

**Braintree District Settlement Fringes
Evaluation of Landscape Analysis Study of
Kelvedon and Feering**

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 2709001

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 K01: Location Plan
- Figure K02: Landscape Setting Areas
- Figure K03: Landscape Setting Areas – Evaluation
- Figure K04: Parcel Arrangement
- Figure K05: 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 Kelvedon and Feering.

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.

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

- 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 K2 to the south-west of Kelvedon has **Low** capacity to accommodate additional development. Landscape Setting Areas K1, K3 and K4, which wrap around the south-eastern and northern fringes of existing development have **Low to Medium** overall capacity. Evaluations for the areas are reflected on Figure K-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 or Low to Medium capacity setting areas around Kelvedon and Feering 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 Kelvedon and Feering are limited, 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 K1:

- 2.6 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:
- The visibility of the area is increased to the elevated northern parts and the fragmented hedgerow structure to in southern and western parts. The elevated areas are seen in the context of historic Coggeshall Hall, White Barn Farm and Monk's Farm. The Visual Sensitivity is judged Medium to High overall due to the open views available within the area and the prominence of the area in the wider landscape. The sensitivity is reduced to the east by the visual enclosure provided by riparian vegetation to the River Blackwater, and to the west by the influence of the railway and overhead pylons.

- The landscape character has a Medium to High sensitivity overall due to the moderate contribution to the wider landscape on account of its generally open character and the historic river valley setting to parts of Kelvedon and Feering. The vegetation structure is generally in good condition, the area has a strong rural character and there is a robust structure of semi-natural vegetation lining the river. The sensitivity is increased in eastern parts by the river corridor and the contribution to the physical and visual separation between Kelvedon and Feering. The sensitivity is reduced in western parts by the loss of historic field enclosures and the weak vegetation structure.
- The Landscape Value is Medium to High overall on account of the Local Wildlife Site at Feering Marsh, the Ancient Monument west of Feering Place, Listed Buildings, the good structure of public footpaths and the moderate sense of tranquillity away from the roads and railway.

2.7 The report identified the most likely areas to accommodate residential or employment development were along the northern settlement edge, to the west of Newtown providing robust belts of trees and shrubs are provided to help integrate any expanded settlement into the local landscape.

Landscape Setting Area K2:

2.8 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- Views within the Area generally comprise near to medium distance, open views of pasture fields and hedgerows. There is a well treed skyline to most of the area. Despite the open nature of many views within the area, its visibility in the wider landscape is limited. The Visual Sensitivity is Medium overall. There are filtered and partial views of historic buildings along the settlement edge. The sensitivity is reduced in parts due to the visual prominence of the railway corridor, large scale buildings within commercial/industrial development at A12/London Road junction and modern residential buildings alongside London Road.
- The landscape character has a High sensitivity overall due to the good structure of semi-natural vegetation, intact hedgerows along settlement fringe and its historic relationship with, and setting to Kelvedon. The Area also forms an open, rural setting to historic Church Hall Farm and The Old Vicarage. The strength of character is reduced within central and southern parts due to a declining field structure and the close proximity to the A12 and railway.
- The Landscape Value is Medium to High on account of the proximity to Kelvedon Conservation Area, numerous Listed Buildings, a good network of public rights of way and the moderate sense of tranquillity away from the A12 and railway.

Landscape Setting Area K3:

2.9 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- Views throughout the area are strongly influenced by the river valley landscape which largely contains houses to the southern fringes of Kelvedon. The elevated southern parts of the area provide expansive views over the village to the south facing river valley slopes. The visual prominence of the area within the wider landscape translates to a Medium to High sensitivity overall with an increased sensitivity to northern parts which are visually prominent in views from the Conservation Area and where views open up to historic buildings on the settlement edge.
- The landscape character is of Medium to High sensitivity on account of the strong rural character and sense of place. An important and historic rural river valley setting is provided for the town by the structure of semi-natural vegetation lining the rivers, the historic field enclosures, the distinctive and well-treed southern approach to Kelvedon along Maldon Road and Ewell Hall Chase and the gently sloping sides and woodland blocks. The strength of character is disrupted by the modern settlement edges and the impact the A12 has on tranquillity.
- The combination of valued components such as the County Wildlife Site/Local Nature Reserve at Brockwell Meadows, the proximity to Kelvedon Conservation Area, the good network of public footpaths, numerous Listed Buildings, the ancient monuments and the medium and high sense of tranquillity.

2.10 Opportunities for locating new development could be taken to the southern edges of the settlement where sensitivity is reduced to the north of the A12 and the west of Inworth Road.

Landscape Setting Area K4:

2.11 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- The existing settlement edge is abrupt but generally softened by mature tree and shrub planting within rear gardens. The visibility of the area in the wider landscape is restricted by the well vegetated A12 embankments and by mature trees and shrubs within the grounds of Prested Hall to the east of the Setting Area.
- The Landscape Character is considered to be of Medium to High Sensitivity due to the strength of rural character and the contribution to the historic core of Feering. The sensitivity is reduced in southern parts by the presence of A12, Business Park and adjacent group of modern houses, which are poorly integrated into the local landscape.

- The Landscape Value is Medium overall with valued components including the former Special Landscape Area designation, the proximity to Feering Conservation Area and the public footpath running across the southern part of the area.

- 2.12 Opportunities for locating new development could be taken to the southern edges of the settlement where sensitivity is reduced to the north of the A12 and the east of Inworth Road.
- 2.13 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 K1 and K3, and the enhancement of the local landscape framework to help absorb the fringes of the settlement into the local landscape.
- 2.14 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 K-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 It should be recognised that the Landscape Setting Areas are focused around the settlement fringes of both Kelvedon and Feering. These are distinct and separate settlements and the analysis of the Parcel capacity responds to the objective of preserving these individual settlements and avoiding development in areas that would further encroach on the separation between the two. Where Kelvedon and Feering are assessed as separate settlements, the groups of housing and ribbon development referred to as Newtown, Hanover Bridge and Hanover Square, do not influence scores for coalescence. It has been judged that these areas relate to the modern expansion of Kelvedon and Feering rather than forming settlements in their own right. The groups of houses originate from the same modern era rather than expanding from a historic core with a clearly defined and distinct character.
- 4.3 Although it has been assumed that no development would occur within the floodplain of the River Blackwater, the mapping and subsequent analysis of Parcels within the Setting Areas included the valley floors of this feature and minor tributaries associated with it.
- 4.4 It had been anticipated at the outset that approximately four Parcels would be identified in each Setting Area. However, the subtleties of the valley landscapes of the River Blackwater and the settlement fringes translated into more complex landscapes across Setting Areas K1 and K3, with eleven and nine Parcels being identified in these areas as a consequence. Setting Areas K2 and K4 to the east and west of the settlement are more uniform, with four Parcels identified generally dissected by the transport routes that enclose the villages of Kelvedon and Feering.
- 4.5 An overview of the scale and arrangement of the Parcels reveals that they are smaller in scale and more intricate in form where they abut the existing village fringes and are influenced by the meandering path of the river and clusters of modern development. For example Parcel 1d is framed by the river and the London to Colchester railway line. Parcels 1m and 1j respond to the river valley landform and housing at Newtown.
- 4.6 Parcel size generally increases away from the village, with substantial compartments lying in the most distant parts of the Setting Areas, comprising elevated large scale arable fields disconnected from the settlement by clearly defined intervening features such as the railway and the A12. The elevated positions often provide long distance views of the wider landscape and views back to the settlement fringes.

