

**Braintree District Settlement Fringes
Evaluation of Landscape Analysis Study of
Hatfield Peverel**

for

Braintree District Council

June 2015

Final

Contact:

Simon Neesam, Technical Director

The Landscape Partnership
The Granary
Sun Wharf
Deben Road
Woodbridge
Suffolk IP12 1AZ

t: 01394 380 509

e: simon.neesam@tlp.uk.com

w: thelandscapepartnership.com

The Landscape Partnership Ltd is a practice of Chartered Landscape Architects, Chartered Town Planners and Chartered Environmentalists, registered with the Landscape Institute and a member of the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment & the Arboricultural Association.

The Landscape Partnership Limited
Registered Office:
Greenwood House
15a St Cuthberts Street
Bedford
MK40 3JG.

Registered in England No 270900

Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Summary of Landscape Capacity Evaluation, November 2007
- 3 Evaluation of Landscape Capacity Analysis
- 4 Findings of evaluation of Landscape Capacity Analysis

Figures

- Figure HP01: Location Plan
- Figure HP02: Landscape Setting Areas
- Figure HP03: Landscape Setting Areas – Evaluation
- Figure HP04: Parcel Arrangement
- Figure HP05: Parcel Evaluation

Appendices

- Appendix A: Field survey sheet
- Appendix B: Landscape Capacity Analysis criteria
- Appendix C: Completed Landscape Capacity Analysis forms

1 Introduction

Background to the study

- 1.1 In November 2014 Braintree District Council (BDC) commissioned The Landscape Partnership to undertake an evaluation of the findings of a suite of documents that analysed the capacity of the landscape around nine settlements within the District to accommodate new development. The results of this study are to be used as part of the evidence base to inform the forthcoming Local Plan, which will set out the Council's strategy for future development and growth up to 2033.
- 1.2 Eight of the Landscape Capacity Analyses were prepared in November 2007 by Chris Blandford Associates, and a ninth (Sible Hedingham) was commissioned in November 2014 and prepared by The Landscape Partnership. The nine settlements comprise:
- Braintree and environs
 - Coggeshall
 - Earls Colne
 - Halstead
 - Hatfield Peverel
 - Kelvedon and Feering
 - Sible Hedingham
 - Silver End
 - Witham

Objectives

- 1.3 The Council has commissioned this study to help determine the most appropriate directions for future residential and employment growth in the District, by providing an up to date evidence base for the new Local Plan. It will also support policy in the new Local Plan relating to Landscape Character Areas, biodiversity and the environment.
- 1.4 As development within the existing towns and villages on brownfield sites is reaching saturation point, it is inevitable that future development will be required to meet the District's Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) figure, and that such development will need to be accommodated on the periphery of the main towns and larger settlements, in sustainable locations.
- 1.5 The Landscape Capacity Analyses identify the capacity of broad parcels of land (termed Landscape Setting Areas) around each of the settlements to accommodate development. Each Landscape Setting Area was graded as having one of the following levels of capacity: Low, Low to Medium, Medium, Medium to High or High.

- 1.6 The aim of this study is to undertake a clear and concise evaluation of these findings in order to provide a finer grain assessment of Landscape Setting Areas identified as having a 'Low' or 'Low to Medium' capacity to help determine which parts of these areas could absorb development with appropriate mitigation measures and minimal impact on the landscape.
- 1.7 This report sets out the findings of the survey and evaluation work for the Landscape Capacity Analysis for Hatfield Peverel.

Approach and Methodology

- 1.8 The methodology to evaluate the findings of the Landscape Capacity Analysis studies was based on the approach promoted in Topic Paper 6, 'Techniques and criteria for judging capacity and sensitivity' published in 2002, which forms part of the Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage guidance 'Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland'. The paper explores thinking and recent practice on judging capacity and sensitivity. The recommended methodology developed for this study adopted the following premise from Topic Paper 6:

"existing landscape character sensitivity + visual sensitivity = Overall Landscape Sensitivity"

- 1.9 Alongside the development of the methodology, a desk-based study was undertaken, which involved gathering and reviewing current and background information, including the datasets and mapping that informed the original Landscape Capacity Analysis studies. This included an understanding of the current planning policy background, and in-depth review of the existing Landscape Capacity Analysis studies, including the Landscape Character Assessment 2006 (Chris Blandford Associates), and:

- Protected Lanes Assessment July 2013 (Essex County Council)
- Braintree District Historic Environmental Characterisation Project 2010 (Essex County Council)
- Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Project Management Plan
- Braintree District Core Strategy 2011
- Braintree District Local Plan Review 2005

Field survey work and results

- 1.10 The field survey work utilised information gathered from each of the Landscape Capacity Analysis studies, and involved a systematic survey of the Landscape Setting Areas identified in the studies as having Low or Low to Medium capacity for development.
- 1.11 The existing Landscape Setting Areas were 'drilled down' to create a finer sub-division of the landscape into 'Parcels' with common characteristics. This was based on desktop research that was then refined and adjusted in the light of findings in the field if necessary. Characteristics that informed the identification of the Parcels included:

- landform
- landscape designations
- hydrology
- landscape scale
- vegetation cover
- land uses
- pattern of settlement
- presence of views and landmarks features
- communications

- 1.12 These Parcels largely reflected the main natural elements of the landscape, such as rivers and floodplains, tributary valleys, valley slopes, ridgelines; and elements relating to land use, human influences, etc. The original assumption had been that each of the Landscape Setting Areas would be subdivided into, on average, four Parcels of various sizes but consistent character. A consequence of the desktop and field work was that, where the landscape was more complex in both the underlying natural elements and overlying land uses, up to seven or eight Parcels were identified in more complex landscapes.
- 1.13 The drawing of boundary lines was a necessary part of the process, but did not always mean that Parcels were dramatically different to either side of the line, as it is more typical for change to be a more gradual transition. The boundary lines for some Parcels mark more a watershed of character, where the balance of the defining elements has shifted from one landscape character to another. For practical purposes, the boundary was aligned on features that could be identified on the ground, such as boundary features or landscape elements.
- 1.14 This analysis was typically at the field level scale with, where appropriate, some aggregation of field and landscape units of a similar character. Such a fine-grain study was required in order to identify any parts of the overall Landscape Setting Area that have the potential to accommodate development.
- 1.15 The field survey work was carried out by a team of Landscape Architects who used a standard pro-forma (see Appendix A) to record data in a consistent manner. The Parcels were photographed (where relevant) to capture landscape character, for internal purposes when reviewing and evaluating the character and analysis studies and compiling the report. The fieldwork confirmed important views that had been identified in the Landscape Setting Areas in the previous studies, as well as identifying further important views – both close and distant. It also verified and assessed landmark landscape features and sensitive routes/corridors and their corresponding sensitivity to

change. Information was also gathered around opportunities for landscape enhancements in keeping with local landscape character, and the potential for green infrastructure provision.

- 1.16 Following the fieldwork the Parcels were reviewed, mapped and the field survey notes written up to provide a general commentary to describe and assess the key characteristics, distinctive features and landscape elements, as well as an indication of the 'Strength of Character' and 'Condition' of each Parcel.
- 1.17 The Parcels were assessed for their landscape sensitivity and capacity, based on a pre-defined set of criteria. These criteria reflect both the national guidance in Topic Paper 6 and the particular circumstances for the rural landscape of the Braintree District.
- 1.18 The criteria were grouped into primary factors (representing features that are more permanent in the landscape, such as landform, or those that would take a substantial period of time to vary) and secondary factors (representing features that are of a more temporary or transient nature or that could be subject to relatively rapid change or improvement).
- 1.19 The following criteria have been selected to reflect existing landscape features:
- slope analysis (primary)
 - vegetation enclosure (primary)
 - the complexity and scale of the landscape (secondary)
 - the condition of the landscape (secondary)
- 1.20 The following criteria have been selected to reflect visual sensitivity:
- openness to public view (secondary)
 - openness to private view (secondary)
 - relationship with existing urban conurbation (primary)
 - safeguarding the separation or coalescence between settlements (primary)
 - scope to mitigate the development (primary)
- 1.21 It is recognised that Topic Paper 6 refers to a wider range of factors within what is termed 'Landscape Character Sensitivity'. However, in the context of this study these are not considered to be relevant and would be picked up as part of other evidence base work, e.g. nature conservation or cultural heritage. It is considered that for the purpose of this evaluation, the main relevant existing landscape and visual factors are addressed in the above categories. These have been incorporated into the field survey forms used for each Parcel (refer to Appendix A).

