

THE RIDGEWAY WILL TRUST
Proposed Residential Development on land
at Bay, Gillingham, Dorset

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT



Peter Swann & Associates – Chartered Landscape Architects
20 Were Close, Warminster, Wiltshire, BA12 8TB
Tel: (01985) 215005

May 2010

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction, background and scope	Page 1
2.	The Existing Situation	Page 2
3.	Landscape Policies and Guidance	Page 5
4.	Landscape Character and Methodology Assessment	Page 6
5.	The Landscape Character in Context	Page 11
6.	The Proposals	Page 12
7.	Landscape Character Assessment	Page 13
8.	Visual Impact Assessment Methodology	Page 19
9.	Visibility Study	Page 22
10.	Assessment of Effect of Visual Impact	Page 28
11.	Summary and Conclusions	Page 33

Appendix A :

Location Plan	Drawing No. 922/PL1
District & Site Aerial Photographs	922/PL2
As Existing/Application Plan	922/PL3
Landscape Character Plan	922/PL4
Relevant Local Designations Plan	922/PL5
Topographic and Vegetation Plan	922/PL6
Visibility Study and Analysis Plan	922/PL7

THE RIDGEWAY WILL TRUST

Proposed Residential Development at Bay, Gillingham, Dorset

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. Introduction, Background and Scope

- 1.1 We were commissioned in March 2010 to advise The Ridgeway Will Trust on the potential impact of their proposal to develop land on the north eastern edge of Gillingham. The following drawings produced by their Planning and Architectural Consultants, Brimble Lea & Partners, have been used as a basis for this report :-

05301-2 Site Survey Plan dated 13.4.2010
Appendix 3 Location Plan dated July 2001
9462-2B Deposit Plan dated 22.6.1998

- 1.2 This land was the subject of a Public Inquiry after which the Inspector recommended to the Council that they should allocate this site within their Local Plan for development purposes. He concluded that it was probably the most sustainable site in the whole of the district and in landscape terms development there would be acceptable.
- 1.3 Since this practice was formed in the late 1960's we have carried out numerous impact assessments throughout the country, many on similar projects, and a considerable number in conjunction with Brimble Lea & Partners.
- 1.4 The report has also been supplemented with site and visibility photographs taken in March and April 2010, including visual assessments from public viewpoints.
- 1.5 The purpose of this report is to provide supporting information with regard to the proposals identified for residential development in the period up to 2016 included in the New Plan for North Dorset; The Draft Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD. This report also assesses the potential landscape and visual impact of the site and comprises :-
- i. a description of the site and its surroundings
 - ii. details of the proposed improvements
 - iii. an appraisal of the landscape character
 - iv. an appraisal of the visual significance of the site
 - v. an assessment of the impacts, including mitigation measures
 - vi. a summary and conclusions
- 1.6 This study conforms generally with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' 2nd Edition (GLVIA) published by The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment and The Landscape Institute in 2002. These define and differentiate landscape effects and visual effects in the following manner :-

'Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape, which may give rise to changes in its character and how this is experienced. This may in turn affect the perceived value ascribed to this landscape.'

'Visual effects relate to the changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, to people's responses to the changes, and to the overall effect with respect to visual amenity'.

Landscape and visual assessments are separate, although linked procedures.

- 1.7 Landscape affects impact in various degrees of magnitude on the fabric and character of the landscape, moderated by its sensitivity and capacity to accommodate change. The significance of adverse and/or beneficial visual effects results from identifying principal viewpoints, assessing the degree of change in view, and consideration of the sensitivity of the viewer. Landscape Impact Assessments include a combination of objective and subjective judgements (i.e. objective and quantifiable = determination of magnitude of change; subjective = assessment of value)
- 1.8 Using Ordnance Survey Sheets, reproduced under licence, a desk-top study has been carried out to identify the physical components of the local area, to identify areas of high ground, significant ridgelines, woodlands and potential location of views into and from the Application Site. The following data was used :-
 - O.S. Landranger Sheet 183 (1/50,000)
 - O.S. Land Plan information (1/10,000)
 - Vertical Aerial Photographs
 - The Applicants' Site Survey Plan
 - Bellway Homes Site Layout Plan 20.18/SL.02