- 4.7 Similarly, the form of the Parcels differ where they are based around the floodplain and slopes associated with the River Blackwater. The meandering valley results in slender and sinuous Parcels that dissect Setting Areas K1 and K3, such as the vegetated path of the River Blackwater in Parcels 1c and 3h.

Parcel analysis

- 4.8 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'.
- 4.9 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 K-05 Parcel Evaluation):

High Landscape Capacity

- 4.10 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 Kelvedon and Feering.

Medium-High Landscape Capacity

- 4.11 One Parcel has been identified as having Medium-High Capacity to accommodate residential or employment development. Corresponding with the findings of the earlier Landscape Capacity Analysis, this is located immediately adjacent to the existing settlement fringe, where it responds to the existing form and function:
- Parcel 3i
- 4.12 The Parcel is located to the south of Feering and framed on three sides by housing on the settlement fringe. The landform gently slopes south-west towards the meeting point of the River Blackwater and Domsey Brook. Dense tree belts on the southern boundary provide visual containment to the from the river valley landscape to the south. Variable vegetation along rear garden boundaries provide some open views into the Parcel from the adjacent housing. Threshelfords Business Park is relatively prominent through breaks in vegetation to the east. However, the Parcel has close visual

and physical associations with the urban fabric and the existing landscape framework provides good scope to mitigate proposed development.

- 4.13 Mitigation measures identified as part of the analysis include the provision of additional planting along the B1023 to contain development from the road. More consistent boundary treatment to the existing settlement edge should also be provided to offset the impact of development on views from facing residential properties. Development should be at an appropriate scale and form in relation to existing development within Feering. The landscape framework provided by a mix of historic and more recent field enclosure patterns should be preserved to maintain the time-depth element of the landscape's character, to utilise the screening benefits in the wider landscape and to reduce the massing of development. The public footpath route through the Parcel should be retained and enhanced, preserving connections between existing development in Kelvedon and Feering and the wider landscape to the south and east.

Medium Landscape Capacity

- 4.14 Nine Parcels have been identified as having Medium Capacity. 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 form and function:
- Parcels 1h and 1j
- 4.15 Occupying the broadly east facing valley slopes of the River Blackwater, the Parcels are split in two by the B1024 (Coggeshall Road) and the prominent presence of Newtown, a block of housing relating to modern expansion to Kelvedon but currently disconnected from the town by the presence of the London to Colchester railway line. Ribbon development extends south along the B1024 to the edge of the railway station. Feering to the south-east is visually contained by the vegetated path of the River Blackwater. Both areas have a relatively well defined landscape structure with especially good containment from the wider landscape to the north-east. The more elevated land to the west also provides visual containment to the Parcels. Proposed development would form a natural extension to the housing at Newtown and would provide a more coherent edge to Kelvedon.
- 4.16 The analysis highlights that development within Parcel 1j should be located away from the flood plain of the River Blackwater. The existing vegetation framework should be enhanced with hedgerows and tree planting to Parcel boundaries improved. Development should reflect the vernacular features in Kelvedon to provide greater visual connections with the main settlement and improve the approach to Kelvedon from the Coggeshall Road. The scale and form of development should reflect the settlement patterns of the village and be sensitive to the setting of the Conservation Area. Key views from public footpath routes should be protected and the amenity value of these links preserved. Opportunities to enhance connections with the river and green links between the settlements and the wider landscape should also be taken.

- Parcel 1d

4.17 This Parcel is located to the north of the Colchester to London railway line and along the northern fringes of Feering. The Parcel comprises an arable field, grass pasture, a cricket pitch and well enclosed residential properties to both sides of Rye Mill Lane. The well-defined landscape structure formed by riparian vegetation to the River Blackwater encloses the Parcel and provides relatively good scope to mitigate any proposed development. The Parcel is visually contained in the wider landscape and the landscape framework would allow for development that is consistent with the existing landscape and settlement patterns.

4.18 The analysis identifies that any proposed development should be concentrated to the eastern side of the Parcel to avoid encroachment on the separation between Kelvedon and Feering. Development would need to mitigate any potential threat of flooding from the River Blackwater. Development would be closely associated with housing to the south of the railway line and properties on Rye Mill Lane. The character of the built form in Feering should be reflected and the landscape framework provided by riparian vegetation and historic century field enclosures should be preserved and strengthened. Opportunities for recreation along the River Blackwater could be taken forming green links with the settlement fringe and the existing public footpath network. Should development take place on the existing cricket ground, alternative provision for recreation should be identified.

- Parcel 1e

4.19 This Parcel occupies gently sloping land directly south of the London to Colchester railway line. Comprised of a recreation ground and Feering primary school, the Parcel is to two sides by residential development. There is moderate containment to the Parcel formed by a clipped hedgerow alongside Rye Mill Lane and vegetation to the railway cutting which is fragmented but dense in parts. The area is currently identified as formal open space in the Adopted Local Plan, therefore if development should take place, alternative open space provision would need to be allocated. The Parcel is enclosed by from the wider landscape by the river valley and development would form a natural extension to the adjoining residential streets.

4.20 Mitigation measures identified as part of the analysis include the strengthening and improving management of the buffer planting adjacent the railway line. Development should be at an appropriate scale and form to that of the existing settlement fringe and elements of vernacular features from the Kelvedon Conservation Area could be incorporated. The public footpath on the southern boundary should be protected.

- Parcel 3a

4.21 Occupying the north-west facing, valley sides of the River Blackwater, the Parcel comprises well enclosed built development and small scale arable fields associated with the parish of Inworth. Development within the Parcel would form a natural extension to the adjacent urban fabric and

incorporate the separate blocks of development to create a more defined settlement edge. The existing structure of vegetation presents good scope to provide mitigation that is in keeping with the existing landscape pattern.

- 4.22 The analysis highlights that development should be sensitive to, and retain the rural separation between Feering and Inworth. Development should reflect the scale and form of existing residential development within Inworth and be sensitive to the settings of the numerous listed buildings within the small settlement. The mature hedgerow and tree structure along the Parcel peripheries and internally should be retained and enhanced to provide enclosure the development where it is more exposed to the wider landscape and to preserve the rural setting of the village with its well contained settlement fringe.

- Parcel 3e

- 4.23 This Parcel is located on the north-west facing lower valley slopes of the River Blackwater and Domsey Brook. The southern boundary abuts the A12 vehicular corridor. The well vegetated water courses and road embankment provide relatively strong visual enclosure to the Parcel in the wider landscape. However, the Parcel is moderately open to view from public footpath connections crossing the landscape and surrounding residential properties.

- 4.24 In order to successfully mitigate any proposed development, the analysis highlights that development should take the opportunity to enhance the settlement edge by reflecting vernacular features and characteristics within the Kelvedon Conservation Area, and be consistent in scale and form to existing settlement patterns. Mature hedgerows and trees along the Parcel boundaries and internally should be retained and enhanced to improve enclosure of any future development and screen views towards it from the A12, the wider countryside to the south, and existing residential properties in Kelvedon. Public footpath connections should be protected with the opportunity to create green links to recreation corridors associated with the River Blackwater.

