

BDC/047/23/27

**Braintree District Settlement Fringes
Evaluation of Landscape Analysis Study of
Sible Hedingham**

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 SH01: Location Plan
- Figure SH02: Landscape Setting Areas
- Figure SH03: Landscape Setting Areas – Evaluation
- Figure SH04: Parcel Arrangement
- Figure SH05: 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 Sible Hedingham.

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 analysis undertaken by The Landscape Partnership 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 Areas SH1 and SH2, together with SH4 to SH6 which form a horseshoe around the north, east and southern fringes of the town have an overall Low to Medium Capacity to accommodate an extension to the existing settlement. The conclusion around Landscape Setting Area SH5 that extends away from the south western edges of the village as a wedge between the A1017 Hedingham Road and the hamlet at Southey Green was that it has Low overall capacity; with the evaluations for the areas reflected on Figure SH - 03: Landscape Capacity Evaluation Plan.
- 2.3 The report concludes that levels of landscape capacity may not be uniform across any one setting area. It acknowledges that the setting areas with Low or Low to Medium capacity around Sible Hedingham 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 acknowledges that landscape capacity is a complex issue, and that it may be possible that a certain amount of well-designed and appropriately located built development may be acceptable within even moderately sensitive or highly valued landscapes.
- 2.5 The evaluations for each of the Landscape Setting Areas are summarised below, including the broad location within which the study suggests that residential or employment development could be accommodated.

Landscape Setting Area SH1

- 2.6 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:
- Although views from the south and west are well enclosed by a combination undulating landform and the overlying vegetation, eastern parts of the area are clearly visible in open views of the valley sides from the floodplain landscape of Setting Area SH6 and Castle Hedingham beyond. Medium to High visual sensitivity overall, with visibility often limited to views experienced by those travelling on the Yeldham Road and minor lane to High Street Green. The sensitivity of southern parts is increased by views along and across the minor

tributary valley, with views framed in part by the hedgerow and trees on the south side of lane. Properties on the settlement fringes to Sible and Castle Hedingham at Crouch Green are visible in these generally open views on the approach to the villages;

- The landscape has a Medium Landscape Character Sensitivity overall due to a moderate strength of rural character, a lack of distinctiveness around the settlement edge, the nature of the open arable landscape and low levels of semi-natural vegetation present; and a fragmented hedgerow structure. The influence of the Yeldham Road corridor in the easternmost fringes reduces the sensitivity in these parts. The northern fringes of Sible Hedingham are fairly well integrated into the local landscape through vegetation around the school perimeter and planting associated with garden boundaries; with scope for enhancements to strengthen the character of the landscape on the northern fringes of the village.
- The Landscape Value is Medium, given the moderate sense of tranquillity around the lane that meanders towards High Street Green in western parts, away from the road and settlement edges.

2.7 The capacity of the overall setting area is evaluated as Low to Medium, with opportunities to incorporate new built development limited. However, the lower valley slopes adjacent to the A1017 Yeldham Road at the easternmost edge of the setting area are identified as having capacity to accommodate new residential development. Development in this location would have an association with the cluster of existing dwellings at Crouch Green around the junction with Nunnery Street, with the proviso that potential development does not extend to the upper valley slopes and have an impact on views to and from Hedingham Castle to the east of the setting area. The reinforcement of hedgerows and trees along the Yeldham Road would filter views of such development from the road corridor on the approach to the village.

Landscape Setting Area SH2

2.8 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- The combination of rolling landform and enclosure provided by vegetation results in restricted visibility of eastern parts of the overall farmland landscape. Sensitivity increases in elevated areas on the brow of the adjacent plateau which are visually prominent in views from footpaths in the area, and within the setting of Listed Buildings. Visual sensitivity is Medium to High overall, due to the degree of enclosure and screening that the undulating landform, blocks of vegetation, and hedgerows to field boundaries provide. Views from the rural lanes and numerous footpaths in the area feature occasional glimpses of features and landmarks in Sible Hedingham and on the opposite slopes in the vicinity of Castle Hedingham.

- Medium Landscape Character Sensitivity overall as a result of the presence and condition of vegetation associated with the hedgerows, woodland blocks and minor streams, and strong sense of a rural landscape. The landscape is characterised by a repeating pattern of minor valleys of similar scale, orientation and vegetation framework, creating strong and unified rural character, with areas of pre-18th and 18th to 19th century field enclosures in central and southern parts, close to the fringes of the adjacent Conservation Area, contributing to a sense of time-depth.
- A comprehensive footpath network provides good access between the village and adjacent farmland landscape, with a range of routes following the tributary valley landforms, providing a distinct contrast to the adjacent plateau landscape. Medium Landscape Value due to this access; the presence of Listed Buildings within the lightly settled landscape, the intact field pattern and often historic hedges associated with the tributary valleys.