2. The Existing Situation (see Drawing Nos. 922/PL1 – 6 inclusive)

- 2.1 The land owned by the Applicants at Bay is situated to the east of a residential development known as Barnaby Mead, and to the west of properties fronting Bay Lane to the east. The northern boundary of the Application Site is defined by a river known as Shreen Water, and to the south is a playing field forming part of Gillingham School. The ownership is identified on the drawings with a blue line and comprises an area approximately 2ha. in extent. Drawing No.922/PL1 is an extract from the 1/10,000 scale Ordnance Survey maps, reproduced under licence which covers an area to the east of Gillingham of approximately 2.5km wide x 1.5km high. The Application Site is shown edged in red and other land under the control of the Applicants is shown edged in blue.
- 2.2 Drawing No. 922/PL2 includes two aerial photographs, the District photograph covering an area at Bay and Lodbourne and the site photograph includes the properties on the periphery. The Application Site is identified edged in red on both photographs and from these it will be seen that the area immediately surrounding the Application Site includes the following landscape features :-

- i. Residential Development
 - ii. Public rights of way, dashed in orange
 - iii. Public roads
 - iv. Shreen Water river
 - v. Playing Fields
 - vii. Hedgerows and hedgerow trees
- 2.3 Drawing No. 922/PL3 illustrates the Application Site in more detail, the red line boundary encloses an area of approximately 2ha. The drawing also illustrates, with a turquoise line, the approximate position of a 1 in 100 year flood line which is a strip of land to the north. It is the Applicants' intention to dedicate this area to the town as public open space to be used in conjunction with a similar area to the north of Barnaby Mead. This strip of land may, in the future, form part of a riverside walk.
- 2.4 To the south east of the Application Site are fields in the ownership of the Applicants, edged in blue, which are used for grazing purposes. A small area of land to the north of the school has been leased to Dorset County Council for use as tennis courts. To the south is a playing field used by Gillingham School. A public footpath runs from Barnaby Mead through the southern end of the Application Site linking with Bay Lane to the north and with Hardings Lane, Gillingham School and the Gillingham Centre to the south east.
- 2.5 The Application Site slopes down from its southern boundary at just over 80m AOD towards the Shreen Water to the north at around 70m AOD. To the south of the Application Site, forming its southern boundary, is a large traditional hedgerow comprising blackthorn and hazel.
- 2.6 The following photographs are taken within the Application Site, i.e. at non-public viewpoints and illustrate the existing site features, ground formation and views out into the surrounding landscape. These locations are identified on Drawing No. 922/PL3. Views from the public footpath which runs south of the site are included with others that were identified in the Visibility Study (Section 9).



VIEWPOINT 1 – a panoramic view looking across the site from just south of Bay Farm with Barnaby Mead at the centre of view and the residences on Bay Lane to the right.



VIEWPOINT 2 – looking south to the boundary with the school playing fields with the public footpath behind the boundary hedge.



VIEWPOINT 3 – a panoramic view from west to north east across the site. Barnaby Mead is seen to the right of the view, the vegetation adjacent to Shreen Water in the lower photograph with Bay Lane to the right.



VIEWPOINT 4 – looking at the north west corner of the site towards Shreen Water and the flood protection zone.



VIEWPOINT 5 – looking south from Viewpoint 4.



VIEWPOINT 6 – a view of Shreen Water in the north west corner of the site and the rear of the properties on Bay Road.



VIEWPOINT 7 – looking east to Bay Farm and residences on Bay Lane.

3. Landscape Policies and Guidance

- 3.1. Reference was made to the site within the current Adopted Local Plan as follows which explains why it was not allocated:-

Environmental Capacity of the Town

15.2.4 – the riverside gap between Bay and the town centre formerly designated as “Buffer Zones”, and a policy of restraint applied within them. However, having considered objections to the Buffer Zone policies the Local Plan Inspector recommended that the policies should be deleted.