- Parcel 3f

- 4.25 This Parcel is located on the south-west facing lower valley slopes of the River Blackwater and Domsey Brook. The well vegetated water courses and dense tree belts to the north of the Parcel provide strong visual enclosure. The Parcel is open to view from the public footpath to the west but is generally well screened from surrounding residential properties on the Kelvedon settlement fringe. Development within the Parcel would form only moderate associations with the existing urban fabric but the visual enclosure of the Parcel, strong landscape framework and opportunity to improve the settlement fringe presents good scope to provide effective mitigation to development proposals.

- 4.26 Proposed development should follow mitigation measures identified in the analysis in particular that development should be concentrated to the eastern side of the Parcel so as not to disturb the scheduled monument of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery that is situated in the parcel's western field. This

would provide a buffer between any built development and the public footpath to the west and could potentially provide a historic educational feature within the landscape. Public footpath routes to be retained and enhanced, preserving connections between existing development in Kelvedon and Feering and the wider landscape. The existing landscape framework provided by mature trees, riparian vegetation and more recently planted tree belts should be retained and enhanced. Built development should be at an appropriate scale to the rural setting of the Parcel and reflect characteristics of existing development within Feering.

- Parcel 4a

4.27 This Parcel occupies gently rolling land wrapping round the northern edge of Feering village. There is moderate enclosure provided by low clipped hedgerows and occasional trees. The adjoining residential properties to the west and south along Coggeshall Road and The Street provides continual connections to the urban fabric throughout the Parcel. Development within the south of the Parcel would form a logical extension to the village. However, the settings to the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings including All Saints Church in Feering would need to be sensitively addressed. Built development should be avoided on the higher ground where new buildings would be prominent in wider views from the north and east.

4.28 Further mitigation methods identified in the analysis include improving the landscape framework with increased planting to the Parcel peripheries and within any proposed layout. Additional tree and shrub planting should reinforce the local landscape character and further enhance the rural setting of the northern fringes to the village. Vernacular features of the Feering Conservation Area should be incorporated into proposals to strengthen the character and continuity of the built form in the village. The public footpath routes would need to be protected from adverse impacts on views and amenity value and preserved to ensure connections between the settlement fringes and the wider landscape south and east. Key views towards the village should be maintained such as views the church tower on approach to Feering village.

- Parcel 4b and 4c

4.29 Occupying predominantly flat land abutting the eastern fringe of Feering, the Parcels are dissected by the B1024 and contained by the railway line and A12. Parcel 4b comprises a single arable field that extends north-east towards the row of housing referred to as Hanover Bridge, facing the Parcel on from New Lane. The northern boundary is partly enclosed by vegetation along the railway line. Parcel 4c to the south comprises smaller scale arable fields divided by a fragmented hedgerow structure. Both parcels are locally intruded by the railway line, Threshelfords Business Park, the A12 and the A12/B1024 junction. The visual containment of the Parcels in the wider landscape and the close associations with adjoining urban fabric present relatively good opportunities to mitigate development in these locations.

- 4.30 Mitigation methods identified as part of the analysis include improving the framework of tree and shrub planting, creating stronger buffers to the A12 and the railway. Additional planting would also be required to maintain the well vegetated settlement edge when viewed from outside the Parcel. There is the opportunity to reinforce the character of the settlement with development that reflects local characteristics incorporated into the newly created settlement fringe. The public footpath to the southern boundary should be protected with the opportunity to create green links between the extended settlement and the wider landscape.

Medium-Low Landscape Capacity

- 4.31 The analysis shows that the wider landscape to the north, west and south-west of the settlement has Medium-Low capacity to accommodate development, given the more elevated ground away from the valley landscape of the River Blackwater and corresponding visibility in both close and distant views.
- 4.32 The well integrated settlement edge to Feering formed by the vegetated path of the River Blackwater reduces the scope for a settlement extension on the higher valley slopes of Parcels 1k, 1l, 1m and 1f. Parcels to the west of Coggeshall Road are more expansive, open and generally isolated from the urban fabric despite views to the settlement fringe. Similar features reduce the capacity for development in Parcels 3b, 3c and 3d to the south-west of Kelvedon, with the A12 forming a prominent intervening feature between the settlement fringe and the wider rural landscape.
- 4.33 To the southern fringe of Kelvedon and surrounding Easterford Mill the landscape capacity for Parcels 3h and 3g is also Medium-Low. This is on account of the location partly within the floodplain of the River Blackwater and the valued and sensitive features of the landscape and built form. These include the Kelvedon Conservation Area and its setting, listed buildings, some intact historic field enclosures, a Local Wildlife Site and the good condition and strong character of the valley landscape.
- 4.34 To the west of Kelvedon the landscape has an overall rural character with strong bands of vegetation that frame the edge of the settlement. The Conservation Area and large numbers of Listed Buildings line this settlement edge. A strong band of vegetation following a tributary stream form a well-integrated settlement edge and enhance the setting of the historic core of the settlement. The steeple of St Mary the Virgin Church is a landmark feature in the area. Development to this side of the village would be fairly prominent due to the declining field structure in Parcels 2a and 2b and have an adverse impact on the existing rural setting to the settlement.
- 4.35 Parcel 4d to the east of Feering slopes south towards Domsey Brook. The capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is reduced in this area by the poor vegetation structure and openness to view from the surrounding roads and public footpath to the northern boundary.

Low Landscape Capacity

- 4.36 The capacity of the floodplain in Landscape Setting Area 1 is consistently Low, due to the good condition and strong character of the valley landscape, and nature of landscape features and visual factors which underpin it. The Local Wildlife Site in Parcel 1c, connecting to the River Blackwater is also a key wildlife corridor to be preserved.

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 analysis form

Parcel No.: 1a

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Character Area: K1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel Description

This Parcel of land is located to the north-west of Kelvedon and the south of Coggeshall Hamlet. The north-western boundary is formed by the northern extent of Landscape Setting Area 1. The southern boundary follows Pantlings Lane leading to Monks Farm and cottages. To the east the Parcel is bound by Coggeshall Road which wraps around the southern edge to the grounds of Grade II listed Pound Farmhouse, Farm Hill House and White Barn.

The Parcel is set on slightly elevated plateau farmland which can in part be seen from the settlement edge of Kelvedon. The valley slopes of the River Blackwater lie to the east. The Parcel is formed by two large scale arable fields with limited enclosure. There is a clipped dense hedgerow leading to Monks Farm but remaining boundaries are open or lined by poor fragmented hedgerows. There is mature vegetation to the periphery of Pound Farm, the one private property located within the Parcel. Overhead power lines also crisscross the Parcel in two directions forming an intrusive feature in the rural landscape.

There is a public footpath running adjacent to the northern boundary. This provides open views to parts of the Parcel with a small area to the west obscured by a high point in the topography. There are also open views across the Parcel from Coggeshall Road. The Parcel is surrounded by a small number of isolated farmhouses and a line of cottages to the north all with potential views across the open farmland.

The elevated nature of the landscape and surrounding open farmland isolates the Parcel from Kelvedon which is generally screened in views by intervening landform. The rural character of the landscape contributes to the setting of the settlement.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17.5 |
| 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) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| 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/) = 37.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1b

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel description

This parcel consists of several gently undulating fields, one of which is recognised as pre-18th century field enclosure, located to the north of Kelvedon and extending north-west from Newtown. The parcel is distinguished by its topography: it is located between the plateau top north of Monks Farm and the steeper topography leading down to Kelvedon to the south. The northern boundary is formed by Pantling's Lane that leads to Monk's Farm from Coggeshall Road. There is a nearly continuous managed hedgerow along the parcel's edge on the south side of the track. The southern boundary follows field boundaries consisting of fragmented hedgerows and intermittent trees and partly follows a field track between Monk's Farm and Windmill Farm. The Parcel stretches westwards from its open boundary on Coggeshall Road to the edge of the Landscape Setting Area.