- 1.22 The Overall Landscape Sensitivity provides an evaluation of the sensitivity of a Parcel in broad strategic terms. In order to assess the Overall Landscape Capacity of a Parcel, 'landscape value' was added to the equation, as follows.

$$\textit{"Overall Landscape Sensitivity + Landscape Value = Overall Landscape Capacity"}$$

- 1.23 Landscape value can be measured in a number of ways e.g. statutory landscape designations, local landscape designations, other ecological/cultural heritage designations, and local perceived value. There are no consensus studies as informed by stakeholders. Consequently, the value of the landscape has been scored based on the presence of: landscape designations (of which there are few, if any, in the study area), Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, the extent of public rights of way, perceptual aspects such as scenic beauty, or the presence/influence of other conservation interests within the Parcel or its setting. Landscape Value is determined on the basis of the same five point scale as the other criteria, using a score of C as the default starting point for a Parcel with no positive or negative landscape-value attributes. This corresponds with the approach adopted by Chris Blandford Associates in the previous Landscape Capacity Analyses for each of the settlements, in which the methodology was based on the evaluation of landscape value as medium, unless an obvious reason existed to elevate or reduce it.
- 1.24 To assess the landscape capacity of a Parcel to accommodate development, certain assumptions need to be applied. For the purposes of this study it is assumed that development will include mainly two to two and a half storey residential units and commercial units of a similar height. It is not anticipated that there would be a need for taller structures, but if a Parcel is considered able to accommodate such structures, this is identified in the description of the Parcel.
- 1.25 Each Parcel was assessed against the criteria noted above, using a five-point scale from most suitable to least suitable (A to E), guided by a set of definitions/descriptions that have been developed for this study to reflect local characteristics (see Appendix B). An assessment has been made of each Parcel in order to determine a score for: Landscape Sensitivity Profile and Overall Capacity Profile. To build in weighting for the primary and secondary factors, a 1.5 x weighting is applied to primary factors.
- 1.26 The results were recorded on a set pro forma to provide a consistent approach reflecting each of the criteria.
- 1.27 The Overall Capacity Profile score identifies the Parcel's capacity based on the following range:
- | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| 27 – 33.5 | Low Landscape Capacity |
| 34 – 40.5 | Medium-Low Landscape Capacity |
| 41 – 47.5 | Medium Landscape Capacity |
| 48 – 54.5 | Medium-High Landscape Capacity |
| 55 – 61.5 | High Landscape Capacity |

- 1.28 The principle of applying a numerical scale to define landscape capacity, has been used to help provide transparency through the field judgement process. However, it should be emphasized that scores should not be regarded as a precise and definitive judgement, but merely as a means to establish relative capacity and no absolute conclusion should be drawn from the numerical totals. The influence of individual criteria in a given Parcel and in the context of the wider landscape character should also be given due consideration. Those Parcels that are borderline in terms of suitability, are considered in more detail based on the overall spread and balance of the profiles and scope to mitigate in making a final judgement. To aid these considerations a commentary of the key points has been provided for each Parcel.
- 1.29 A general commentary has been provided for each Parcel based on the key characteristics and distinctive features. Parcels that have a Medium, Medium-High or High landscape capacity are considered to be the most likely to be suitable as a potential location for development. Where appropriate, further detail regarding the type, nature and principles for development are described for each Parcel to help provide guidance in identifying the most suitable locations and/or layouts for future development.

2 Summary of Landscape Capacity Evaluation, November 2007

- 2.1 The CBA study reached conclusions around the capacity of the landscape to accommodate change without significant effects on its character. This work involved making a judgement around whether the amount of change proposed can be accommodated without having unacceptable adverse effects on the character of the landscape (relating to *landscape character sensitivity*) or the way that it is perceived (relating to *visual sensitivity*), without compromising the values attached to it (relating to *landscape value*).
- 2.2 The summary schedule for levels of landscape character sensitivity, visual sensitivity and landscape value revealed that Landscape Setting Area HP4 to the north-east of Hatfield Peverel has **Medium** capacity to accommodate additional development. This area has not been assessed further due to its higher overall potential to accommodate development. Landscape Setting Areas HP1, HP2 and HP3, which wrap around the southern and north-western fringes of existing development have **Low to Medium** overall capacity. Evaluations for the areas are reflected on Figure HP-04.
- 2.3 The report concludes that levels of landscape capacity may not be uniform across any one setting area. It acknowledges that the Low to Medium capacity setting areas around Hatfield Peverel may include specific locations therein that are more suitable for development in landscape or visual terms, particularly where they are small in scale and have a moderate amount of visual enclosure. Where capacity within the setting areas varies, any development proposals would need to respond to the inherent landscape sensitivity and take account of both the setting and potential impacts on the surrounding landscape.
- 2.4 The report concluded that although potential opportunities for accommodating new built development around Hatfield Peverel are limited (with the exception of HP4), there may be capacity within even moderately sensitive or highly valued landscapes to accommodate some well-designed and appropriately located built development.
- 2.5 CBA's **evaluations** for each of the Landscape Setting Areas are summarised below, including the broad locations within which the study suggests that residential or employment development could be accommodated.

Landscape Setting Area HP1:

- 2.6 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:
- The visibility of the area settlement edge is reduced from northern and western parts, due to its undulating landform combined with robust hedgerows and a strong woodland structure. This also results in restricted visibility of the Setting Area in the wider landscape. The Area has a medium visual sensitivity overall with increased sensitivity to elevated western and eastern parts, and within the low-lying central and eastern parts where a strong sense of visual continuity is formed along the river corridor. There are several highly prominent visual

detractors on the northern fringes of the settlement including large buildings, telecommunication mast, pylons and overhead power lines which also contribute to a reduced sensitivity in southern parts of the area.

- The landscape character has a Medium to High sensitivity overall due to the strength of rural character, patterns of semi-natural vegetation alongside the river, quiet rural lands, the fairly intact hedgerow and field structure and substantial blocks. These elements all contribute to the setting of the settlement and form a generally unified and distinctive sense of place. The sensitivity is decreased in parts due to industrial development within the northern settlement fringe, the railway, the A12 and overhead power lines, all of which detract from the strength of rural character.
- The Landscape Value is Medium to High overall on account of the numerous Listed Buildings, good public right of way network, the previous Special Landscape Area designation, and the moderate to high sense of tranquillity and remoteness away from the railway, roads and settlement edges.

2.7 The report identified a potential area to accommodate residential or employment development would be along the western edge of the settlement to the north of the A12, provided robust trees and shrub planting is used to integrate any expanded settlement into the local landscape. Opportunities should also be taken to develop landscape recreational corridors alongside the River Ter, which passes through the setting area.

Landscape Setting Area HP2:

2.8 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- Views within the Area towards the settlement edge are softened and substantially enclosed by riparian vegetation, and robust tree and shrub structure lining most parts of the settlement fringe. This forms a well-vegetated skyline to most parts of the area. There are views of landmark historic buildings within the area and along the settlement edge. The visual sensitivity is judged Medium-High overall for the land north-east of the River Ter due to the enclosure provided by the strong landscape framework. The sensitivity to the south-west of the river is increased where land is more open.
- The landscape character has a Medium-High sensitivity overall strong contribution to the setting of the settlement and the visual and physical separation provided between Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley. Elements contributing to the rural character include the good structure of riparian vegetation, semi-natural and ancient woodland, intact hedgerow structure to northern parts, scattered historic buildings, overall tranquillity and network of quiet rural lanes and byways. The sensitivity is slightly reduced within southern parts where there has been

substantial decline in the hedgerow structure, particularly between Mowden Hall Lane and the River Ter.

- The Landscape Value is Medium to High on account of the Historic Hatfield Priory, including a listed building and wealth of ancient monuments, scattered Listed Buildings, comprehensive footpath network including routes along the river and the strong sense of tranquillity and remoteness away from roads and the settlement edge.

2.9 Opportunities should be taken to develop landscape recreational corridors alongside the River Ter, which passes through the setting area.

