on relatively flat land or low lying slopes which are associated with existing or allocated development, are not widely visible and do not adversely affect river corridors. Care would be needed on the relationship with the M5 to minimise visual and other impact in both directions.

4.9 Whilst we would generally concur with this conclusion, we provide a more specific conclusion for each of the actual sites based on three main categories.

4.10 Our findings are based on a straightforward 'traffic-light' approach –

- GREEN - development potential
- AMBER some limited development potential
- RED - no development potential

4.11 The 'Green' sites are as follows

Site Ref	Reasons for conclusion	White conclusion
07a	Adjacent to P&R. Good connectivity. Sustainable. Limited landscape or visual harm. Logical infill.	<i>Housing development could be accommodated on the west side of Box Road, preferably retaining and enhancing the adjoining hedgerows and trees. It would be desirable to retain the open field to the east of the road as a positive open setting for the mill.</i>
08	Large site. Needs to be masterplanned in its entirety. Well contained by roads. Need to retain significant recreation offer, and respect PROW network, but limited landscape harms. Jubilee Playing Field is a key local asset and needs to be retained. Gap to M5 corridor needs to be addressed.	<i>Housing development could be accommodated in parts of the area but the fields to the north and west of the listed Woodend Green Farm should not be developed in order to retain its rural character and the context of the rural slopes to the south. The mature trees and grounds around Draycott should also be retained. There should be a substantial screening mitigation and green infrastructure between the area and the M5, e.g. tree screen and earth bund. The recreation ground and PROWs would need to be accommodated into the green infrastructure of the development.</i>

4.12 Amber sites

Site Ref	Reasons for conclusion	White conclusion
02	Extensive PROW network, setting of AONB. Some (very) limited roadside development potential. Majority of the site would be 'red' hence coloured 'red' on the maps, but with a note to caveat	<i>Housing development would be highly visible rising up the slopes, would erode separation between settlements and be visible in key views to and from Peaked Down and AONB.</i>

	that some limited development may be possible at some point.	
05	Some very limited potential if done sensitively but only when done sequentially with other adjacent sites. Majority of the site would be 'red' hence coloured 'red' on the maps, but with a note to caveat that some limited development may be possible at some point.	Some housing could be accommodated on the south two fields adjoin Draycott Farm, more especially when and if adjacent allocated areas are developed.

4.13 Red sites

Site Ref	Reasons for conclusion	White conclusion
01a	River corridor, part of important GI corridor. Extensive existing vegetation. Wholly unsuited for development.	<i>Housing development would have adverse effects due to visibility, setting of key views and the wider AONB</i>
01b	Setting of AONB, River Cam, flood plain, historic artefacts. Some (very) limited roadside development potential.	<i>Housing development would have adverse effects due to visibility, setting of key view and the wider AONB</i>
03	Important to defend the remaining lengths of the River Cam from development. Would be very difficult to restrict further development from expansion to the north-east. Overall, the development of this site would be harmful to the River corridor, landscape character and users of the PROW network.	<i>Housing development may be able to be accommodated on three fields adjoining the river corridor although not desirable due to the current positive edge to the settlement, at least in the short term. Development on the higher sloping valley sides would also be undesirable.</i>
04	Consider this to be the wrong direction and scale for any extension to Cam. Harmful to the rural landscape and would cause harm to the users of the PROW's.	<i>Housing development would be visible on these rising slopes, would significantly extend the settlement form, would reduce the separation of Upthorpe from Cam and would adversely affect the rural setting of rural settlement.</i>

06	Wholly unsuitable for development of this type. Listed buildings, remnant orchards, small scale, flooding issues etc.	No development is appropriate in this area.
07b	Very sensitive, PROW and flood plain issues. Not suited for development.	Housing development could be accommodated on the west side of Box Road, preferably retaining and enhancing the adjoining hedgerows and trees. It would be desirable to retain the open field to the east of the road as a positive open setting for the mill.
09	Steeply sloping, exposed and visually very sensitive. No appropriate mitigation achievable.	Housing would be either noticeable or prominent on the slopes and would impinge on their function as backcloth to the settlement as well as potentially being highly visible to the wider countryside and the M5 to the north. It is therefore considered inappropriate.
10	Very visually sensitive, development would be intrusive and difficult to contain / restrict. Development would be harmful to landscape character, therefore not suitable.	Housing would be either noticeable or prominent on the hilltop, potentially breaching the skyline to become widely visible to the north and west and would impinge on their function as backcloth to the settlement. It is therefore considered inappropriate.
11	Within the AONB, on an important and sensitive sloping hillside. Development would be harmful to landscape character, therefore not suitable.	Housing development would extend the suburban character into the AONB and adversely affect the setting of the wooded slopes.
12	Visually sensitive and steeply sloping. Setting of AONB. Very harmful to landscape character if developed.	Housing would be either noticeable or prominent on the slopes potentially being highly visible to the wider countryside and the M5 to the north. It would also significantly extend the settlement, especially if located on the western side of the valley. Implementation on the steep slopes would be difficult and undesirable. Housing is therefore considered inappropriate.