The gently undulating topography obscures some land within the parcel between Windmill Farm and Monk's Farm, causing land beyond the Parcel to appear closer than it is when looking north towards Monk's Farm. The fragmented hedges within the boundary are not sufficient to contain long distant views across the site. However the hedge along Pantlings Lane and a dense, tall Leylandii hedge block views into the site locally.

Several tracks and paths cross the parcel between Pantlings Lane and the track leading to Windmill Farm, the parcel's north and south boundaries respectively. However none are public rights of way.

In terms of built development, the parcel includes Kings Cottages on Coggeshall Road and Monk's Farm, consisting of farm buildings and offices in the north-east of the parcel, consisting of farm buildings and offices. Monk's Farm Cottages, located on the north side of Pantlings Lane, are designation as Grade II listed. The setting of the Cottages is informed to some extent by the parcel, particularly in its approach along Pantlings Lane. However there are farm buildings between it and the parcel which obscure direct visual connections with the Cottages. The parcel abuts Windmill Farm and residential properties in Newtown on Coggeshall Road.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 19.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 39 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1c

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel Description

Parcel of land characterised by the vegetated path of the River Blackwater. The path of the river meanders north-east from its central path between Kelvedon and Feering, towards Feering village and then north to the edge of the Landscape Setting Area adjacent Coggeshall Hall. The river marks a boundary between areas associated with settlements and the open, larger scale countryside.

The Parcel comprises the river corridor, blocks of woodland, formal plantation blocks, water meadows, and trees and scrub along the entire length. There are small rough grass and pastoral fields to the east of the river with pre-18th century field enclosure. The Parcel also includes a Local Wildlife Site, Feering Marsh, located to the west of Feering village.

There are a number of public footpath routes running close to the path of the river including one extending north-east from Coggeshall Road to the west of the Parcel and one extending south-west from Coggeshall Road to the east. These footpath routes provide some partial views to the river corridor as does the railway line to the south. However, a large amount of views from surrounding publically accessible locations are screened by the dense blocks of riparian vegetation. There are some views to the river corridor from residential properties to the south of the railway line and potentially some very limited glimpsed views from the western edge of Feering village and ribbon development approaching Newtown.

The River Blackwater and riparian vegetation divide Kelvedon and Feering and form an important ecological corridor which also provides some screening to the settlement in views from the north. There is limited development in close association with the Parcel as the railway line tends to form a barrier to development extending further north.

| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 16.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 32 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1d

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel description

A Parcel located immediately north-west of the London-Colchester railway line, along the northern fringes of Feering. The railway line forms the south-east boundary to the Parcel which, from west to east, runs through a cutting and then embankment. There are occasional trees along the edge of the railway line and denser shrubs on the railway embankment on the eastern portion of this boundary. Two-storey houses overlook the Parcel and railway line from Sherwood Way and Marshall Close in Feering. The northern boundary is marked by the distinct change from the parcel's land covers to riparian vegetation and rough grass associated with the River Blackwater. Generally tall trees, including poplar, line the boundaries and strongly filter views of the parcel from the north and east of the river. The river bends round to the south to form the western boundary, and Feering Marsh, a wetland habitat extends south from the river at Feering Village to form the Parcel's eastern boundary.

The Parcel comprises a mix of uses: the western portion of the Parcel is an arable field which is separated by grass pasture to its east by a managed hedgerow indicating 18th-19th century enclosure. To the east of this and adjacent to Rye Mill Lane are residential properties well enclosed by mature trees. From this cluster of houses, Rye Mill Lane leads south to Feering via a bridge under the railway embankment. East of this road is an area of amenity grass and club house used by the Kelvedon Feering Cricket Club.

A public footpath connects Rye Mill Lane with Feering Village, following the parcel's northern boundary along the River Blackwater. As well as private viewpoints from housing along the railway line, there are long distance views available from Kelvedon, Newtown and Feering Village, as well as from public rights of way across the countryside between Kelvedon and Newtown and northwards to White Farm. These are filtered by intervening vegetation, including the Parcel's boundary trees. Private receptors immediately north of the Parcel have their views largely obscured by their property boundary vegetation.

| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17 |
| 2/ Visual features | | | | | | | |
| Openness to public view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 22.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 42.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures

- Mitigate any potential threat of flooding from the River Blackwater.
- Development to be closely associated with housing to the south of the railway line and properties on Rye Mill Lane.
- Character of the built form in Feering should be reflected
- The landscape framework provided by riparian vegetation and historic century field enclosures should be preserved and strengthened, and be used to inform future development layouts.
- Opportunities for recreation along the River Blackwater could be taken, forming green links with the settlement fringe and the existing public footpath network.
- Alternative sports recreation should be identified if development takes place on the existing cricket ground
- Maintain the public right of way and improve its amenity value.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1e

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel Description

Playing fields and play area located to the north-western edge of Feering. The Parcel is characterised by its land use as recreational resource for the settlement. The Parcel is bound by residential development to two sides. Houses face Rye Mill Lane on the south-western boundary and the rear gardens of properties on Watermill Road form the south-eastern boundary. The north-western boundary is formed by the railway line. To the north-east are the buildings and grounds of Feering Primary School.

The Parcel comprises amenity grassland with a football pitch and an open area for informal games. There is a cluster of play equipment to the north-western corner that is open to the recreation ground with no fenced enclosure. The play equipment is varied and generally in a good condition. The landform is gently sloping to the north-west towards the railway line and the valley bottom of the River Blackwater. The vegetation to the railway line is sparser to the south with scattered trees. To the north is a denser block of trees and there is scrub along the railway embankment. There is a low clipped hedge in good condition with intermittent trees to the boundary with Rye Mill Lane. The boundary to the south-east is formed by close board fencing with only occasional trees located along it in rear gardens.

There are views across the Parcel from the adjacent pavement and Rye Mill Lane. A Public footpath runs along south-east boundary divided from the playing fields by a chainlink fence. This route also has open views across the Parcel. Private properties enclose and overlook the Parcel from two sides.

The Parcel is enclosed within the settlement edge of Feering and bound by existing built development. The railway line forms a strong boundary to the north-west of the settlement enclosing the recreation ground within the settlement pattern. The Parcel currently provides a formal recreation space for Feering.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 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) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 25 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 42 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures

- The area is currently identified as formal open space in the Adopted Local Plan, therefore if development should take place, alternative open space provision would need to be allocated.
- Development should be at an appropriate scale and form to that of the existing settlement fringe and elements of vernacular features from the Kelvedon Conservation Area could be incorporated.
- Buffer planting adjacent to the railway line should strengthened with improved management of the planting to provide a more consistent visual screen and wildlife corridor.
- The public footpath on the southern boundary should be protected.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1f

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel description

Arable fields located immediately north-west of Feering Village, adjacent to Coggeshall Road (Feering) which forms its eastern boundary. It is bounded to the west by hedgerows and drain which approximates to the edge of the River Blackwater valley bottom, and to the south by Feering Marsh, a Local Wildlife Site. The northern boundary coincides with the Landscape Setting Area extent, which approximately follows hedgerow field boundaries. The landform is very gently sloping south-westwards towards the river, with a drain crossing the Parcel from a spring at Warren Cottage to the east of Coggeshall Road (Feering).