Landscape Setting Area HP3:

2.10 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- The area is well enclosed from the wider landscape by local vegetation and landform. Views within the area are generally well contained by buildings, tree belts and a robust hedgerow structure. Houses along the settlement fringes of Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley are visible in open and partial views from many parts of the area resulting in a Medium visual sensitivity to the area overall. There is an increased sensitivity within western parts which are visible in distant views from the upper slopes of the Chelmer Valley to the southwest.
- The landscape character is of Medium to High sensitivity due to the contribution of the area to the physical and visual separation between Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley and to the rural setting of Hatfield Priory. The poorly integrated settlement edges and intrusive urban fringe land uses reduces the sensitivity of central and northern parts. The containment of the area by peripheral settlement edges and the vegetation structure largely encloses the Area reducing the contribution it makes to the wider landscape. The sensitivity is increased in northern parts to the survival of historic field enclosures and intact hedgerows.
- The combination of some valued components such as the well-used public footpaths, listed buildings and proximity to the Hatfield Priory along with some urban intrusive features result in Medium Landscape Value overall.

2.11 Opportunities for locating new development could be taken along the eastern edges of the settlement providing that robust belts of trees and shrubs are provided to help integrate any expanded settlement into the local landscape.

2.12 The potential development opportunities described above are proposed on the basis that they are verified by the finer grain assessment of the setting areas carried out in this Landscape Capacity Analysis. The study contains a further recommendation that any development would need to be consistent with the scale and form of the existing settlement fringe, and that the recommended tree and shrub planting areas are sufficiently robust where new employment development is a possibility. The report makes further recommendations around the development of recreational corridors along

the River Blackwater which passes through Landscape Setting Areas HP1 and HP2, and the enhancement of the local landscape framework to help absorb the fringes of the settlement into the local landscape.

- 2.13 The study concludes that the landscape sensitivities and values it identifies should guide the subsequent land use distribution and development proposals, ensuring that they build on existing form and character, and minimise impacts on the landscape setting of the existing settlement. The recommendation around the preparation of landscape strategies addressing land use, built form, landscape character, minimising impacts on the surrounding landscape and heritage assets also references the need for development proposals to consider the setting of, and separation between, existing settlements in the District.

3 Evaluation of Landscape Capacity Analysis

- 3.1 The completed Landscape Capacity Analysis forms for each Parcel can be found at Appendix C.

4 Findings of evaluation of Landscape Capacity Analysis

Identification and arrangement of Parcels (See Figure HP-04 Parcel Arrangement):

- 4.1 As described in the methodology, a combination of desktop and comprehensive fieldwork was used to 'drill down' the Landscape Setting Areas into Parcels with common characteristics. This involved a systematic survey of the natural elements of the landscape and overlying elements relating to land uses.
- 4.2 Although it has been assumed that no development would occur within the floodplain of the River Ter, the mapping and subsequent analysis of Parcels within the Setting Areas included the valley floors of this feature and the minor tributaries associated with it.
- 4.3 It had been anticipated at the outset that approximately four Parcels would be identified in each Setting Area. However, the subtleties of the valley landscape of the River Ter and the more defined historic grain to parts of the Areas translated into more complex landscapes across Setting Areas HP1 and HP2, with eight and eleven Parcels identified in the areas as a consequence. Landscape Setting Area HP3 to the south-east of Hatfield Peverel is smaller in scale, with only four Parcels identified within the agricultural land to the settlement fringes of Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley.
- 4.4 An overview of the scale and arrangement of the Parcels reveals that they are smaller in scale and more geometric in form where they abut the settlement fringes. The preserved historic field enclosure patterns also influence the delineation of Parcels to the south of Hatfield Peverel and to the north of the River Ter. The northern fringes of the settlement are affected by the major transport links cutting across the landscape with the London to Colchester railway line, the A12 and the B1137.
- 4.5 The wider extents of Landscape Setting Areas HP1 and HP2 are generally larger in scale where the landscape is less influenced by development and retains a largely rural character. These areas often provide long distance views across the river valley landscape framed in part by dense woodland blocks. For example Parcel 1e occupies the upper east facing valley slopes with views across the River Ter and a dense backdrop formed by the Ancient woodland forming Lost Wood.
- 4.6 Similarly, the form of the Parcels differ where they are based around the floodplain and slopes associated with the River Ter. The meandering valley form results in a slender and sinuous Parcels that dissect Setting Areas HP1, such as the meandering path of the river to the north-west of Hatfield Peverel in Parcel 1b.

Parcel analysis

- 4.7 Six inherent landscape characteristics of the Parcel (comprising the impacts of landform and landcover; historic pattern; discordance or tranquillity, frequency or rarity, and visual unity) were reviewed and scored with the criteria 'Weak – Moderate – Strong'. The landscape condition, partially reflecting the active management of the landscape for agriculture, amenity uses or nature

conservation, together with the impact of development on the landscape, was similarly assessed and scored as either 'Poor – Moderate – Good'.

- 4.8 A range of landscape and visual criteria were identified, assessed and scored in order to evaluate the capacity of the landscape, Parcel by Parcel, to accommodate development. The potential to alleviate the effects of built development on each Parcel was considered, based on the ability of the landscape to provide effective mitigation across the short – medium - long term. The consideration around mitigation was undertaken as part of the fieldwork, and based on factors such as scale, enclosure, pattern, type and maturity of vegetation, movement and visibility of each Parcel.

Description of results (See Figure HP-05 Parcel Evaluation):

High Landscape Capacity

- 4.9 Evaluation of the landscape features, visual factors, potential landscape features and landscape value revealed that there are no Parcels with High capacity to accommodate residential or commercial development within the Landscape Setting Areas around the fringes of Hatfield Peverel.

Medium-High Landscape Capacity

- 4.10 One Parcel has been identified as having Medium-High capacity to accommodate residential or commercial development. Corresponding with the findings of the earlier Landscape Capacity Analysis, this is located immediately adjacent to the existing settlement fringe, responding to the existing form and function:
- Parcels 2d
- 4.11 The Parcel occupies a rolling landform to the top of the south-west facing valley slopes of the River Ter and abuts the southern settlement fringe of Hatfield Peverel. The Parcel incorporates small scale horse paddocks, allotments, Hatfield Peverel Cricket Club, a village hall and a small number of residential properties. There is dense enclosure to some of the Parcel perimeters with a woodland block to the west and a consistently thick tree belt to the east which encloses the historic grounds to Hatfield Priory. The southern boundary is inconsistent with some parts well contained, but the allotment area more vulnerable to cross valley views from the south.
- 4.12 Mitigation methods identified as part of the analysis include supplementing the tree and hedgerow structure to the southern boundary to form a well-integrated settlement fringe in cross valley views. Development should be appropriate in scale and form to neighbouring residential development on Willow Crescent. Woodland blocks and tree belts should be retained and managed especially to the east where development proposals would need to be sensitively addressed to avoid any adverse impact on the setting of Hatfield Priory. Valuable community facilities should be retained where possible with the possibility of improving public footpath connections and open space provision. If recreation opportunities are reduced, alternative provision should be allocated in equally accessible locations.

Medium Landscape Capacity

- 4.13 Six Parcels have been identified as having Medium Capacity to accommodate development. Corresponding with the findings of the earlier Landscape Capacity Analysis, these are located immediately adjacent to the existing settlement fringes, where they respond to the existing landscape features and visual characteristics:
- Parcel 1a
- 4.14 The Parcel is set on slightly undulating land to the east of the River Ter and adjoins the western fringe of Hatfield Peverel to the north of the A12. The A12 slip road extends into the Parcel and Bury Lane, providing access to a small number of residential properties, Hatfield Bury Farm and the Arla Foods Dairy divides the Parcel into two areas. The western side of the Parcel slopes down to the valley bottom and is dissected by a drainage channel. Planted verges largely screen views into the Parcel from the A12. The framework of existing development and major transport routes provides relatively good scope to accommodate development. However, the Parcel is small in scale and provides opportunities for small scale infill development only.
- 4.15 The analysis highlights that development should be at an appropriate scale and form to the adjoining settlement fringes. The small pastoral field to the east of the Parcel has a context and character that would relate to small scale residential development. The existing landscape framework should be supplemented where possible to provide containment to development from the industrial factory site and the A12.
- Parcels 1j
- 4.16 Located to the north of the London to Colchester railway line, the Parcel occupies the sloping valley sides of the River Ter. Existing development on the northern settlement fringe is currently confined by the railway line. However, fragmented vegetation along the railway embankment provides little visual containment to the settlement fringe in the local landscape. Industrial development to the west of Station Road is especially prominent and forms an intrusive feature in the valley landscape. Development within this Parcel provides the opportunity to better integrate the northern settlement fringe and improve the character of the built form on the settlement edge. The Parcel is relatively well contained in the wider landscape by Titbeech Wood to the north and woodland blocks and tree belts lining the route of the River Ter to the west. This existing landscape framework presents good scope for mitigation that is in keeping with the existing landscape pattern.
- 4.17 Mitigation measures identified as part of the analysis include the provision of increased buffer planting to the southern boundary to better screen the existing industrial development and railway line. Development proposals should reflect the local character of Hatfield Peverel and integrate the existing harsh urban edges in the vicinity of Terling Road with a framework of tree and shrub planting to form an improved gateway to the village. Opportunities could be taken to provide enhanced

recreation opportunities along the River Ter by extending public footpath connections from the proposed settlement fringe to the wider landscape.