2.9 The easternmost parts of Landscape Setting Area SH2, adjacent to the school and Church Street Conservation Area, are identified as having the potential to accommodate residential development, providing that the pre 18th century and 18th-19th century pattern of field enclosure is safeguarded. Mitigation opportunities include the restoration of the landscape framework around Cuckoo Hill on the Wethersfield Road on the western fringes of the area, and tree and hedgerow planting alongside the stream valley at the northern tip, to improve habitat connectivity in the area.

Landscape Setting Area SH3

2.10 Landscape Sensitivities & Value

- The Visual Sensitivity is Medium overall, due to the restricted visibility of the setting area in the wider landscape due to a combination of rolling landform and enclosure provided by trees and hedgerows to either side of the peaceful lanes and rights of way. Sensitivity increases in elevated western parts of the area, which lie on the brow of the adjacent plateau, which are visually prominent in views from the numerous footpaths in the area. These views often include notable historic houses such as Southey Green Farm and Baykers Farm, within whose setting sensitivity similarly increases.
- The setting area is characterised by a repeating pattern of minor valleys of similar scale, orientation and vegetation framework, creating strong and unified rural character. Sensitivity enhanced by the presence of dispersed and historic farmsteads, often associated with publicly accessible areas such as commons or footpaths, corresponding to Medium to High Landscape Character Sensitivity overall.
- The strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity, good access to the area by public footpaths, the significant Listed Buildings within the lightly settled landscape, the Parish Council owned

common at Southey Green, the intact field pattern and often historic hedges associated with the tributary valleys correspond to Medium to High Landscape value overall.

- 2.11 The findings of the assessment is that overall Landscape Setting Area has Low capacity to accommodate new built development. It highlights that if such development is necessary, land to the south of School Road and west of Hawkwood Road, adjacent to the existing settlement edge in the north of the area should be examined in more detail. Any development would be outside the areas of pre 18th and 18th-19th century field enclosure present, specifically at Harrowcross and Cobbs Fen. Potential opportunities for expansion would need to be verified through a more detailed landscape and visual assessment, and the landscape and visual sensitivities safe-guarded as part of any such proposals. New tree belts and would need to be provided to help integrate a new development into the adjacent landscape.

Landscape Setting Area SH4

- 2.12 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- Views into the Setting Area from the Halstead Road and Hedingham Road are generally contained by hedgerows, trees and planting associated with gardens; the visual prominence increasing towards the south, where the more open landscape and gentle rise of the valley slopes towards the plateau landscape is apparent from both the Halstead Road and adjacent Landscape Setting Area SH6. Visual sensitivity varies, but is Medium to High overall due to the presence and visibility of the linear settlement fringe on the western boundary of the area, which meets a range of Listed Buildings and Alderford Conservation Area.
- Landscape Character Sensitivity is Medium overall due to the unified and generally rural character associated with the underlying valley slopes, and recognisable landscape structure of fields perpendicular to the River Colne and network of hedgerows and woodland blocks. The settlement fringes are largely well-integrated and generally enclosed by vegetation; and pockets of intact historic field enclosures in northern parts adjacent to Alderford Mill, and southern parts alongside the Halstead Road, contribute to a sense of time-depth in the area.
- The Landscape Value is Medium, due to good footpath access across the area and a sense of tranquillity away from the Halstead Road - the only other road in the area being the peaceful narrow lane to the river and fording point at Hull's Mill. The comprehensive network of rights of way provides direct access from the village into the adjacent floodplain landscape, connecting with the Colne Valley Path and the landscape on the west facing valley slopes beyond.

- 2.13 Although the capacity of the setting area to accommodate new development is Low to Medium overall, farmland to the east of the Alderford Street Conservation Area in the northern parts of Landscape Setting Area SH4, between A1017 at Potter Street as it stretches south of the village and

the minor lane extending to the sewage works and Hull's Mill is identified as having the capacity to accommodate new built development. Any such development should be closely related to the existing settlement edge, such as the cluster of properties and business units at Wash Farm, ensuring that there is no adverse impact on the tranquil character of the river valley landscape to the east.

Landscape Setting Area SH5

2.14 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- Varies across the area, but Medium to High overall, since the slopes on the valley sides are visually prominent in the wider landscape. Sensitivity is Medium in southern parts, where there is a high degree of enclosure provided by field and roadside hedgerows and tree belts, but increased sensitivity in northern parts, where the open and rising slopes are visually prominent in views from the fringes of Sible and Castle Hedingham and from the wider landscape. In particular, the large and open arable field in the northern part of the area is visible in open views from the B1058 Queen Street which links the two villages, glimpsed at breaks in the hedge and rising away to an open horizon.
- The area has a Medium to High Landscape Character Sensitivity overall, with farmland on the gently falling valley slopes, the presence of hedges and woodland, the scattered and often historic farmsteads in the area accessed by a network of quiet rural lanes and tracks resulting in a strong rural character that contributes to the landscape to the settings of Sible and Castle Hedingham. Sensitivity increased in southern parts due to the sequences of small-scale fields defined by robust hedgerows, mature woodland and threads of semi-natural woodland associated with the meandering lanes and pasture of the tributary valleys.
- The Landscape Value is Medium to High, v due to good access to the area by public footpaths; the presence of Listed Buildings within scattered farms; and a sense of remoteness and tranquillity. A prevailing sense of the adjacent River Colne, given the presence of a continuous band of vegetation on the edge of the floodplain.