The small- to medium-scale fields exhibit an 18th-19th century enclosure pattern that are aligned perpendicular to the river. The field boundaries are generally intact but their quality varies and there are some gaps. Public views of the Parcel can be gained through these gaps along Coggeshall Road, and from field access points in the south-east corner and at Frame Farm. Similar views are available from Bushmoor Cowes cottage at the south-east corner and from Warren Cottage and Feering Place which overlook the parcel from east of Coggeshall Road. There are further private receptors on the edge of Feering Village although these are set back from Coggeshall Road and would have views of the southern portion of the Parcel only.

The Parcel provides an arable setting to the Grade II listed buildings Frame Farm barn and Bushmoor Cowe which are both within the Parcel and also to Warren Cottage and Feering Place to the east of the Parcel. A Scheduled Monument is situated within the arable fields of the Parcel. According to Historic England's record of scheduled monuments, this is a long mortuary enclosure and round barrow 160m south west of Frame Farm. However these features are no longer visible on the ground except as cropmarks.

The southern part of the Parcel shares its boundary with Feering Village, where it is opposite Glebe Gardens and several houses on Coggeshall Road, although these are generally set back from the roadside. However, Feering Village and the Parcel are separated from Feering and Kelvedon by the railway embankment except for the road tunnel of Coggeshall Road, and this Parcel does not share visual connections with Feering or Kelvedon.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 11.5 |
| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 23 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 36.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1g

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel Description

Extensive large scale Parcel of land to the north-west of Kelvedon. The Parcel boundaries are defined at field boundaries by changes in scale, landform and enclosure to that of neighbouring Parcels 1a and 1b. To the west the Parcel extends to the edge of the Landscape Setting Area and the boundary is partly marked by an access track to Felixhall Park containing a group of listed buildings. The Parcel is set on plateau land, slightly elevated from Kelvedon, providing enclosure to the settlement in views from the north.

The Parcel comprises large scale arable fields that have experienced decline in field boundary enclosure leaving open boundaries to parts. The remaining field boundaries have fragmented hedgerows and small groups of trees in a variable condition. There is a taller, better quality hedge to the boundary with Parcel 1b.

There is a public footpath route that travels alongside the railway line which encloses the northern extent of Kelvedon, before travelling north-west across the Parcel. St Mary the Virgin Church in Kelvedon features in views to the south from the public footpath. The limited vegetation allows relatively wide stretching views across open arable landscape and Monks Farm is visible on elevated land to the north. Views to built development in Kelvedon are generally screened by the intervening landform and the well vegetated fringe to parts of the settlement formed by embankment planting on the railway line. The facing valley slopes on the opposite side of the River Blackwater can be seen above the vegetation in the distance.

There are limited visual and physical connections to the edge of Kelvedon and the Parcel is generally isolated from the urban fabric. Large parts of the landscape are only accessed by public footpaths or farm tracks, aside from Hollow Road which adjoins part of the southern boundary. There are isolated farms and private properties to the south-west of the Parcel on Hollow Road, which would have some views of the Parcel. However, the railway line forms a barrier to connections with built development in Kelvedon, and the slightly elevated, large scale nature of the landscape further isolates it from the settlement fringe.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17.5 |
| 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) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| 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/) = 37.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1h

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel description

A sloping triangular parcel located adjacent to the London-Colchester railway line, north-west of Kelvedon. The Parcel encompasses Newtown and its northern extent follows the village envelope. The Parcel's north-eastern boundary is Coggeshall Road and its western is a hedgerow situated along a break in slope that reads as a plateau edge, with a public footpath alongside it.

The Parcel consists of three main areas: an arable field sloping south-east towards Kelvedon to the railway line, housing in Newtown and extending south to Kelvedon rail station's car park along Coggeshall Road, and paddocks in the southern corner of the Parcel associated with Bridge Farm. This is little vegetation within the site except for the hedgerow on the western edge of the Parcel which is in good condition, occasional trees along the railway line, and vegetation within private properties.

The public footpath along the north-west Parcel edge provides views into the Parcel and across to Kelvedon. In addition there is a public footpath extending north-east to south-west in the southern portion of the parcel along the edge of the arable field and rough grass on its margins. This has views to the lower areas of the Parcel but the Parcel's rising topography limits a view across the whole area. Vegetation along the railway line and the River Blackwater filter views of the Parcel from housing in the lower elevations. Elsewhere views would be mitigated by local vegetation and hedgerows to the south of the railway line. There are open views between the parcel and housing in Newtown and along Coggeshall Road.

As Newtown does not have a village centre, is linked to Kelvedon rail station and is predominantly housing, this study has considered it a residential extension of Kelvedon rather than a settlement in its own right with the prevention of coalescence being a factor in assessing parcels. Therefore this Parcel has been assessed as not comprising any separation.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| 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 | | | | | | | 23.5 |
| 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 analysis form

Parcel No.: 1i

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel description

A rolling landscape consisting of arable fields located north of Kelvedon, divided from it by the London-Colchester railway line and in part by Parcel 1h, and extending north to Windmill Farm and the western edge of Newtown. Good quality hedgerows, with hedgerow trees, enclose the parcel although hedgerows within the parcel are less well maintained. The eastern boundary is a hedgerow, shared with Parcel 1h. At the parcel's southern extent this hedgerow and footpath lead to Rolleylane Bridge, which crosses the railway line. Another public footpath is perpendicular to this one, extending from Rolleylane Bridge north-eastwards to a plateau. This divides the northern portion of the parcel from the southern portion which is adjacent to the railway line and has closer visual connections to Kelvedon. Windmill Farm is located in the north-east corner of the Parcel, adjacent to Newtown.

There are limited views to Kelvedon and Newtown and from farms beyond the Parcel's boundaries. The Parcel has a strong sense of tranquillity, as is typical away from towns and major roads.

| 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) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 21 |
| 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 analysis form

Parcel No.: 1j

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel Description

A low lying parcel of land associated with the gentle side slopes and valley bottom of the River Blackwater. The eastern edge of the Parcel falls within the flooding zone. The Parcel is located to the north of Kelvedon and to the north-west of Feering. Coggeshall Road forms southern boundary to the Parcel. The densely vegetated path of the river forms the boundary to the east. The land rises more steeply to the elevated valley slopes within Parcel 1k to the north.

The Parcel comprises two fields, the small field to the south currently contains unmanaged rough grass. The slightly larger scale field to the north contains rows of plantation associated with further large scale tree and shrub plantations in surrounding fields. There is a workshop with goods yard and car park located centrally between the two fields and a single residential property located to the north of this. The Parcel has moderate enclosure by tall hedges and tree belts to the north, east and parts of the western boundary. However, large parts of the boundary with Coggeshall Road are open with only occasional trees and small fragmented blocks of low hedges lining the roadside verge.

Prominent residential properties face the Parcel from Coggeshall Road on slightly elevated land. This includes ribbon development extending from the edge of Kelvedon and a cluster of houses on Coggeshall Road and Observer Way referred to as Newtown. The properties fronting on to the Parcel would have relatively open views across the landscape. There is a public footpath to eastern side also providing views across open parcel.