- Parcel 1k

4.18 This Parcel is located to the eastern side of the Terling Road and similarly to Parcel 1j, abuts the London to Colchester railway line and the northern settlement fringe of Hatfield Peverel. Comprising small to medium scale arable fields, the Parcel has moderate enclosure provided by fragmented tree belts and hedgerows. These are denser to the north providing visual containment from the wider landscape. The landform gently slopes north-west towards a small stream that feeds in to the River Ter. Development within the Parcel would relate to the housing to the south of the railway line and provide the opportunity improve the partly exposed abrupt urban edge.

4.19 The analysis highlights the opportunity to create an improved gateway on the approach to Hatfield Peverel from the north. Development should be appropriate to the rural setting of the village and reflect the scale and form of existing development within the settlement. The existing landscape framework should be supplemented with tree and shrub planting and improved management providing a consistent treatment to both sides of Terling Road on the approach to the village. The eastern boundary should be strengthened to enclose development from the open band of farmland providing separation between Hatfield Peverel and Witham. The public footpath to the eastern boundary should be protected and enhanced as a green link between the settlement and the wider rural landscape.

- Parcel 2c

4.20 Occupying a rolling landform adjacent to the south and south-west facing valley slopes of the River Ter, the Parcel abuts the south-western fringe of Hatfield Peverel. The well-defined hedgerow structure relating to pre-18th and 18th-19th century field enclosures provides relatively good visual containment to the Parcel in the wider landscape. The Parcel has good links to the settlement fringe with visual and physical associations with neighbouring residential streets. The existing edge to the settlement is relatively abrupt and the houses have limited containment in local views, with boundaries to properties formed by an inconsistent mix of fencing and fragmented vegetation.

4.21 The analysis identifies there is good scope to provide mitigation to proposed development that is in keeping with the existing landscape pattern. Development should be aligned with existing residential areas to the north-east of the Parcel and kept away from any areas that are more exposed in views across the River Ter. The existing hedgerow structure should be retained and strengthened where necessary to break up the massing of any proposed development. There is an opportunity to integrate the slightly abrupt urban edge in local views with a good network of tree and shrub planting to development fringes. Public footpath routes should be protected with the opportunity to incorporate open space into potential extensions to residential areas.

- Parcels 3a

4.22 The Parcel abuts the south-eastern fringe of Hatfield Peverel, and has a generally flat topography, gently sloping south-east beyond the boundaries towards a minor tributary stream of the River Blackwater. The Parcel is contained by a slightly fragmented field structure with low clipped hedgerow to the north, and irregular hedgerows and trees to remaining parameters. Vegetation to the northern side of Maldon Road contains the Parcel in views from the north. There are currently no public footpaths through the Parcel and there are close associations with the urban fabric to the west with adjoining houses on Green Close. Development would extend east in line with the existing settlement fringe rather than reducing the band of farmland that provides separation between Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley.

4.23 The existing landscape features present relatively good scope to mitigate development through the strengthening of the southern boundary in order to integrate the settlement fringe, but also to create a visual barrier to reduce the prominence of development in any potential views from Nounsley. The intrinsic character of Hatfield Peverel should be reflected in any development proposals, with the scale appropriate to the adjoining residential close to the west. Opportunities to provide green links between the extended settlement fringe and the public right of way network should be taken.

- Parcels 3d

4.24 The Parcel abuts part of the south-eastern settlement fringe of Hatfield Peverel and currently comprises a grass field, allotments and a graveyard extension to Saint Andrew's Parish Church located to the west. The predominantly flat landform is surrounded by residential properties to the north, east and west. The enclosure by existing development and flat landform provide moderate scope for small scale residential development.

4.25 The analysis highlights that the interface between proposed development and adjoining graveyard and facing houses would need to be sensitively addressed. The public footpaths to these boundaries should also be protected with the opportunity to create both separation and a green link between the two areas. A structure of tree and shrub planting should be incorporated into layout proposals to reflect the well treed settlement edge of Hatfield Peverel and the character of built form in the village should be reflected. A buffer strip of open space or relocated allotments could be provided to the southern boundary to integrate the new settlement fringe and create a defined edge that is visually separate from Nounsley.

Medium-Low Landscape Capacity

4.26 Large scale Parcels 1e, 1h and 1i to the north of the London to Colchester railway line, have Medium-Low capacity to accommodate development. These areas would be isolated from or have only limited associations with the existing urban fabric. These Parcels comprise large to medium scale arable fields with limited development and are a part of the rural landscape enclosing the settlement fringe.

Development within these Parcels would be adverse to the character of the landscape and would encroach slightly on the visual and physical separation between Hatfield Peverel and Terling.

- 4.27 The analysis found that the landscape to the south-west of Hatfield Peverel within Parcels 2f and 2b has Medium-Low capacity to accommodate development. These areas are well wooded and interspersed with isolated manor houses and farmsteads including a number of Listed Buildings. The dense tree belts, woodland blocks and riparian vegetation along the River Ter enclose the western settlement fringe and reduce the connections these Parcels have with the urban fabric. Parts of these areas are also fairly prominent in cross valley views. The landscape has a tranquil character with minor rural lanes, some intact pre-19th century field enclosures and limited intrusive features. Parcel 1c is also detached from the settlement fringe, dissected by the London to Colchester railway line and abuts the busy A12 carriageway. These factors contribute to the limited scope to accommodate development within the Parcel.
- 4.28 The sloping valley sides of the River Ter in Parcels 1f and 1g also have Medium-Low capacity with their contribution to the rural river valley landscape. Titbeech Wood and The Grove to the south of these Parcels form dense intervening features, reducing the visual connections the Parcel has with the settlement fringe. The separation is increased by minor tributary streams crossing the landscape travelling east from the River Ter.
- 4.29 The capacity of Parcel 3c is reduced by the openness to view from public footpaths and residential properties facing the Parcels from the south and north and the fairly limited vegetation structure. The fields currently provide separation between Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley and the open nature of the Parcel would increase the prominence of any proposed development, significantly compromising the separation between the two settlements.

Low Landscape Capacity

- 4.30 The Parcels to the southern extent of Landscape Setting Area HP2 comprising the north and south facing slopes of the River Ter and open agricultural land to the south-west are judged to be of Low capacity to accommodate development. This is on account of the rural setting the landscape provides to the southern settlement fringe of Hatfield Peverel. Development within these areas would be prominent in cross valley views and intrusive in the largely undeveloped landscape. The Grade II* Listed Hatfield Priory with associated Registered Park and Garden to the south-east of the settlement is also of Low landscape capacity. As well as a valuable landscape feature providing a historic setting to the village, this area has an important role in preserving the physical and visual separation between Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley. The farmland within Parcel 3b plays a similar role, defining the physical and visual separation between the two settlements.
- 4.31 The capacity of the floodplain and river corridor in Parcel 1b is Low, due to the good condition and strong character of the valley landscape, and nature of landscape features and visual factors which underpin it. Titbeech Wood, a local wildlife site and Ancient Woodland is included within the Parcel

boundaries as an area of landscape value. Parcel 1d which slopes east towards the River Ter has Low capacity. This is on account of the good condition of the parkland style landscape, the listed buildings at Hatfield Wick Farm and Berwick Farm, and the strong intervening features of the A12 and the railway line which visually and physically separate the area from urban fabric associated with Hatfield Peverel.