15.2.5 – while the Council is prepared to follow the recommendation to delete the Buffer Zone policy areas, it should be recognised that they primarily comprise “Greenfield” land. In view of the current healthy situation in terms of the availability of land for development in the town, the Council does not intend to allocate any part of the Buffer Zone areas for development at this stage. A landscape assessment is currently being undertaken of each of the areas. Once this is complete the Council intends to propose new formal statutory policy for the relevant areas, taking into account the Local Plan Inspector’s recommendations, and any other material considerations. If necessary, as with any policy, Supplementary Planning Guidance may also be produced to help guide development in these areas”.

3.2 Within the Report *Assessing Growth Potential at Gillingham* (Atkins 2009) it was recognised that the site should now be considered favourably for development. This advice has been reflected as follows:

Draft Local Plan Core Policy 16: Gillingham

Housing

About 2,300 homes will be provided at Gillingham during the period 2006-2026. About 900 homes will be built in the period up to 2016 with about 1,400 dwellings built thereafter.

In the period up to 2026 housing will be provided:

- *Through the mixed use regeneration of land at Station Road to the south of the town centre;*
- ***On land to the south and south west of Bay;***
- *On land adjacent to Lodden Lakes; and*
- *Through infilling and regeneration within the settlement boundary.*

Green Infrastructure

*A network of green infrastructure will be developed in and around Gillingham focussing primarily on the corridors of the River Stour, River Lodden and **the Shreen Water.***

4. Landscape Character and Methodology Assessment Elements

- 4.1 This assessment has been carried out using the "Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment" (GLVIA) published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment, Second Edition 2002 as a guide. These describe landscape effects and visual effects in the following manner :-

'Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape, which may give rise to changes in its character and how this is experienced. This may in turn affect the perceived value ascribed to this landscape.'

'Visual effects relate to the changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, to people's responses to the changes, and to the overall effect with respect to visual amenity'.

- 4.2 The specific landscape character of an area can be recognised by the presence of an identifiable and consistently recurring pattern of elements, which are representative of generic character types, or unique character areas. These range from large scale regional landscapes to small localised zones. Landscape character results from a combination of geology, landform, landcover, hydrology, vegetation, landuse management, as well as historical influences and ecological assets. Before determining the impact of the development the nature of the local character should be established by studying national and regional policy guidance and carrying out on-site investigations. The National guidance for landscape character is the Countryside Agency's Natural Areas Character Map of England and also English Nature's document, which are large-scale nationwide assessments. The Character Map of England considers all aspects of landscape character whereas the Natural Areas are formally defined as 'biogeographic zones which reflect the geological foundations, the natural systems and processes and the wildlife in different parts of England, and provide a framework for setting objectives for nature conservation'. Regional-scale character assessments should be consulted and on-site investigations ensure a detailed definition of the local landscape character. Having defined the local landscape character, an assessment is made of the impact of development on it. This is done by evaluating the landscape's sensitivity and the magnitude of impact of the development.
- 4.3 The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2nd Edition, Sections 7.16 and 7.17 state the following :-

The degree to which a particular landscape type or area can accommodate change arising from a particular development, without detrimental effects on its character will vary with:-

- existing land use;
- the pattern and scale of the landscape;
- the scope for mitigation, which would be in character with the existing landscape;
- the value placed on the landscape.

Variations of these characteristics within the local landscape and within the site need to be identified.

The determination of the sensitivity of the landscape resource is based upon an evaluation of each key element or characteristic of the landscape likely to be affected. The evaluation will reflect such factors as its quality, value, contribution to landscape character, and the degree to which the particular element or characteristic can be replaced or substituted.