The Parcel has strong visual and physical connections to the existing residential development to the south, although this area is slightly detached from the main settlement which is predominantly confined to the southern side of the London to Colchester railway line. Feering is also enclosed by the river corridor. The Parcel is well enclosed from the wider landscape by dense riparian vegetation along the river corridor to the east, existing development on higher ground to the west and the elevated slopes of the river valley to the north.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 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) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 25 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 42 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures

- Conserve and enhance existing vegetation on the northern and eastern boundaries. Strengthen the hedgerow and tree planting on the southern boundary to provide containment to development and enhance the approach to Kelvedon on the Coggeshall Road.
- Development should be appropriate in scale and form to existing neighbouring residential development and reflect the styles of built development within Kelvedon to provide greater visual connections with the main settlement.
- Development should be located avoid the floodplain of the River Blackwater and to make best use of the existing enclosure from surrounding landform, development and existing vegetation.
- Key views from public footpath routes should be protected and the amenity value of these links preserved. Opportunities to enhance connections with the river and green links between the settlements and the wider landscape should also be taken.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1k

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel description

Parcel 1k is located on the slopes of the River Blackwater to the north and west of the river's meanders. It is north of Kelvedon, separated from the town by the London-Colchester railway, the River Blackwater and its valley bottom, and the lower slopes of this valley (Parcels 1c, 1d, 1j and 1l). The Parcel comprises arable land currently planted by a monoculture of thorny fruit. Their linear rows are prominent in views towards the slope as the topography rises up from the river to the apparent edge of the plateau at White Barn.

A public footpath crosses the parcel on a north-south axis from between White Barn and Coggeshall Hall to the river valley floodplain. It is part of a wider public rights of way network. There is a recently planted hedgerow along the edge of this path which appears to be a native mix. Currently views across the Parcel are open, but as this hedgerow matures it should filter views to and from the parcel. The hedgerow along the eastern boundary is sparse and views can be gained into the adjacent Parcel (1l). However this has been replanted recently, showing management of the landscape character, views and biodiversity.

The western boundary along Coggeshall Road comprises occasional trees and shrubs. This filters local views of the parcel. In addition a gappy hedgerow with some mature trees between this road and the public footpath filters views both from east and the west to the west and east portions.

| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15 |
| 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) | | | | | ✓ | 1.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| 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/) = 35 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 11

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel is located on the south-east facing lower valley slopes of the River Blackwater. The south-eastern side of the Parcel is lower-lying and partly within the floodplain. The Parcel boundaries are formed by the vegetated river corridor to the east and north, and a relatively strong network of hedgerows and mature trees to the south and west. The land to the west within Parcel 1K is elevated above Parcel on more prominent upper valley slopes.

The Parcel comprises two arable fields of a medium scale. The northern field has a pre-18th century enclosure structure and the southern field has 18th-19th century enclosure. Well enclosed by strong hedgerows. There is no public access through the Parcel and views towards it from nearby public footpaths are generally well screened by intervening vegetation. There are also limited views from surrounding private properties in Feering to the south-east and the groups of properties along Coggeshall Road to the west. Views from private properties would be very occasional and generally filtered by mature vegetation.

The Parcel is isolated from the surrounding urban fabric and has limited visual and physical connections with the surrounding settlements of Kelvedon and Feering due to the enclosure formed by the river corridor. The enclosed nature of the Parcel and the adjoining farmland and river corridor provide a relatively tranquil and rural context to the landscape and contributes to the wider rural setting of the settlements.

| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 21.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 39 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 1m

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K1

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 11/03/2015

Parcel description

A parcel located to the north of Kelvedon, adjacent to the northern extent of Landscape Setting Area K1, south of Halfway Cottages on Coggeshall Road. This road forms the parcel's western boundary and the edge of the River Blackwater valley bottom demarcates the eastern extent. The Parcel encompasses properties at White Barn and Farm Hill House, Coggeshall Hall, and extends south to the edge of the plateau, where the landform then slopes more steeply down the River Blackwater valley and towards Kelvedon and Feering. A hedgerow also marks this southern boundary. A public footpath bisects the Parcel, linking Newtown and Kelvedon with the public footpath network to the north, leading to areas in the north, east and west. The properties are well enclosed by mature hedgerows and trees. The grounds of Coggeshall Hall are well contained from public views but appear to include areas of maturing woodland, parkland gardens and pasture. Between Coggeshall Hall and White Barn and to the north of these are arable fields currently growing what appears to be a thorny fruit crop, as also found in adjacent parcels to the south. These fields are further subdivided by single lines of semi-mature trees.

| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 18 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 37 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 2a

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K2

Surveyor: LH/SN

Date surveyed: 03/03/2015

Parcel description

A parcel to the west of Kelvedon, immediately north of the London to Colchester railway line. The land stretches between Crane's Lane on its south-west boundary and Hollow Road as its north-east boundary. A public bridleway between these two is the Parcel's northern boundary, as well as the northern extent of Landscape Setting Area K2.

The parcel comprises Clarks Farm, which includes a listed building and its private lawn and paddock, arable fields gently sloping downwards toward the River Blackwater beyond and sub-divided by patchy clipped hedgerows, and mixed land uses and land cover, including house and domestic garden, woodland, grass field and water associated with Felix Place at the northern corner of the Parcel. Some of these fields at Felix Place are identified as pre-18th and 18th-19th century enclosures.

From the bridleway and arable fields, views can be gained across much of the area. Felix Place is well contained between closeboard fence and hedgerows. Undulations and fragment hedgerows limit some local views. Hedgerows and woodland blocks block views towards the parcel from the west, and a treed hedgerow along the northern edge of the public bridleway partially screens views into the parcel from areas to the north. There are few views between the parcel and Kelvedon as the settlement edge is well vegetated. The church spire of St Marys the Virgin beyond the Parcel's south-west corner is visible above the vegetation, and houses along Hollow Road are partially visible to other areas of the Parcel. There are distant views to slopes on the southern side of the River Blackwater valley.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 21.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 37.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 2b

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K2

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 03/03/2015

Parcel Description

The Parcel is on sloping land to the valley sides of the River Blackwater. It is bound to the north-west by the railway line, to the south-west by Crane's Lane and to the south-east by the B1024 (London Road). The B1024 provides access to Kelvedon and connects with the A12. To the north-east the Parcel extends to the rear gardens of properties on Church Street in Kelvedon. The grounds and buildings of the Old Vicarage, Church Hall Farm and St Mary the Virgin Church, Kelvedon are all included within the Parcel.

The Parcel is gently sloping with localised shallow valleys associated with tributary streams of the River Blackwater. The Parcel comprises medium scale arable fields, with some smaller scale rough grass fields to the rear of properties on Church Street and Crane's Lane. The fields are divided with low clipped hedges, fragmented in parts. The central field has pre-18th century enclosure. There are listed buildings at Crabb's Farm, Church Hall Farm. The Old Vicarage and St Mary the Virgin Church are also Listed and the church steeple is a noticeable landmark in views to the north-east. There are taller bands of mature trees surrounding the church and along the stream to north east of the Parcel. The farmland, stream and riparian vegetation all contribute to the rural setting of the Kelvedon Conservation Area which the Parcel abuts. There has been some modern expansion residential ribbon development along the B1024 which falls within the Parcel boundaries.

There is no public access through the Parcel but views from a bridleway running adjacent to the railway line on the outer extent of the Setting Area extend across Parcels 2a and 2b to the houses on both sides of the B1024 (London Road). These properties and the isolated buildings surrounding the Parcel would have open views across the landscape with the fragmented low hedges forming little enclosure. There are also views from the railway line which has limited vegetation running alongside it. The arable fields slope up to the houses on the B1024 which increases their prominence in a generally rural landscape.