Figures

Appendices

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.:

Settlement:

Landscape Setting Area:

Surveyor:

Date surveyed:

Parcel description

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | | |

Strength of character/condition:

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | | |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | | |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | | | |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | | | |
| Sub total | | | | | | | |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | | | |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | | | |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | | |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | | |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | | |
| Sub total | | | | | | | |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Presence of landscape-related designations | Secondary (x1) | | | | | | |
| Sub total | | | | | | | |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Overall Capacity: | |
|--------------------------|--|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures

Appendix B

| Criteria group | Criteria | Measurement of criteria Scores: A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, E = 1 | Importance | Comments |
|-----------------------------|---|--|----------------|---|
| Existing Landscape Features | Slope analysis | A = Plateau / gently undulating B = Rolling / undulating landform providing some enclosure C = Tributary valleys / lower valley slopes / gentle side slopes D = Valley floor / floodplain E = Elevated landforms, prominent slopes on valley sides | Primary (1.5x) | Higher capacity ↑ ↓ Lower capacity |
| | Enclosure by vegetation | A = Enclosed by mature vegetation – extensive tree belts / woodland B = Semi-enclosed by vegetation - moderate woodland cover, good quality tall hedgerows or hedgerows with hedgerow trees C = Moderate enclosure by vegetation - scattered small woodlands, fragmented shelterbelts and/or medium to low hedgerows D = Limited or poor hedges (with no trees) and/or isolated copses E = Largely open with minimal vegetation | Primary (1.5x) | |
| | Complexity / Scale | A = Extensive simple landscape with single land use B = Large scale landscape with limited land use and variety C = Large scale landscape with variations in pattern, texture and scale or medium scale with limited variety D = Small or medium scale landscape with a variety in pattern, texture and scale E = Intimate and organic landscape with a richness in pattern, texture and scale | Secondary (1x) | |
| | Landscape character – quality / condition | A = Area of weak character in a poor condition B = Area of weak character in a moderate condition or of a moderate character in a poor condition C = Area of weak character in a good condition or of a moderate character in a moderate condition or of a strong character in a poor condition D = Area of moderate character in a good condition or of a strong character in a moderate condition E = Area of strong character in a good condition | Secondary (1x) | The condition of the landscape partially reflects the active management of the landscape for agriculture, amenity uses or nature conservation. |
| Visual Factors | Openness to public view | A = Parcel is well contained from public views B = Parcel is generally well contained from public views C = Parcel is partially contained from public views D = Parcel is moderately open to public views E = Parcel is very open to public views | Secondary (1x) | Public views will include views from roads and railways, rights of way and public open space. Score will depend on the extent of the visibility from all the Parcel perimeters and the rights of way through Parcel. |
| | Openness to private view | A = Parcel is well contained from private views B = Parcel is generally well contained from private views C = Parcel is partially contained from private views D = Parcel is moderately open to private views E = Parcel is very open to private views | Secondary (1x) | This relates to private views from residential properties. The score will depend on the extent of visibility from all the Parcel perimeters. |

| Criteria group | Criteria | Measurement of criteria Scores: A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, E = 1 | Importance | Comments |
|------------------------------|--|--|----------------|---|
| | Relationship with existing urban conurbations | <p>A = Location where built development will form a natural extension of an adjacent part of urban fabric</p> <p>B = Location where built development will form some close associations with the existing parts of urban fabric</p> <p>C = Location where built development will form some moderate associations with existing urban fabric</p> <p>D = Location where built development will only form some limited associations with the existing urban fabric due to intervening features</p> <p>E = Location where development will be isolated from and not form any relationship with existing urban fabric</p> | Primary (1.5x) | Considers the relationship of the Parcel to the existing urban form. The intention it is to understand the relationship with the existing urban fabric of the settlements. Consideration is also given to the extent of openness of the urban fringe, and the density/scale of existing development, as well as location relative to settlement layout. This will also include existing levels of connectivity and potential for future connectivity. |
| | Prevention of settlement coalescence | <p>A = Development would not compromise any separation</p> <p>B = Development would have slight impact on separation</p> <p>C = Development would have moderate impact on separation</p> <p>D = Development would significantly compromise separation</p> <p>E = Development would cause complete coalescence</p> | Primary (1.5x) | Settlement in this sense was considered to be settlements that had developed from a core, over a period of time, as opposed to a single-age or opportunist development away from a main settlement edge. |
| Potential Landscape Features | Scope to mitigate the development | <p>A = Good scope to provide mitigation in the short to medium term in harmony with existing landscape pattern</p> <p>B = Good scope to provide mitigation in the medium term and in keeping with existing landscape pattern</p> <p>C = Moderate scope to provide mitigation in the medium term broadly in keeping with existing landscape pattern</p> <p>D = Limited scope to provide adequate mitigation in keeping with the existing landscape in the medium term</p> <p>E = Very limited scope to provide adequate mitigation in the medium to long term</p> | Primary (1.5x) | The ability of the landscape to provide effective mitigation that is not harmful. This is based on a number of factors including: scale; enclosure; pattern; type and maturity of the vegetation; movement; and visibility of the Parcel |
| Landscape Value | Strength of Character and Condition: Effect of development on the relative value attached to different landscapes | <p>A = -</p> <p>B = Landscape with initiatives promoting landscape enhancement</p> <p>C = Default position: Landscape with no positive or negative landscape-related designations</p> <p>D = Landscape with landscape-related designation(s) of local or regional importance</p> <p>E = Landscape with landscape-related designation(s) of national importance</p> | Secondary (1x) | |

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1a

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

This Parcel is located on the northern edge of Hatfield Peverel, adjacent to the railway line. The railway embankment forms the Parcel's northern boundary, the A12 forms the southern boundary. Its east boundary comprises private gardens and is adjacent to the Arla depot and factory style buildings. The Parcel slopes down the valley side of the River Ter, with the flatter valley bottom marking the Parcel's western edge. The Parcel comprises The Bury Farm, several detached houses and commercial use properties. Other uses include paddocks in the eastern half of the Parcel and arable fields on the valley slopes.

Views beyond the Parcel are contained to the south by trees and shrubs along the northern boundary of the A12 and to the south by the raised embankment of the railway line.

Tranquillity is broken by the A12 to the south (although the exit junction with the slip road around a field creates a buffer between the road and existing buildings), intermittent trains, and traffic movement on surrounding roads (to depot etc).

Vegetation includes mature native trees in the grounds of the residential properties, narrow hedgerows and scrub on the railway embankments.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | Weak | | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | | Good |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Strengthen and Reinforce |
|---|---------------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | ✓ | | | | | 5 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 28.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 47 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium |
|--------------------------|---------------|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures

- Development should be at an appropriate scale and form to the adjoining settlement fringes. The small pastoral field to the east of the Parcel as a context and character that would relate to small scale residential development.
- The existing landscape framework should be supplemented where possible to provide containment to development from the industrial factory site and the A12.

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1b

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Linear Parcel of land to the north-west of Hatfield Peverel defined by the character of the River Ter valley landscape and the riparian vegetation and blocks of woodland alongside it. The Parcel extends north from the A12, through a viaduct under the railway and up to Shealy Spring and Whitelands Grove. The River Ter has a meandering path with a relatively shallow valley rising to approximately 50mAOD to either side. There is a reservoir associated with the river to the north of the Parcel near Whitelands Grove.

The Parcel comprises a small-scale, organic landscape of grass fields contained by vegetation throughout. There is a mix of recent plantation blocks and mature woodlands including Titbeech Wood, an Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Site. The small-scale grass fields to the eastern side of the River Ter have pre-18th century field enclosure pattern although hedgerows are fragmented in parts.

One public footpath crosses the Parcel from Terling Hall Road, travelling south-east under the viaduct alongside the river and across the A12 and B1137 corridor. This provides local views of the river valley. There are also partial views from Terling High Road, although the Parcel is generally contained by vegetation. There are a limited number of residential properties in proximity to the Parcel located on the east facing valley slopes on Terling Hall Road. These have occasional filtered views to the river valley through intervening vegetation.