- 4.4 The table below focuses on capacity to accept this change and a value of the sensitivity of the landscape. The condition of the landscape is a judgement from a visual, functional and ecological perspective and reflects the physical state of individual features and elements which make up the character of the place :-

Table 1: Sensitivity of landscape

Sensitivity of Landscape		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Capacity to accept this type of development :					
	Difference in land use	The land use proposed does not exist in this landscape	Land uses of a similar scale currently exist	The proposed type of land use is found in this landscape	The proposed type of land use is common to this landscape
	Difference in pattern and scale	Such a proposal is vastly different in terms of pattern and scale	Such a proposal is not similar to the landscape in terms of pattern and scale	There are elements within the landscape with a similar pattern and scale to this type of proposal	
	Visual enclosure/ Openness of views	The landscape is open with high visibility	The landscape is moderately open with some visibility	Enclosed landscape with low visibility	
Value placed on the landscape		National designation National Park, AONB and regional designation	Regional designation	Local designation	No designation
Policy objective for the landscape		Proposal conflicts with objectives	There are minor conflicts between the proposal and the objectives	Proposal neither fits nor conflicts with objectives	
Condition of the landscape		Very high, with recognisable elements in good repair	Moderate, distinctive elements, some in need of repair	Poor, with few distinctive elements which are in disrepair	

4.5 The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2nd Edition, Sections 7.18 to 7.23 detail the scale or magnitude of landscape impacts as follows:-

The evaluation of the individual effects may be quantified within a series of categories, indicating a gradation from high to low. A minimum of four categories is recommended for both negative (adverse) and positive (beneficial) effects. In all cases the thresholds should be clearly defined, readily understood and applicable for all circumstances. The assessment of the scale or magnitude of relative effects is generally based on the scale and degree of change to the landscape, the nature of the effects, their duration and whether it is permanent or temporary, or indeed whether the effects are reversible. Some effects may be easily quantified, i.e. the number of mature trees and length of hedgerow to be lost as a result, and the extent of new and replacement planting to take place at restoration. A distinction is made between the scale of the effect, the nature of the change and the duration, as follows :-

- scale: large, medium, small etc.;
- nature: negative (adverse) or positive (beneficial);
- duration: short, medium long term/permanent or temporary.

The weight to be given to each aspect is to be judged in arriving at an overall value for scale or magnitude for each effect, and be clearly set out in order to be readily understood by the decision makers and members of the public. More weight is usually given to effects that are greater in scale and permanent or long term, whereas change that is confined to a small area and visible only from a few private residential properties may be considered to be of low scale or magnitude. In assessing the duration of the effect, consideration should be given to the effectiveness of mitigation, particularly where planting is proposed for screening purposes. Planting out of character with its surroundings may increase the scale of the negative (adverse) changes to the landscape.

- 4.6 A combination of the factors below are used to assess of the magnitude of impact on the landscape. The following factors address the detailed nature of the change :-

Table 2: Magnitude of Impact of the development on that landscape.

Magnitude of Impact (or change to view)		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Capacity to accept this type of development :					
	Characteristic landscape features are lost	Yes, most of the characteristic landscape features are lost- or those which are lost are irreplaceable.	Yes, some of the characteristic landscape features are lost	No, none or a small quantity of the characteristic landscape features is lost. Or those which are lost are replaceable.	No, none of the characteristic landscape features are lost
	Characteristic BAP habitats are lost	Yes, most of the characteristic BAP habitats are lost – or those which are lost are irreplaceable	Yes, some of the characteristic BAP habitats are lost	No, none or a small quantity of the characteristic BAP habitats is lost. Or those which are lost are replaceable	No, none of the characteristic BAP habitats are lost
Contribution to the local landscape character :					
	Development is characteristic in terms of scale, mass, colour, texture, form or features	No	Some of it is characteristic, some of it isn't	Yes, most of the development is characteristic	Yes, all of the development is characteristic
	Scope for mitigation and replacement of features and/or potential for characteristic BAP habitats	Little or no scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats	Some scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats	Much scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats	Great scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats

4.7 The assessments of sensitivity of the landscape and the magnitude of impact are used to determine the significance of the overall landscape effect which is calculated in the following table :-

Table 3: Assessment of potential significance of landscape impacts

SENSITIVITY	NEGLIGIBLE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	SIGNIFICANCE
MAGNITUDE					
NEGLIGIBLE	0	2	4	6	NEGLIGIBLE 0
LOW	1	3	5	7	SLIGHT 1 - 3
MEDIUM	2	4	6	8	MODERATE 4 - 6
HIGH	3	5	7	9	SUBSTANTIAL 7-9

5. The Landscape Character in context

5.1 Drawing No. 922/PL4 is a version of the Location Plan (922/PL1) on which the Regional Joint Landscape Character areas, Local Plan Character Types and Character areas have been shown. This site does not lie within any AONB designation, although the boundary of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB lies approximately 4km to the north at Mere. The character types and areas are illustrated and described on the drawing. These have been obtained from the following sources :-

“The Character of England” – Natural England

“Dorset Landscape Character Assessment” LDA 1993

“Landscape Character Area Assessment” – North Dorset DC March 2008

5.2 Drawing No. 922/PL5 is a further version of the North Dorset Local Plan (1st Revision), (2011 Deposit Draft) on which North Dorset District Council’s Local Plan designations/policy areas which are considered relevant to this proposal are shown, these include :-

- i. Important Open or Wooded Areas (IOWA), these are to be reviewed.
- ii. Gillingham Conservation Area
- iii. Sites of Archaeological Importance
- iv. Areas liable to flooding
- v. Gillingham Royal Forest Project

From the plan it will be seen that the Application Site lies within the Gillingham Settlement Boundary identified in the Local Plan and between two IOWA areas, one adjacent to Shreen Water to the north and the other to the south the Playing Field associated with Gillingham School.

5.3 Drawing No. 922/PL6 is also a version of the Location Plan which has been coloured to illustrate and identify topography, landform and areas of significant vegetation. This shows the Application Site, at an elevation around 75m AOD. The ground formation is shown using the colours illustrated in the Key to illustrate land below and above the general level of the Application Site. From this it will be seen that the Application Site lies on a gentle northerly facing slope on the western edge of a shallow north/south ridge which penetrates into the heart of Gillingham and to the east of The Shreen Water Valley. Principal ridgelines are shown as identified in the Key and it will be seen that, with the exception of the higher ground to the north west near Milton on Stour and to the north east near North End, the land does not rise above 100m AOD.

5.4 Major blocks of vegetation are identified and from this it is clear that these are mainly confined to the south and east.

5.5 From the above plans it will be seen that the land was greenfield and the Council did not need to allocate it for development at the Local Plan stage. In the light of the Inspectors decision the Council is presumably reconsidering this position.

6. The Proposals

- 6.1 The proposals are that the Application Site should be considered and allocated for housing. The Planning Inspector in his report in 2000 stated :-

“15.1.80 – Whilst Bay Lane is a pleasant narrow cul-de-sac, with some attractive older properties, the hamlet does not in my opinion have a distinctive cohesive character or identify of its own. Also, in my opinion, the open fields to the west and south have limited intrinsic landscape value, though they clearly have a semi rural appearance.

15.1.81 – having visited the area on a number of occasions, I have come to the conclusion that the Zone is not justified in terms of protecting the setting of Bay.

15.1.82 – I recommend that the Plan be modified by deleting the Bay Buffer Zone.”

Similarly in his considerations and conclusions he remarked :-

“15.1.204 The Barnaby Mead site falls within the proposed Bay Buffer Zone, which I concluded above was not justified and should be deleted. The site adjoins proposed housing Site C to the west. It is within easy walking distance of the town centre and is very close to Gillingham’s County Primary and Comprehensive Schools to the south. The main railway station and Station Road Industrial Estate are close by, a little further to the south. Shreen Water lies to the north, but the objection land lies outside the defined flood area.