13	Valley side (part of bigger parcel), steeply sloping, likely to be part of important GI corridor. Visually very sensitive and difficult to develop.	<i>Housing on the flatter part would significantly extend the main settlement westwards and would feel divorced from it. Housing on the steep slopes would be difficult to implement satisfactorily and would remove the function of the area as a green/wildlife corridor. Overall, housing would be undesirable.</i>
14	The Avenue is a major factor and must be given appropriate space and protection. Inside AONB and very sensitive. Development would be harmful to landscape character, therefore not suitable.	<i>Housing would significantly extend the main settlement westwards and would feel to extent divorced from it. It would potentially adversely affect the setting of the escarpment and would also close the gap between Cam and Stinchcombe. Overall, housing would be undesirable.</i>
15	Not possible to sub-divide this site to avoid harms. The road frontage would have some logic but would cause greatest harm to The Avenue. Inside the AONB and considered very harmful if developed. Isolated site which does not provide any logical sequence to development. Overall, not suitable.	<i>Housing development would extend the suburban character into the AONB and adversely affect the setting of the wooded slopes.</i>
A	Whilst it does contain some detracting elements such as a manege and an electric sub-station, this is land that abuts the AONB and is very sensitive. I consider that it is an important buffer between Cam and the AONB. Development would be harmful to landscape character and is therefore not suitable.	N/A

- 4.14 Our overall conclusion is that sites 7a and 8 are entirely logical and together provide a sensible and 'least harmful' area where the future expansion of Cam should take place. There are other sites, 2 and 5, where some limited infill might be acceptable, but only when considered in relation to allocated sites being built out. This position must be reviewed again at that time.
- 4.15 Further work is needed to ensure that any sites that do come forward are underpinned by an appropriate level of assessment and masterplanning. A fully detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment would be the absolute minimum in each case and very specifically in respect of 8 due to the need to retain recreation facilities and the extensive PROW network.
- 4.16 Fig 04 illustrates our findings in a graphic form. The subsequent pages include our detailed discussion and assessment work for each of the 15 parcels of land.





Fig 04. Assessment conclusions

5.0 Detailed site assessment sheets

5.1 Site 1.



5.2 OS Extract. Not to scale.




5.3 Site photograph

5.4 Notes (site 1)

Site Ref	01.
Location	Upper Cam, adj Church Farm
Broad description	Gently sloping open farmland to the east of the road and floodplain land to the immediate west of River Cam. Adjacent to St Georges Church. Overlooked and visually dominated by Cam Peak and Cam Long Down. Should realistically be sub-divided to form two sites, west of Hopton Rd which is part of the River Cam corridor and east of Hopton Rd which is open farmland.
Sensitivity	High (both areas). Users of the PROW's high sensitivity. Forms part of the setting for the AONB.
Landscape features	East side - gently sloping pasture with well wooded boundary to the north alongside Dulkan Brook. Some internal vegetation and good hedge to road frontage. Large vehicular access to NW corner. West side – generally narrow area that forms a part of the river flood-plain. Some well-established, mature trees and derelict railway to the west side.
Constraints & opportunities	Located just outside AONB boundary. Clearly forms an important part of the setting of Cam Peak and Long Down. Important relationship with AONB and very well used by local dog walkers. Any development would cause significant visual harm to PROW users and viewers on highly sensitive Peak and Long Down. This site is close enough to be very intrusive in the view and does not relate to the logical pattern of the settlement.