The river valley landscape is detached from development in Hatfield Peverel. Despite presence of the nearby railway and A12 corridors which are elevated above the valley floor, the Parcel retains a relatively tranquil and rural character.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | | Strong |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | | Good |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Safeguard and manage |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 12.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 32 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Low |
|--------------------------|------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1c

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel is located to the west of Hatfield Peverel and abuts the A12 and B1137 to the south. The western boundary is formed by Terling Hall Road which is a Protected Lane. To the east and north tributary streams feeding into the River Ter enclose the Parcel. The landform slopes to the north-east towards the River Ter and tributary streams, the valley slopes are steeper to the south-east and elevated in views.

The Parcel comprises two sloping arable fields dissected by the railway line. Riparian vegetation along the tributary streams to the north and east provide strong visual containment. There is also dense tree belt planting adjacent the railway line to the eastern side of the Parcel. Planting along the roads to the south and west is limited to intermittent trees resulting in some open views across the fields from these vehicular links. Views from the public footpath to the east of the Parcel are partially contained by the elevated valley slopes.

Berwick Farm is located to the north of the Parcel beyond the stream. The Farmhouse is Grade II listed. There is also a small amount of ribbon development alongside Terling Hall Road but boundary vegetation generally prevents views to the Parcel from private residences. The Parcel is isolated from the developed edge of Hatfield Peverel due to the intervening presence of the River Ter valley and the A12 corridor. The Parcel is surrounded by treed farmland but tranquillity levels are locally disrupted by the railway line and the A12 corridor.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/ Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | Weak | | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Reinforce |
|---|------------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 20.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 39.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1d

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Parcel comprises a mix of uses/land types. Hatfield Wick – residential and farms along Terling Hall Road. Berwick place – private house + estate. Consisting Of pasture/ grass fields with scattered fields. East of Terling Hall Road are a series of private houses and farms. Private gardens above fields that are small in nature although hedgerows are sporadic, generally deprived by post and rail fencing and random trees/ copses of trees. Berwick Place includes some historic enclosure fields but intactness and quality is declining. Visual connection with railway but rising topography to rail embankment and Hatfield Peverel and to fields north of site encloses/screens views with other urban areas outside of Hatfield Wick.

Area B separated from Hatfield Peverel by river, rail and from most parts of town by roads.

PROW crosses field. Lack of consistent field boundaries means public views are extensive across the eastern portion of this Parcel.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | | Good |

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Conserve and Strengthen |
|---|--------------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 14.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 32.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Low |
|--------------------------|------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1e

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Large-scale arable / pasture fields to west of Terling Hall Road. Topography generally appears flat with subtle undulations on rising slope. Western edge is defined by and enclosed by woodland blocks. Tree-lined Terling Road to east, but generally open views available towards Hatfield Peverel on opposite side of River Ter – Warehouse/Depot prominent on horizon. Trains visible below in front of horizon. Topography generally obscures views to buildings at Berwick's Cottages, Berwick Place, Berwick Farm and Hatfield Wick Farm, at lower elevations.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | ✓ | | | | | 5 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 18.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 13 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 34.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1f

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: IJ

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel is located on the east facing valley slopes of the River Ter. It is bound to the west by Terling Hall Road, and to the east by the vegetated path of the river. Terling Hall Road is a quiet, meandering Protected Lane with a strong rural character. The road forms a definite boundary where the adjoining landscape to the west is less associated with the river corridor. To the north and south are blocks of woodland called Whitelands Grove and The Grove respectively. The parcel extends north to the edge of the Landscape Setting area close to the parish boundary and is denoted by a tree belt. The southern boundary adjoins Hatfield Wick including a cluster of cottages, farm buildings, three of which are listed, and associated small-scale fields contained within Parcel 1d.

The Parcel is formed by two large-scale arable fields divided by a farm track with individual mature trees. The open farmland slopes eastwards towards the River Ter and a dense band of riparian vegetation. The remaining boundaries are more open, formed with intermittent trees with no hedgerows and small plantation blocks. There is evidence of pre-18th century enclosure to the northern field.

Terling Hall Road is located on higher ground and provides open views across the river valley. The industrial estate and residential properties to the north-west of Hatfield Peverel is visible through breaks in riparian vegetation. The landform partially conceals the lower valley slopes in views from road. Aside from distant views to development, the Parcel has a tranquil rural character, surrounded by sloping arable fields, woodland blocks and isolated farms. There is no public access through the Parcel but the Parcel is moderately open to long distance views from footpaths on the facing valley sides. Views from private residences are limited to glimpsed views from the isolated properties on the facing valley side and a small number of houses in Hatfield Wick to the south.

The Parcel is generally isolated from development and accessed via a quiet rural road. The presence of the railway line and the A12 corridor form a physical boundary between the Parcel and Hatfield Peverel despite distant visual connections to the settlement. The Parcel is part of a large expanse of farmland to both sides of the River Ter providing a rural context to the northern extent of Hatfield Peverel.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/ Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 34.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1g

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Grassland fields west of Terling Road and east of Whitelands Grove/River habitat area. Extends north of woodland block to Whitelands Farm, including irrigation reservoir. Topography is relatively smoothly sloping to river, down westwards. Views/vegetation generally often along road except around the few private residences. Bounded by river woodland and shelter belts to north, west and south.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 35 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1h

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Flat open/exposed arable fields extending from rail line Northwards to east of PROW leading to Termites Farm west of field boundaries leaning north to Dancing Dicks Farm and westwards to Whitelands. Perception of large-scale fields due to fragmented hedgerows – loss of historic enclosure field patterns.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 18.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 37.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1i

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Located to the north of Hatfield Peverel, the Parcel occupies an undulating landform, sloping in part towards a minor tributary stream of the River Ter which cross the Parcel diagonally. The southern boundary is formed by a tree belt and woodland block dividing the Parcel from Parcel 1k which has stronger connections with the settlement edge. To the north and east the Parcel is bound by a public footpath and farm track extending from Termitts Farm which mark a transition to open rolling farmland away from the river valley landscape. Terling Road runs alongside the western boundary and provides access to Hatfield Peverel from the north.

The Parcel comprises small- to medium-scale arable fields partially enclosed by the undulating landform and shallow valleys formed by the tributary stream. Termitts Farm and Termitts Chase cottages are existing development within Parcel, including two listed buildings at Termitts Farm. A line of Poplars define the access route to the farm. Vegetation is variable with strong tree belts and small copses to some boundaries and others formed by unmaintained, fragmented hedgerows with occasional mature trees.

A public footpath crosses the Parcel from Terling Road, travelling east and around Termitts Farm before heading south alongside the eastern boundary and towards Hatfield Peverel. This route provides moderately open views across the rural landscape. There are also some views from Terling Road. There are limited filtered views across the Parcel from a small number of residential properties on Yew Tree Close and Terling Road.

The Parcel has limited visual associations with the industrial and residential development to the northern extent of Hatfield Peverel due to intervening vegetation and landform. Titbeech Wood forms dense enclosures to views to the south-west. The railway line to the south currently forms a physical boundary marking the transition between open farmland and the settlement edge and the Parcel has a largely rural character.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 19.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 38 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1j

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Located to the north-west of Hatfield Peverel, the Parcel occupies the north-west facing River Ter valley slopes. The Parcel is bound by the vegetated path of the river to the west and the London to Colchester railway line to the south. The northern boundary is formed by Titbeech Wood, a Local Wildlife Site and Ancient Woodland that provides dense enclosure to the Parcel in views from the north. The eastern boundary is formed by Terling Road providing access to Hatfield Peverel from the north.

A minor tributary stream dissects the Parcel, dividing a medium-scale arable field from a smaller scale pasture and the grounds of Titbeech House. There are dense tree belts to the south, west and north along the railway line, river and Titbeech House. The vegetation is sparser to the east with a fragmented, unmanaged hedgerow and occasional trees lining the boundary with Terling Road. Internal field boundaries have declined. Overhead power lines cross the Parcel to the south running parallel to the railway line forming, an intrusive feature in the landscape.

There are no public rights of way crossing the Parcel. Views are obtained from Terling Road and the railway line where there are only scattered trees providing visual containment to the south-eastern side. Small parts of the Parcel are screened by intervening landform and field boundary vegetation. The Parcel is generally well contained in views from private residencies due to the railway line and Arla Foods factory site located to the immediate south of the Parcel on the settlement fringe. The large-scale industrial buildings are prominent in views and have an intrusive impact on views to the edge of Hatfield Peverel. Titbeech Wood and the river valley provide good containment to the Parcel from the wider landscape.