15.1.205 – In my view, the objection site occupies a highly sustainable location for residential development. The illustrative layout shows a low density scheme of 18 detached dwellings, though the objectors in this instance suggested that the site would be suitable for 20 to 25 dwellings and still be in keeping with the surroundings. In order to make best use of the site I consider the higher number would be more appropriate as a basis for negotiation.

15.1.206 – The scheme shows a wide landscaped area immediately adjacent to the Bay Area of Local Character, so the impact on that area would be minimised. The footpath on the southern boundary of the site would be retained, thus the current degree of permeability would not be reduced.

15.1.209 – Overall, however, I conclude that the Barnaby Mead site should be allocated for residential development.

15.1.212 - I recommend that the Plan be modified by allocating the Barnaby Mead site for at least 25 dwellings “.

- 6.2 The proposed housing development within the red line Application Site will, of course, be the subject of a separate Planning Submission and this will be produced following consultations with the relevant authorities. Within this development adequate provision will be made for soft landscape planting which will also include screening on the periphery, particularly adjacent to Bay Lane.

7. Landscape Character Assessment

- 7.1 Using desk-top and published studies, site surveys, aerial photographs and computer analysis, the baseline character of the landscape has been identified, confirmed and assessed. The identification of effects, changes to this baseline, whether positive or negative, their magnitude, sensitivity and significance is analysed and have all been identified.
- 7.2 Mitigation proposals have been considered from the outset of the scheme to reduce potential and residual impacts and the methodology and terminology referred to above has been used.
- 7.3 Worst case scenarios have been considered, i.e. in winter and during periods of construction, and assessed; options and alternatives discussed with the Clients and implemented.
- 7.4 The cumulative effect of the site set-up, construction, site access, screening, vehicle movements and landscape scheme, have all been considered and assessed. The new planting plays a vital role in the development of the proposals.
- 7.5 Using the tables set out in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.6 the landscape impacts have been considered and assessed as follows :-

Table 1: Sensitivity of landscape

Sensitivity of Landscape		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Capacity to accept this type of development :					
Difference in land use		The land use proposed does not exist in this landscape	Land uses of a similar scale currently exist	The proposed type of land use is found in this landscape	The proposed type of land use is common to this landscape
Difference in pattern and scale		Such a proposal is vastly different in terms of pattern and scale	Such a proposal is not similar to the landscape in terms of pattern and scale	There are elements within the landscape with a similar pattern and scale to this type of proposal	
Visual enclosure/ Openness of views		The landscape is open with high visibility	The landscape is moderately open with some visibility	Enclosed landscape with low visibility	
Value placed on the landscape		National designation National Park, AONB and regional designation	Regional designation	Local designation	No designation
Policy objective for the landscape		Proposal conflicts with objectives	There are minor conflicts between the proposal and the objectives	Proposals do not conflict with objective	Proposal fits policy objective
Condition of the landscape		Very high, with recognisable elements in good repair	Moderate, distinctive elements, some in need of repair	Average	Poor, in disrepair

The overall sensitivity is therefore assessed as **Low**.

Table 2: Magnitude of Impact of the development on that landscape.

Magnitude of Impact (or change to view)		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Capacity to accept this type of development :					
	Characteristic landscape features are lost	Yes, most of the characteristic landscape features are lost- or those which are lost are irreplaceable.	Yes, some of the characteristic landscape features are lost	No, none or a small quantity of the characteristic landscape features is lost. Or those which are lost are replaceable.	No, none of the characteristic landscape features are lost
	Characteristic BAP habitats are lost	Yes, most of the characteristic BAP habitats are lost – or those which are lost are irreplaceable	Yes, some of the characteristic BAP habitats are lost	No, none or a small quantity of the characteristic BAP habitats is lost. Or those which are lost are replaceable	No, none of the characteristic BAP habitats are lost
Contribution to the local landscape character :					
	Development is characteristic in terms of scale, mass, colour, texture, form or features	No	Some of it is characteristic, some of it isn't	Yes, most of the development is characteristic	Yes, all of the development is characteristic
	Scope for mitigation and replacement of features and/or potential for characteristic BAP habitats	Little or no scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats	Some scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats	Much scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats	Great scope for mitigating features or characteristic BAP habitats

The overall magnitude is assessed as **Negligible**.