Discussion points	Development to the west of the River Cam appears wholly inappropriate and would cause substantial harm to landscape character. Loss of vegetation would be a major issue. It is accepted that there is development alongside the river in other locations, but that places even more importance on this remaining undeveloped area. Consider loss of GI, loss of valuable habitat and flood risk – there are most probably historical issues with the old railway line & bridge.
Conclusions	The main part of the eastern side of the area is wholly unsuited due to harm to landscape character, setting for the AONB and harm to users of the PROW's. The very eastern boundary of the site is relatively random and, should any development be allowed, then it would be extremely difficult to restrict the spread across to Ashmead Green. We would strongly advise against any development to the west side of Hopton Rd. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential. See diagram.</i>

5.5 **Site 2.**



5.6 OS Extract. Not to scale.




5.7 Site photograph

5.8 Notes (site 2)

Site Ref	02.
Location	South east of Upthorpe Lane and south west of Cam Green
Broad description	Large, gently sloping open farmland between Cam and the outlying settlement of Upthorpe. Extensive long range views in all directions.
Sensitivity	High / medium. Users of the PROW's high sensitivity.
Landscape features	Large open fields. Well wooded boundary to the south with Dulkan Brook.
Constraints & opportunities	Very important gap in housing between Cam and Upthorpe. Must not allow any development here to avoid coalescence. Could consider some very limited road frontage development on Hopton Rd, between Elm Lodge and Dulkan Brook. Many PROW's across the site and would be highly visible from AONB / Cam Peak / Long Down.
Discussion points	Consider coalescence with Upthorpe as a key issue. Eastern boundary would be very difficult to defend and then places great visual / development pressure on Ashmead Green. Very important that this area (1 and 2) are protected as part of the setting of the AONB and Cam Peak and Long Down especially. Eastern boundary would be difficult to defend to further development and does not follow the settlement pattern.

Conclusions	Generally, unacceptable with minor exceptions i.e. small 'windfall' / infill of individual plots to the outer road edges. Development of 1 would give greater logic for 2 to happen but we consider this scenario would be extremely harmful and must be avoided. <i>AMBER - some (very) limited roadside development potential only.</i>
--------------------	--

5.9 **Site 3.**



5.10 OS Extract. Not to scale.




5.11 Site photograph

5.12 Notes (site 3)

Site Ref	03.
Location	Rectangular site on northern bank of River Cam.
Broad description	Gently sloping and very attractive site alongside the river. Should generally be considered as part of the green corridor. Limited road access (adjoins Upthorpe Lane in SE corner).
Sensitivity	Medium. Users of the PROW's high sensitivity.
Landscape features	Extensive vegetation alongside River cam. Bisected by PROWs.
Constraints & opportunities	River corridor / flood plain must be considered. Road access would cause harm to existing character. Would not necessarily effect coalescence with Upthorpe.
Discussion points	No real links to existing residential development. Would be harmful to character of river corridor. Eastern boundary then difficult to defend from further applications. The site generally divides lengthways into two areas. The west side, beside the River Cam, must be retained as part of the wider GI corridor / flood plain. Any development here would be very harmful and should be avoided. In the case where the west side remains as a valuable corridor, the remaining east side would be illogical and harmful to landscape character, users of the PROW network and would be difficult to stop it spreading further i.e. it does not follow a logical and defendable boundary.

Conclusions	It is important to defend the remaining lengths of the River Cam from development. Would be very difficult to restrict further development from expansion to the north-east Overall, the development of this site would be harmful to the River corridor, landscape character and users of the PROW network. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential. See diagram.</i>
--------------------	--

5.13 **Site 4.**



5.14 OS Extract. Not to scale.



5.15 Site photograph

5.16 Notes (site 4)

Site Ref	04.
Location	Immediately north of Upthorpe.
Broad description	Large, open fields on gently sloping ground. Not connected to Cam unless 3 or allocated sites come forward. Sloping mainly to the north and north-west. Some large fields with good existing hedgerows.
Sensitivity	High / medium.
Landscape features	Hallmore Lane overgrown track. Adjacent to streamside area (River Cam) with historic mill.
Constraints & opportunities	Bisected by PROWs and good hedges. Hallmore Lane to the east. Setting of AONB.
Discussion points	Need to consider the coalescence of Upthorpe and Cam. Consider that this would be harmful and should be avoided. Might be considered to cause only moderate harm to setting of AONB. Difficult to contain to the north and, if developed would then be very difficult to argue against much more development i.e. 3 and 5 would be seen as logical. The overall development of 3, 4 and 5 would be too extensive. The development of 4 in isolation would be harmful and not recommended.
Conclusions	Consider this to be the wrong direction and scale for any extension to Cam. Harmful to the rural landscape and would cause harm to the users of the PROW's.