The Parcel is closely associated with the industrial and residential development to the northern extent of Hatfield Peverel. The railway line currently forms a physical boundary marking the transition between open farmland and the settlement edge. However, the industrial development is especially prominent in views south from the Parcel towards the edge of Hatfield Peverel.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining /relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | Poor | | |

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Restore |
|---|----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 27 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 46.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium |
|--------------------------|---------------|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Opportunity to improve the settlement fringe by providing an enhanced gateway to the village. Increased buffer planting to the southern boundary should be provided to better screen the existing factory site and railway line on the approach to the village.
- Development proposals should reflect the local character of Hatfield Peverel and integrate the existing harsh urban edges in the vicinity of Terling Road with a framework of tree and shrub planting to form an improved gateway to the village.
- Opportunities could be taken to provide enhanced recreation opportunities along the River Ter by extending public footpath connections from the proposed settlement fringe to the wider landscape.

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1k

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 26/02/2015

Parcel Description

Located to the north-west of Hatfield Peverel, the Parcel gently slopes north-west towards a tributary stream of the River Ter. The southern boundary is formed by the railway line which encloses the edge of development in Hatfield Peverel. To the east the Parcel is bound by a public footpath which mark a transition to open rolling farmland away from the river valley landscape. Terling Road runs alongside the western boundary and provides access to Hatfield Peverel from the north. To the north, the boundary is formed by tree belts and small woodland copses enclosing smaller scale fields surrounding Termitts Farm.

The Parcel comprises medium-scale arable fields partially enclosed in the wider landscape by the undulating landform and woodland blocks. External field boundaries are variable and formed by unmaintained fragmented hedgerows with occasional mature trees. The southern field is defined by pre-18th century field enclosures. Overhead power lines cross the Parcel to the south running parallel to the London to Colchester railway line.

There are partial views of the Parcel from Terling Road and the railway line where there are only scattered trees providing visual containment. Small parts of the Parcel are screened by intervening landform and field boundary vegetation. There are filtered views across the Parcel from a small number of residential properties on Yew Tree Close to the south and Terling Road to the west. However, the garden vegetation associated with these properties is generally strong.

The Parcel has some close associations with the industrial and residential development to the northern extent of Hatfield Peverel. The railway line currently forms a physical boundary marking the transition between open farmland and the settlement edge. However, the industrial development is especially prominent in views south-west from the Parcel towards the edge of Hatfield Peverel.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 14 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 24 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 41 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium |
|--------------------------|---------------|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Development should be sensitive to the rural context of the Parcel and reflect the local character of Hatfield Peverel. There is an opportunity to create an improved gateway on the approach to Hatfield Peverel from the north.
- The existing landscape framework should be supplemented with tree and shrub planting and improved management providing a consistent treatment to both sides of Terling Road on the approach to the village.
- The eastern boundary should be strengthened to enclose development from the open band of farmland providing separation between Hatfield Peverel and Witham. Views across the Ter river valley should also be treated sensitively.
- Public rights of way providing access from Hatfield Peverel to the surrounding countryside should be retained and enhanced.

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2a

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

Flat edge top large-scale arable fields. Occasional views to Hatfield Peverel between blocks of woodland and hedgerows/tree boundaries associated with houses along Damases Lane/Mowden Hall Lane (garden boundaries border Parcel) Views from roads are open except behind private properties. Public footpath along north edge and north-south axis. Allows views across fields.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | ✓ | | | | | 5 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 13.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 33.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Low |
|--------------------------|------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2b

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel occupies a large area to the west of Hatfield Peverel and to the south of the A12/ B1137 carriageways, defined by dense tree belts and woodland blocks including Brewhouse Wood, Sandpit Wood, Bishop's Wood and Long Wood. These woodland blocks are also managed as a Local Wildlife Site. The Parcel is set on the valley slopes of the River Ter and a number of drainage ditches, streams and ponds are also contained within the Parcel.

The area is comprised of isolated farms and large residential properties set within small-scale arable and grass fields. The isolated properties are well enclosed by large grounds and tall vegetation. There are a number of listed buildings including Hatfield Place, Little Crix and Crix House. A sewage works to the east and a reservoir to the west are also contained within dense vegetation belts.

There is limited public access across or in close proximity to the Parcel. Mowden Hall Lane cuts through the western side connecting with the B1137. The remainder of vehicular access is via private tracks to the individual properties. A public footpath adjoins the southern boundary and provides partial views across the valley landscape. However, these views are generally screened by intervening vegetation, as are views from the small number of surrounding private properties.

The dense tree belts, woodland blocks and riparian vegetation help to contain the western edge of Hatfield Peverel in views from the surrounding landscape, providing a rural setting to the settlement. The Parcel is largely isolated from the urban fabric associated with Hatfield Peverel and is located within agricultural land that provides separation between Hatfield Peverel and Boreham to the south-west.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/ linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | | Good |

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Conserve and Strengthen |
|---|--------------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 14.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 34.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2c

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel abuts the south-western edge of Hatfield Peverel and is bound by the B1137 (The Street) to the north and Crabb's Hill to the east. The land is gently rolling adjacent to the south and south-west facing slopes of the River Ter. The Parcel is defined by a change in topography to the south and west where the land descends along the lower valley slopes of the River Ter.

The Parcel comprises arable and rough grass fields wrapping around the south-western edge of Hatfield Peverel and the residential streets, Garden Field and Stone Path Drive. Beyond the western boundary are the substantial grounds and listed building at Hatfield Place. There is good containment to Parcel on the western and southern external boundaries, fringed by tall mature but unmanaged hedgerows. Two of the fields are defined with pre-18th century and 18-19th century enclosure. The boundaries adjoining residential development are less consistent with a mix of post and wire fencing, timber fencing to rear gardens, occasional trees and fragmented hedgerows. Directly adjacent the B1137 is a smaller linear field containing rough meadow grassland with no access connection to the remaining Parcel.

A public footpath provides access through the Parcel with open views across the northern and eastern fields and to the relatively prominent houses adjacent to the Parcel boundaries. The third field is partially enclosed from view by boundary vegetation. Wider views of the landscape to the west are contained by riparian vegetation along the River Ter and mature trees surrounding Hatfield Place. There are glimpses of more extensive views across the river valley to the south-west. The Parcel is enclosed to the north by presence of A12/ B1137. Houses facing the Parcel from Garden Field and Stone Path Drive have views to parts of the Parcel.

The Parcel is closely associated with neighbouring residential development in Hatfield Peverel. Local roads follow the Parcel boundaries including Stone Path Drive, Church Road and the B1137, and housing lies adjacent to three sides.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 27 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 46.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium |
|--------------------------|---------------|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Development should be aligned with existing residential areas to the north-east of the Parcel and kept away from any areas that are more exposed in views across the River Ter.
- Development should be appropriate in scale and density to adjoining residential development in Hatfield Peverel.
- Opportunity to integrate the slightly abrupt urban edge in local views with a good network of tree and shrub planting to development fringes. Retain and strengthen boundary hedgerows and internal hedgerows to break up the massing of any proposed development.
- Public footpath routes should be protected with the opportunity to incorporate open space into potential extensions to residential areas.

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2d

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel occupies a rolling landform to the top of the south-west facing valley slopes of the River Ter. The settlement edge of Hatfield Peverel lies to the north with Church Road forming the northern boundary. The western boundary is formed by Crabb's Hill and the eastern boundary is formed by a tall, dense tree belt enclosing the grounds of Grade II* listed building The Priory. To the south the landform falls away towards the River Ter.

The Parcel is formed of small-scale paddocks divided by post and rail fencing, allotments in a variable condition, a nursing home and a cricket ground with pavilion. The small-scale fields are generally well enclosed by vegetation to the outer boundaries and there is an area of woodland and scrub to the west of the cricket pitch. There are good quality tree belts to most of the southern boundary on the ridge line where landscape enters the river valley, apart from to the south-west of the allotments which are more prominent in cross-valley views.