7.6 Table 3 below assesses the significance of the development using the results from the overall sensitivity and magnitude described in the preceding paragraphs :-

Table 3

SENSITIVITY		NEGLECTIBLE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	SIGNIFICANCE	
MAGNITUDE							
NEGLECTIBLE		0	2	4	6	NEGLECTIBLE 0	
LOW		1	3	5	7	SLIGHT 1 - 3	
MEDIUM		2	4	6	8	MODERATE 4 - 6	
HIGH		3	5	7	9	SUBSTANTIAL 7-9	

7.7 In terms of the potential impact of the proposals the sensitivity has been assessed as **Low** and the magnitude assessed as **Negligible** resulting in an overall significance of **Slight**.

7.8 The foregoing Landscape Character Assessment has described and assessed the Application Site in the context of National, County and Local character areas and has assessed the potential impact on its character of the proposals. This process has resulted in the conclusion that it will have potentially **slight** significance due primarily to its current location adjacent to existing residential development. In mitigation the design and use of traditional materials, form, groundshaping and planting all of which have been built into the scheme from the outset, will have a significant impact once established. The following Field Study Sheets identify in diagrammatic form the elements that make up the immediate character of the area :-

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT

FIELD SURVEY SHEET

SHEET NO: 1

Project: Proposed Residential Development for the Ridgeway Will Trust Job No. 922

Location: Bay, Gillingham, Dorset

Date: March 2010

Regional Landscape Character Type:

District Landscape Character Type

Geology: Limestone Sandstone Chalk Clay Granite Alluvial

Topography:

Flat	Plain	Dry Valley
Sloping	Rolling Lowland	Deep Gorge
Undulating	Plateau	Broad Valley
Rolling	Scarp/Cliffs	Narrow Valley
Steep	Hills	Coastal
Vertical	Floodplain	Downland
Mountainous		Estuary

Dominant Landcover and Landscape Elements :

Buildings:	Heritage:	Farming:
Farmsteads	Vernacular Buildings	Walls
Masts/Poles	Country House	Fences
Pylons	Field Systems	Hedges
Industry	Prehistoric	Fields
Settlement	Hill Top Enclosure	Arable
Urban	Ecclesiastic	Improved Pasture
Follies	Monuments	Rough Grazing
Military	Coppice	Water Meadows
Urban fringe	Ancient Woodland	Grassland
Village		Species Rich Grassland
Woodland/Trees:	Hydrology:	Communications:
Deciduous	River	Road
Coniferous	Stream	Track
Mixed Woodland	Reservoir	Footpath
Shelterbelt	Dry Valley	Railway
Hedge Trees	Winterbourne	Pylons
Orchard	Pond	Communication Masts
Species rich hedges	Lake	
Isolated Trees	Ditch	
Moorland	Coastal	
Heathland	Marshland	
Parkland		
Fen		

Note: All options are shown in Black, **Green** is specific to the character type

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT

FIELD SURVEY SHEET

SHEET NO: 1

Project: Proposed Residential Development for the Ridgeway Will Trust Job No. 922

Location: Bay, Gillingham, Dorset

Date: March 2010

Brief Description (including main elements, features, attractors and detractors) of the

Application Site: An area of sloping agricultural land set at the urban edge of the town and adjacent to housing/school sites and bounded at north by river.

Key Characteristics/Distinctive Features of the Character type

Seen as an area of open space between the recent Barnaby Mead housing area and the properties on Bay Lane. It is semi-enclosed.

Rarity within the character type :

Not typical of the character area within which it lies.

Condition of the landscape character:

Of moderate quality though more urban than the type.

Capacity to Accommodate Change:

Could accommodate change as shown by recent development to the west.