	<i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential. See diagram.</i>
--	--

5.17 **Site 5.**



5.18 OS Map extract.



5.19 Site photograph

5.20 Notes (site 5)

Site Ref	05.
Location	Land around Draycott Farm.
Broad description	Open, gently sloping farmland with well-established hedgerows. To the north-east of Cam and immediately south of the River Cam. Some large fields with good existing hedgerows.
Sensitivity	Medium.
Landscape features	Arable and improved pasture. Medium to large elongated quite regular field pattern from formerly unenclosed cultivation. Intact hedgerows of diverse management and some mature hedgerow trees. Adjacent to scrubby overgrown vegetation and mature tree belt on Hallmore Lane, a public footpath corridor on east side. PROW along Hallmore Lane and crossing south-east corner.
Constraints & opportunities	PROW, Listed building at Draycott Farm.
Discussion points	Relatively limited visual harm envisaged, but not a logical location to extend. Flood issues. Separation from Cam is an issue although relatively close to the Park and Ride facility. Currently land-locked and therefore not logical for development. No logic to developing this parcel in isolation but some logic if seen as an extension to already allocated land to the east. Similarly, some logic to development if 4 came forward.

Conclusions	Consider harm caused by sequential development from 4 and allocated land. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential if developed in isolation.</i>
--------------------	---

5.21 **Site 6.**



5.22 OS Map extract




5.23 Site photograph

5.24 Notes (Site 6)

Site Ref	06.
Location	Land around Hallmore Mill
Broad description	Small paddocks around semi-derelict mill.
Sensitivity	High. PROW to the immediate outside of the site.
Landscape features	Mill wheel still working, ponds, derelict / remnant orchard.
Constraints & opportunities	Flood issues. Listed buildings to north east of the site, adjacent to sewage works. No physical or other connection with Cam, so development / expansion here would be totally isolated and incongruous.
Discussion points	Small site that appears wholly incongruous for larger scale residential development. Could possibly consider small scale restoration projects around main mill building.
Conclusions	Not suited for any expansion of Cam per se, but has some scope for restoration projects and possible recreation use such as camping. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>

5.25 **Site 7.**



5.26 OS Map extract




5.27 Site photograph

5.28 Notes (Site 7)

Site Ref	07.
Location	Land adjacent Cam & Dursley Station, north of Box Rd plus smaller parcel south of Box Rd.
Broad description	Well contained, low lying fields in a triangle formed by railway, Box Road and dismantled railway. Some recent housing in this area.
Sensitivity	Medium
Landscape features	Good hedgerows, but heavily influenced by road, rail and existing housing.
Constraints & opportunities	No PROW's. Some listed buildings to north-west corner. New development already underway. Ideal option for expansion development. Excellent connectivity. Consider that the site to the south of Box Road is wholly unacceptable as it is important to the setting of Hallmore Mill, is in flood plain and bisected by PROW.
Discussion points	Should be sub-divided into A) north of Box Rd and B) south of Box Rd. No visual impact of harm to landscape character for the north side, but harm to both for the south side.
Conclusions	North side is ideal with limited harm, south of Box Road, very harmful to setting of Hallmore Mill. <i>GREEN Generally flat / not prominent in the view = development potential for the northern part.</i>

5.29 **Site 8.**



5.30 OS Map extract



5.31 Site photograph

5.32 Notes (Site 8)

Site Ref	08.
Location	Land adjacent to M5 and between Woodend Lane and the A4135.
Broad description	Large site with roads on 3 sides and existing development of 4th side. Extensive PROW across site and includes two primary uses - agriculture and recreation. Jubilee playing field is an important local resource and gives a clear edge to this parcel. It also separates the area around the farm to the south west, the setting of which you highlight in your overall conclusion as sensitive) and there are also some fine mature trees around the site.
Sensitivity	Medium / low.
Landscape features	Extensive hedgerows and significant embankment planting alongside most of M5 corridor. There is a gap to the SW end by Woodend Lane flyover that needs to be addressed.
Constraints & opportunities	Archaeological issues especially around Draycott. Open gap to M5 to be addressed. Adjacent to AONB boundary in SW corner. LVIA can be used to identify more sensitive elements, views and features.
Discussion points	Extensive site with excellent containment to all sides. Considerable potential for development but must consider existing landscape features and recreation uses. Suggest that an overall development masterplan would

	assist in maximising potential of existing and proposed features.
Conclusions	Most appropriate site for well-considered expansion of Cam. Landlocked by roads so very easy to control overall extent. No harm to AONB. Gap to M5 corridor must be considered and dealt with appropriately. Jubilee playing field is a very important local resource that needs to be accommodated. Masterplan could be used to maximise potential and create landscape structure within which planned development can happen. Allows for phasing as local plan neighbourhood plan allows. This site needs to be developed on a strategic level and not any piecemeal approach. <i>GREEN Generally flat / not prominent in the view = development potential.</i>