Kelvedon currently follows a general development pattern of being located to the south-eastern side of railway line and the Parcel follows this precedent. The settlement edge is generally well contained by the vegetation associated with the church and the stream. There is limited inter-visibility between the Parcel and Kelvedon aside from the smaller scale fields creating the setting to Conservation Area and the church. However, the Parcel is connected to the settlement by the B1024 and the presence of the residential properties to the south-east increase the associations that it has with the urban fabric.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 12.5 |
| 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) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 23.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 38 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 2c

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K2

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 03/03/2015

Parcel description

The site is approximately triangular. Flood plain landscape of the river Blackwater. Includes housing along B1024, some farm buildings and a small quadrant of Kelvedon Houses.

Site is approximately triangular – N/W boundary is B1024 (and houses. This is elevated in comparison to majority of site. Also North corner including the library of Kelvedon) East side of road crossing Kelvedon the River Blackwater. South edge is A12 and its vegetated Flood plain Grass and trees. Higher land is grass/ arable. Distinct "shelf" below houses and field besides A12.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| 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) | | ✓ | | | | 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/) = 38 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 2d

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K2

Surveyor: IJ/LH

Date surveyed: 03/03/2015

Parcel Description

Parcel of land located to the south-east of Kelvedon and comprising the southern extent of Landscape Setting Area K2. The area is characterised by its land use for agricultural production. The A12 runs along the northern boundary and has a dominant presence, cutting the Parcel off from the surrounding landscape and settlement to the north and north-east. Maldon Road leading to Highfields Lane which provides access to isolated farms to the south-west and the village of Tiptree to the south-east also runs adjacent to part of the A12 on the northern boundary, before cutting the Parcel in two in a south-westerly direction.

The Parcel is set on the gently sloping valley sides of the River Blackwater. Aside from the roads built development is limited to Ashmans Farm and associated small sheds and agricultural buildings. The remaining Parcel is comprised of a varied mix of large to medium fields including arable, rough grass, plantation woodland, pastures and linear Willow coppice plantation bands. There is also riparian vegetation associated with the meandering path of the River Blackwater that crosses the western side of the Parcel. Kelvedon Hall Wood located just beyond the southern boundary forms a dense wooded backdrop to views.

There is a strong noise presence from the A12 throughout the Parcel despite its largely rural character. Public footpaths provide access to parts of the landscape, with one route travelling north from the A12 crossover and another route travelling west from the A12 slip road and adjacent to woodland plantation blocks. There are also views into the Parcel from the minor roads and glimpses from the A12.

The Parcel is isolated from the development edge of Kelvedon which is generally well contained within the River Blackwater corridor and a band of farmland that provides a rural setting to the settlement. This also provides a buffer to the A12 which is set back from Kelvedon and Feering.

| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 5 |
| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 19 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 37 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No: 3a

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

- 1.1 Occupying the north-west facing, valley sides of the River Blackwater, the Parcel comprises well enclosed built development and small scale arable fields associated with the parish of Inworth. Development within the Parcel would form a natural extension to the adjacent urban fabric and incorporate the separate blocks of development to create a more defined settlement edge. The existing structure of vegetation presents good scope to provide mitigation that is in keeping with the existing landscape pattern.

Inworth and surrounding fields (Inworth treated as an individual settlement away from Kelvedon)

| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 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 | | | | | | | 26 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 43.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Development should be sensitive to, and retain, the rural separation between Feering and Inworth built development areas, and between Inworth and Tiptree.
- Development should be sensitive to the style of housing within Inworth and be at an appropriate scale in relation to existing development.
- The existing frontages onto B1023 should be retained to reduce the visual impact to views from road users and the rest of Inworth.
- Public footpath routes should be retained and enhanced, preserving connections between existing development in Inworth and the wider landscape.
- Mature hedgerows and trees along the Parcel boundaries and internally should be retained and enhanced to improve enclosure of existing and any proposed development and to help screen views towards them. Additional vegetation would be required to screen new development in exposed views from the wider countryside, such as from the west, or where boundaries are inconsistent or not tall or dense enough to screen views, such as and to strengthen the southern edge with taller vegetation to provide more consisted screening, to preserve the rural context of the village and its well contained developed edge.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3b

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

Medium scale rectilinear fields on gently sloping fields. Generally northfacing, western most fields are westerly facing. Edge of plateau with views towards Kelvedon. Adjacent to Highfields Lane with additional accesses from Highfields Lane and Inworth Hall along private tracks and public footpaths. Uses include arable and a recent **xxha** solar panel development enclosed by **xxm** height fencing and new shrub and tree planting.

| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| 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 | | | | | | | 20.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 39 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3c

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

North facing fields on the upper slopes of the River Blackwater valley, to the south of the A12 bypass. Clear visual connections to Kelvedon, and adjacent to houses and farms at Highfields and Lucas' Croft.

| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 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) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| 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 | | | | | | | 17.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 35.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3d

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

Arable fields adjacent to the A12, to its south. Stretches from the west to eastern extents of the Landscape Setting Area. Located on slopes rising from the River Blackwater. Hedgerow field boundaries aligned perpendicular to the river and road.

| 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) | | ✓ | | | | |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17 |
| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| 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/) = 35 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3e

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

North-facing lower valley slopes of the River Blackwater. Between the river and the A12.

This Parcel is located on the north-west facing lower valley slopes of the River Blackwater and Domsey Brook. The southern boundary abuts the A12 vehicular corridor. The well vegetated water courses and road embankment provide relatively strong visual enclosure to the Parcel in the wider landscape. However, the Parcel is moderately open to view from public footpath connections crossing the landscape and surrounding residential properties

| 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) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 17.5 |
| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| 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/) = 41 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Development should be at an appropriate scale in relation to existing development within Kelvedon. Potentially reflecting some vernacular styles and character of the Kelvedon Conservation Area in order to improve the settlement edge.
- Mature hedgerows and trees along the Parcel boundaries and internally should be retained and enhanced to improve enclosure of any future development and screen views towards it from the A12 and the wider countryside to the south, and existing development in Kelvedon.
- Additional planting at the edge of existing development and along the boundaries and within the adjacent Parcel 3h on the River Blackwater's river valley to strengthen screening between the existing settlement edge and 3e.
- Public footpath routes to be retained and enhanced, preserving connections between existing development in Kelvedon and the wider landscape.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3f

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

Arable fields sloping towards and including Domsey Brook. Western parcel includes an Anglo-Saxon cemetery that is designated as a Scheduled Monument.

| 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 | | |

- 1.1 This Parcel is located on the south-west facing lower valley slopes of the River Blackwater and Domsey Brook. The well vegetated water courses and dense tree belts to the north of the Parcel provide strong visual enclosure. The Parcel is open to view from the public footpath to the west but is generally well screened from surrounding residential properties on the Kelvedon settlement fringe. Development within the Parcel would form only moderate associations with the existing urban fabric but the visual enclosure of the Parcel, strong landscape framework and opportunity to improve the settlement fringe presents good scope to provide effective mitigation to development proposals.

| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Openness to private view | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Relationship with existing urban conurbation | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 23.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 42 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Development should be at an appropriate scale in relation to existing development within Kelvedon and Feering.
- Mature vegetation along Domsey Brook within the Parcel and the River Blackwater should be retained and enhanced to improve enclosure of any future development and screening between it and existing development in Kelvedon and Feering. The recently planted vegetation along the parcel's northern boundary should be encouraged and strengthened with additional planting where necessary to screen views towards it from Feering. Additional planting would be needed to screen views from users of the B1023 to the east and the Worlds End footpath to the west.
- Public footpath routes to be retained and enhanced, preserving connections between existing development in Kelvedon and Feering and the wider landscape.
- Development should not disturb the scheduled monument of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery that is situated in the parcel's western field, although this could provide potential as a historic educational feature. This would also provide a buffer between the Worlds End public footpath and any potential built development.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3g

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

Lower valley slopes of the River Blackwater, arable fields and paddocks. Includes an equestrian centre. Ewell Hall, Bridgeford Farmhouse and Easterford Mill (listed buildings). Small scale regular field pattern are of pre-18th-19th century enclosure origins. Accessed from a private road with public rights of the way access through the 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 23 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 39 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3h

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

River Blackwater river valley bottom. A mosaic of semi-natural vegetation, poplar plantations and grassland fields designated as a Local Wildlife Site. No public access although public footpath is adjacent to its eastern edge (within 3e and 3f). Well vegetated boundary to housing on the south of Kelvedon although in winter views may be gained of 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 | | | 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) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 24 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 38.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 3i

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K3

Surveyor: LH/IJ

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

Grassland parcels flat or gently undulating adjacent to existing housing and the B1023. Public footpath crosses the parcel between Inworth Road, connecting to routes further east, and London Road, Feering.

The Parcel is located to the south of Feering and framed on three sides by housing on the settlement fringe. The landform gently slopes south-west towards the meeting point of the River Blackwater and Domsey Brook. Dense tree belts on the southern boundary provide visual containment to the from the river valley landscape to the south. Variable vegetation along rear garden boundaries provide some open views into the Parcel from the adjacent housing. Threshelfords Business Park is relatively prominent through breaks in vegetation to the east. However, the Parcel has close visual and physical associations with the urban fabric and the existing landscape framework provides good scope to mitigate proposed development.

| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 20.5 |
| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 25 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 48.5 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Development should be at an appropriate scale in relation to existing development within Feering, and provides an opportunity to improve the exposed settlement edge.
- Additional planting at the edge of existing development to strengthen screening from private viewpoints towards the parcel. Additional planting along the B1023 would help screen public views from this road.
- Public footpath routes to be retained and enhanced, preserving connections between existing development in Kelvedon and Feering and the wider landscape to the south and east.
- Development to be sensitive to and reflect the historic enclosure pattern to maintain the time-depth element of the landscape's character, also well as maintaining existing hedgerows to benefit from their screening contributions.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 4a

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area:

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

This Parcel occupies gently rolling land wrapping round the northern edge of Feering village. There is moderate enclosure provided by low clipped hedgerows and occasional trees. The adjoining residential properties to the west and south along Coggeshall Road and The Street provides continual connections to the urban fabric throughout the Parcel. Development within the south of the Parcel would form a logical extension to the village. However, the settings to the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings including All Saints Church in Feering would need to be sensitively addressed. Built development should be avoided on the higher ground where new buildings would be prominent in wider views from the north and east.

| 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) | | ✓ | | | | 6 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|--|---|---|--|-------------|
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 15.5 |
| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 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) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 2 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 42 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Development should be sensitive to the Feering Village Conservation Area and be at an appropriate scale in relation to existing development within the Village.
- Key views towards the Village should be maintained, such as towards the church tower when approached Feering Village from Coggeshall Road (Feering) to the north, from Feering to the south and from areas to the east.
- New built development would be most suitable in the southern portion of the parcel which relates most closely to existing development and would more likely be blocked by existing development in Feering Village in views from Kelvedon to the west of Feering Village. Built development should be avoided on the higher areas within the parcel where new buildings would likely be prominent in wide views from the north and east.
- Public footpath routes to be retained and enhanced, preserving connections between existing development in Feering Village and the wider landscape to the north.
- Existing boundaries should be reinforced to provide screening towards any new development and additional planting would be needed to maintain the well vegetated boundaries of existing development in views from outside the settlement, and to maintain the rural setting of the village.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 4b

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K4

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 03/03/2015

Parcel description

Occupying predominantly flat land abutting the eastern fringe of Feering, the Parcels are dissected by the B1024 and contained by the railway line and A12. Parcel 4b comprises a single arable field that extends north-east towards the row of housing referred to as Hanover Bridge, facing the Parcel on from New Lane. The northern boundary is partly enclosed by vegetation along the railway line. Parcel 4c to the south comprises smaller scale arable fields divided by a fragmented hedgerow structure. Both parcels are locally intruded by the railway line, Threshelfords Business Park, the A12 and the A12/B1024 junction. The visually containment of the Parcels in the wider landscape and the close associations with adjoining urban fabric present relatively good opportunities to mitigate development in these locations.

| 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) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Vegetation enclosure | Primary (x1.5) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| 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) | | ✓ | | | | 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) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 25 |
| 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:

- Maintain existing hedgerows and trees on boundaries to filter views towards new development from existing dwellings and users of London Road to the south and the railway line to the north.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 4c

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K4

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 05/03/2015

Parcel description

Generally flat.

Occupying predominantly flat land abutting the eastern fringe of Feering, the Parcels are dissected by the B1024 and contained by the railway line and A12. Parcel 4b comprises a single arable field that extends north-east towards the row of housing referred to as Hanover Bridge, facing the Parcel on from New Lane. The northern boundary is partly enclosed by vegetation along the railway line. Parcel 4c to the south comprises smaller scale arable fields divided by a fragmented hedgerow structure. Both parcels are locally intruded by the railway line, Threshelfords Business Park, the A12 and the A12/B1024 junction. The visually containment of the Parcels in the wider landscape and the close associations with adjoining urban fabric present relatively good opportunities to mitigate development in these locations.

| 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: | Medium-Low |
|---|-------------------|

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 2 |
| 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 | | | | | | | 26 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 46 | | | | | | | |

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Reinforce existing planting along the A12 and the parcel to make a more consistent screen between the road and parcel. (or maintain a buffer between the A12 and new planting and development to preserve the character of a town in a rural setting?)
- Additional planting would be required to maintain the well vegetated settlement edge when viewed from outside the parcel.
- Development layout to be informed by field patterns to develop the historic character of the area. Existing hedgerows and parcel boundaries to be reinforced to strengthen enclosure.
- Public footpath route to be retained and enhanced, preserving the connection between existing development in Kelvedon and Feering and the wider landscape to the east.

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.: 4d

Settlement: Kelvedon

Landscape Setting Area: K4

Surveyor: LH

Date surveyed: 03/03/2015

Parcel description

Small sub portion to K4C but treated separately as this area is defined as sloping ground down to the Domsey Brook and further south beyond the extent of Kelvedon (as provided by the business park)

Grass/arable road/A12/Topo/business park are boundaries.

| 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) | | | | ✓ | | 3 |
| Complexity / scale | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Condition | Secondary (x1) | | ✓ | | | | 4 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 14.5 |
| 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) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Prevention of coalescence | Primary (x1.5) | ✓ | | | | | 7.5 |
| Scope to mitigate the development | Primary (x1.5) | | | ✓ | | | 4.5 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 22.5 |
| 3/ Landscape value | | | | | | | |
| Strength of character and condition | Secondary (x1) | | | ✓ | | | 3 |
| Sub total | | | | | | | 3 |
| Overall capacity profile (1/ + 2/+ 3/) = 40 | | | | | | | |

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