There are filtered views from residential properties facing the Parcel and from Church Road. There are views across the paddocks and parts of the allotments from two public footpath routes to the centre of the Parcel. Other areas are visually contained. The footpaths provide views to elevated land on the opposite side of the river valley. These views generally comprise sloping wooded farmland with occasional interspersed by isolated farms and houses.

The Parcel has good connections with the developed edge of Hatfield Peverel surrounding Willow Crescent and is more closely associated with the character of urban fabric than surrounding Parcels. The small-scale enclosed nature of the Parcel contrasts with the more open sloping farmland associated with the river valley to the south.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/ Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | Weak | | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Reinforce |
|---|------------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 18 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 27 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 48 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-High |
|--------------------------|--------------------|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Strengthen southern boundary to provide containment to development in cross-valley views. Retain and manage existing tree belts and woodland.
- Development should be appropriate in scale and density to neighbouring development on Willow Crescent, and valuable community recreation facilities should be retained. The setting to Hatfield Priory would need to be sensitively addressed with a settlement edge that is successfully integrated into the surrounding rural landscape.
- Opportunity to improve footpath connections between Hatfield Peverel and the river valley landscape to the south. Open space provision could also be incorporated into the development with the potential to improve existing community facilities. If recreation opportunities are reduced, alternative provision should be allocated in equally accessible locations.

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2e

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel is located to the south of Hatfield Peverel on the gentle side slopes of a tributary stream associated with the River Ter. The eastern boundary adjoins with Landscape Setting Area HP3 and follows the route of a public footpath which connects Hatfield Peverel with the settlement of Nounsley to the south.

The Parcel incorporates the grounds of two listed buildings and a Scheduled Monument. The Parish Church of St Andrew and graveyard is located to the north-east of the Parcel. The remaining area is occupied by Hatfield Priory. The Priory is a Grade II* listed building and the parkland style grounds are a Registered Park and Garden. The grounds include a series of ponds, mature trees set in mown grass and dense tree belts to the Parcel boundaries. The Parcel is generally well contained by mature vegetation including tall bands of conifers surrounding the church graveyard.

There is no public rights of way through the Parcel aside from access to the church. However, a public footpath adjacent the eastern boundary allows views to parts of the graveyard and church. There are also glimpsed views into the Parcel from Sportsmans Lane to the south and Church Road to the north. The Priory is positioned to have open views across the valley of the River Ter. Equally The Priory is relatively prominent in views from public rights of way on the facing valley slopes.

The dense visual containment to the Parcel from the north reduces the Parcel's associations with Hatfield Peverel. The Hatfield Priory Registered Park and Garden is an historic asset of landscape value. The well maintained grounds, cross-valley views and containment from surrounding modern development are all important characteristics to the settings of the listed buildings. The Parcel also plays an important role in preserving the separation between Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2 Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/ Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/ Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | | Strong |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/ linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | | Good |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Safeguard and Manage |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 13.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 1 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 30 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Low |
|--------------------------|------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2f

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

Two large-scale arable fields to east of nursing home property. Gently sloping but prominent when viewed from a wall River Ter Valley open to Sportsmans Road. Glimpses to roofs of Hatfield Peverel over topography through vegetation line (except open through allotments). Vegetation block to east. To west part open, part screened by nursing home grounds.

Historic field boundaries dating from the 18th and 19th centuries. Vegetation block to south, opposite side of road. House on corner has views across Parcel.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 34 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2g

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | | Strong |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | | Good |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Safeguard and Manage |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 13.5 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 14 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 30.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Low |
|--------------------------|------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2h

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP2

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | | Strong |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Strength of character/condition: | Conserve and Restore | | |

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | ✓ | | | | | 5 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 13 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 13 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 29 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Low |
|--------------------------|------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3a

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP3

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

A Parcel immediately south of Maldon Road. Its northern boundary is adjacent to the B1019 and the rear of properties Green Close and Ivy Barns Farm. Ivy Barns Cottages and Bovingtons Bungalow are located within the Parcel on the northern boundary. Low clipped hedges along the road edge Hedgerows and trees form the southern and western boundary as well as an internal field boundary. Remaining field subdivisions are formed by tracks / or post and tapes.

Fields are relatively flat on their northern portions, then gently sloping southwards a valley. Glimpses of views towards Nounsley (in winter).

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/ linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 24.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 44.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium |
|--------------------------|---------------|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Planting to the southern boundary should be strengthened in order to integrate the settlement fringe and to create a visual barrier to reduce the prominence of development in potential views from Nounsley.
- The intrinsic character of Hatfield Peverel should be reflected in any development proposals, with the scale appropriate to the adjoining residential close to the west.
- Opportunities to provide green links between the extended settlement fringe and the public right of way network should be taken.

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3b

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP3

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

A Parcel of pasture fields, some sub-divided as paddocks. A reservoir. Some field boundaries are well-defined by dense hedgerows and trees. Others are subdivided by paths while paddocks are delineated by post and rail fencing.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|---|-----------------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 14 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 14 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 31 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Low |
|--------------------------|------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3c

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP3

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

Fields separating Hatfield Peverel and Nounsley. Arable. Northern boundary, consisting of a field sub-division and defined by a line level with the southern extent of residential development of Hatfield Peverel on Ulting Road and the burial ground, is open to Parcel HP3-D. The eastern boundary is open to Ulting Road. The southern boundary is rear garden property boundaries: generally closeboard fences with some vegetation. The western boundary is a vegetation with the majority a dense conifer tree belt that screens views to the west towards Hatfield Priory, and gives a sense of containment in that direction. There are copses associated with water within the fields. The south-east field is a recreational field consisting of amenity grassland and including some play equipment. It is bounded by a post and rail fence.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | | Moderate | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | | Moderate | |

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Improve and Conserve |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 18 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 13.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 34.5 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium-Low |
|--------------------------|-------------------|

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3d

Settlement: Hatfield Peverel

Landscape Setting Area: HP3

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 25/02/2015

Parcel Description

This Parcel comprises three areas: allotments, grass field and fenced off burial ground. A public footpath follows the northern boundary and northern portion of the west boundary, with access points at the north-west, north-east corners and from the St Andrews churchyard and the west boundary. The Parcel is generally flat with residential development to the north and east and the St Andrews churchyard is to the west. The southern boundary is open to further grassland and arable fields and views to Nounsley.

| Strength of character/condition | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Strength of character | Weak | Moderate | Strong |
| S1/ Impact of landform | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S2/ Impact of landcover * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S3/ Historic pattern * | Insignificant | Apparent | Dominant/Prominent |
| S4/ Tranquillity | Discordant | Moderate | Tranquil |
| S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity | Frequent | Unusual | Unique/rare |
| S6/ Visual unity | Incoherent | Coherent | Unified |
| Totals * Prime character if a tie | Weak | | |
| Condition | Poor | Moderate | Good |
| C1/ Landcover change | Widespread | Localised | Insignificant |
| C2/ Age structure of tree cover * | Over mature | Mature or young | Mixed |
| C3/ Extent of semi-natural habitat survival * | Relic | Scattered | Widespread/linked |
| C4/ Management of semi-natural habitats | Poor | Not obvious | Good |
| C5/ Survival of cultural pattern (fields and hedges) | Declining/relic | Interrupted | Intact |
| C6/ Impact of development | High | Moderate | Low |
| Totals * Prime condition if a tie | Poor | | |

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Strength of character/condition: | Reconstruct |
|---|--------------------|

| Capacity analysis | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| Criteria | Importance | A=5 | B=4 | C=3 | D=2 | E=1 | Total |
| 1/ Landscape features | | | | | | | |
| Slope analysis | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | ✓ | | | | | 5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | | ✓ | 1 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 24 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 43 | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Overall Capacity: | Medium |
|--------------------------|---------------|

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- A structure of tree and shrub planting should be incorporated into layout proposals to reflect the well treed settlement edge of Hatfield Peverel and the character of built form in the village should be reflected.
- Development should be appropriate in scale and form to the rural setting of the Parcel.
- The interface between proposed development and adjoining graveyard and facing houses would need to be sensitively addressed. The public footpaths to these boundaries should also be protected with the opportunity to create both separation and a green link between the two areas.
- A buffer strip of open space or relocated allotments could be provided to the southern boundary to integrate the new settlement fringe and create a defined edge that is visually separate from Nounsley.