5.33 Site 9.



5.34 OS Map extract




5.35 Site photograph

5.36 Notes (Site 9)

Site Ref	09
Location	Land south of Woodend Lane. Upper Knapp / Lower Knapp Farms.
Broad description	Very sensitive hillside. Steeply sloping land with change of some 40m in elevation. This means good views out and is very visible in the wider view, particularly from the NE.
Sensitivity	High / medium.
Landscape features	Sloping land, facing north and east. Steeply sloping, extensive views and several PROWs. Some freestanding trees.
Constraints & opportunities	Steep slopes are an issue. Housing would be very visible and the site shape / boundaries appear incongruous and not related in any way to the actual development pattern of Cam. Difficult to actually develop sensibly without extensive and expensive cut/fill operations. Few / no opportunities to develop any of this parcel without significant visual harm and harm to the character of the area. No mitigation is possible.
Discussion points	Development would be very visible from the north east, would be incongruous and difficult to deliver development on this parcel.

Conclusions	Significant visual harm on very steep and exposed hillside. No mitigation measures could alleviate or offset the visual harm. Development would be harmful to landscape character, therefore not suitable. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>
--------------------	---

5.37 **Site 10.**



5.38 OS Map extract



5.39 Site photograph

5.40 Notes (Site 10)

Site Ref	10.
Location	Land adjacent Elstub Lane.
Broad description	Generally flat land to the south of Elstub Lane, adjacent to the school and more gently sloping to the north of Elstub Lane.
Sensitivity	High / medium
Landscape features	Generally flat, open farmland with extensive views. Logically divides into two parcels – each side of Elstub lane. East side of lane has direct views towards Cam Peak and Cam Long Down. This site abuts the school. The west side generally faces north. Suggest sub-dividing the sites (A-B). Both sites are exposed and the east side sits more adjacent to existing residential development.
Constraints & opportunities	Elevation provides visual and physical exposure. Some logic to limited development as Elstub Lane provides natural boundary to development.
Discussion points	Land by school would be ideal for expansion i.e. south of Elstrub Road. Land north of Elstrub would start to become more widely visible in the landscape and should be avoided if possible.
Conclusions	This site is either flat and on an elevated plateau and therefore very visible, or on prominent and sensitive slopes and also visually prominent. Photograph illustrates the relationship with the wider landscape.

	Development would be harmful to landscape character, therefore not suitable. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>
--	--

5.41 **Site 11.**



5.42 OS Map extract



5.43 Site photograph

5.44 Notes (Site 11)

Site Ref	11.
Location	Land alongside Dursley Rd (A4066)
Broad description	Rectangular site on gently sloping fields at base of hanging woods below Stinchcombe Hill. Can logically be divided into two separate parcels as each has slightly different constraints.
Sensitivity	High.
Landscape features	Good vegetation alongside road frontage and extensive woodland to south below the main hillside. Good roadside vegetation and limited access points from B4066. PROW dividing the site in two.
Constraints & opportunities	Narrow site. Inside the Cotswolds AONB.
Discussion points	This is 'tucked under' the hillside and has very limited visibility from the hilltop or from the wider landscape below. Limited visibility from the north and west but very harmful to landscape character. Although some other adjacent areas do have residential development to the south of the road and on the slopes of the main ridge, we consider this 'face' of the slope is particularly sensitive. Existing vegetation is very important and an important part of the local character. This would also be put at risk for visibility splays etc.
Conclusions	Within the AONB, on an important and sensitive sloping hillside.

	Development would be harmful to landscape character, therefore not suitable. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>
--	--

5.45 **Site 12.**



5.46 OS Map extract



5.47 Site photograph

5.48 Notes (Site 12)

Site Ref	12.
Location	Land south / west of Field Lane and north of Tait's Hill.
Broad description	Steeply sloping valley to brook. Criss crossed with extensive PROW network. Located right beside the AONB at Tait's Hill and is clearly visible from the M5.
Sensitivity	High / medium. Forms part of the setting for the AONB.
Landscape features	Very sensitive landscape character with extensive hedgerow vegetation. Steep slopes.
Constraints & opportunities	PROWs, existing vegetation, steeply sloping land. Extremely sensitive and difficult to develop.
Discussion points	No development potential due to landscape harms (character and visual).
Conclusions	<i>This site should not be considered for any development due to its overall landscape sensitivity.</i> <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>

5.49 **Site 13.**



5.50 OS Map extract




5.51 Site photograph

5.52 Notes (Site 13)

Site Ref	13.
Location	Land to the east of Taits Hill (B4066).
Broad description	Relatively small site with part on valley side and part on the flat valley top.
Sensitivity	High / medium. Forms part of the setting for the AONB.
Landscape features	Flat open field to west and steep valley side to east.
Constraints & opportunities	West side is visually open and abuts AONB but has some development potential mainly because it is flat so is perhaps a sensible site to develop and is relatively discrete. East side is steep and wholly unsuitable. Valley is (probably) part of a valuable GI corridor with no development potential. Road access difficult and resultant loss of roadside vegetation could be a major issue due to proximity with AONB.
Discussion points	Division of flat / steep slopes provides main restriction to development. Proximity to AONB places difficulty on west side.
Conclusions	This site should not be considered for any development due to its overall landscape sensitivity. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>

5.53 **Site 14.**



5.54 OS Map extract



5.55 Site photograph

5.56 Notes (Site 14)

Site Ref	14.
Location	Land north of The Avenue (B4060) to the rear (north) of Animal Hospital / Hounds Green.
Broad description	Generally flat plateau, open land to the south is flat, with field behind gently sloping. Existing housing to east and west. Some existing development to south-east corner.
Sensitivity	This site was not given a sensitivity rating in the White report (p96), but we conclude high as it is inside AONB.
Landscape features	Borders onto The Avenue which is a striking landscape feature. Adjacent to existing roadside development along the east side / Taits Hill Rd.
Constraints & opportunities	Inside Cotswold AONB. PROW to west edge only. Flat land has value as recreation asset, 'The Avenue' must be given appropriate space for its 'setting'. Likewise any proposed access points must avoid this frontage at all costs, so access would need to be off Taits Hill Rd.
Discussion points	High sensitivity as within AONB. Flatter land has high recreation value. Visible from higher elevation (e.g. Stinchcombe Hill / Drakestone Point).
Conclusions	The Avenue is a major factor and must be given appropriate space and protection. Inside AONB and very sensitive. Development would be harmful to landscape character, therefore not suitable.

	<i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>
--	---

5.57 **Site 15.**



5.58 OS Map extract



5.59 Site photograph

5.60 Notes (Site 15)

Site Ref	15.
Location	Land south of The Avenue / B4060 and east of Street Farm.
Broad description	Gently undulating field with some 'parkland' character due to presence of two large trees and 'The Avenue'.
Sensitivity	High.
Landscape features	'The Avenue' is a very important local 'landscape' feature and must be retained and protected. The road frontage hedgerow is also important as are two main freestanding trees within the site. Sits right 'under' wooded hillside of Stinchcombe Hill and therefore is partially hidden from the actual hill (the main viewpoints at least).
Constraints & opportunities	Inside the Cotswold AONB. Limited visibility in the wider landscape i.e. in views from the west and north. Relatively large site. Important internal and perimeter vegetation. Good access to roads and local services. Within AONB so has high level constraints.
Discussion points	Would be very harmful to the AONB. Would be harmful to the Avenue. Not actually connected to any other development, so would not form a logical progression to development.
Conclusions	Not possible to sub-divide this site to avoid harms. The road frontage would have some logic but would cause greatest harm

	to 'The Avenue'. Inside the AONB and considered very harmful if developed. Isolated site which does not provide any logical sequence to development. Overall, not suitable. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>
--	--

5.61 **Site 'A'**



5.62 OS

Map extract



5.63 Site photograph

5.64 Notes (Site A)

Site Ref	'A'.
Location	Located to the immediate west of Drake Lane and south of Springhill.
Broad description	Sloping land with high point centred on the Cam House School.
Sensitivity	High.
Landscape features	Flat plateau to the east / top of the parcel, overlooked by Cam Peak. Smaller scale field pattern south and west of the school. Some detracting features such as manege, sub-station and overhead cables.
Constraints & opportunities	Adjacent to the Cotswold AONB. Network of PROW's to include central track adjacent to the school. Medium visibility in the wider landscape i.e. some clear views from the south and west and specifically from Cam Peak. Good hedgerow / field structure.
Discussion points	Development would be very harmful to the character of the AONB.
Conclusions	This land is very sensitive and forms a very important buffer zone between the main area of Cam and the AONB. <i>RED Prominent / harmful / not following settlement pattern = no development potential.</i>