2.15 Given these landscape and visual sensitivities, the Landscape Setting Area is evaluated as having an overall Low to Medium capacity to accommodate new built development. The enhancement of the local hedgerow structure and additional tree planting would help to soften the appearance of more open fringes of the settlement and any new built development that may be necessary. The report highlights the potential to enhance the framework of vegetation along the Colne Valley Path, as well as improved connections with it, to benefit the recreational corridor alongside the River Colne.

Landscape Setting Area SH6

2.16 Landscape Sensitivities & Value:

- Medium visual sensitivity overall, due to the limited visibility of the river valley corridor within the wider landscape, particularly in central sections in the vicinity of Sible and Castle

Hedingham. Visibility of the river itself is limited in views of the wider landscape, given the presence of the mature vegetation on the intersection of the lower valley slopes and the floodplain landscape of the setting area. Increased Sensitivity increases within the visual setting of Listed Buildings and the Ancient Monument at Alderford Mill.

- The landscape has a strong rural character with its riverside woodland blocks; patterns of semi-natural vegetation; good condition hedgerows; well-contained and well-integrated floodplain edges; distinctive historic buildings scattered within the landscape and its sense of unity, all providing a distinct landscape break between the Hedinghams. The Landscape Character Sensitivity is Medium to High, the area providing a rural river valley setting on the approaches to Castle Hedingham from the west and Sible Hedingham from the east, contributing to the character of each village as they straddle the floodplain on each side of the setting area.
- The presence of Local Nature Reserves in the floodplain, public footpaths, including recreational routes alongside river corridors; scattered Listed Buildings, and a strong sense moderate sense of tranquillity away from roads and development sites result in a Medium to High Landscape Value.

2.17 As with Landscape Setting Area 5, the landscape and visual sensitivities, the Landscape Setting Area is evaluated as having an overall Low to Medium capacity to accommodate new built development. Should such development be necessary, the enhancement of the local hedgerow structure and additional tree planting would help to soften the appearance of more open fringes of the settlement and any new built form. The report highlights the potential to enhance the framework of vegetation along the Colne Valley Path, as well as improved connections with it, to benefit the recreational corridor alongside the River Colne.

2.18 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, that areas of new tree and shrub planting are provided to help integrate any new development into the landscape, and that this recommended planting is sufficiently robust where new employment development is a possibility.

2.19 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 SH – 04 Parcel Arrangement):

- 4.1 As described in the methodology, a combination of desktop and comprehensive fieldwork was used to 'drill down' the Landscape Setting Areas into Parcels with common characteristics. This involved a systematic survey of the natural elements of the landscape and overlying elements relating to land uses.
- 4.2 Although it has been assumed that no development would occur within the floodplain of the River Colne that runs through the centre of Sible Hedingham, the mapping and subsequent analysis of Parcels within the Setting Areas included the valley floors and minor tributaries associated with it.
- 4.3 It had been anticipated at the outset that approximately four Parcels would be identified in each Setting Area. However, the subtleties of the landform associated with the valley landscapes of the River Colne and minor tributaries connecting with it translated into more complex landscapes across Setting Areas 2, 3 and 5, with five or six Parcels being identified in these areas as a consequence. Setting Areas 1 and 4 lie alongside the A1017 on the northern and southern approaches to the village are both smaller and more uniform, with three to four Parcels identified on farmland which rises gently westwards away from the Colne towards the adjacent plateau, with subtle undulations around minor streams valleys falling eastwards to the river.
- 4.4 The consistency in the key characteristics of Setting Area 6, in terms of both the underlying landform and range of built and landscape features that overlie it, results in there being no meaningful landscape definition to warrant sub-division into a finer grain of sub-parcels. The floodplain of the River Colne therefore comprises a single Parcel 6.
- 4.5 An overview of the scale and arrangement of the Parcels reveals that they are smaller in scale and more geometric in form where they abut the existing village fringes, the boundaries responding to the pattern of field enclosure, variations in underlying landform and organic nature of the existing settlement edge. As an example, Parcel 2a is angled around the rear garden boundaries to Abbey Meadow and former dairy site on the south eastern boundary, whilst the opposite boundary is defined by the falling landform associated with the stream valley at Rookwoods. Similarly, Parcel 3a follows the line of the existing settlement edge at Hawkwood Road, rising away from the settlement edge to form a square that is based on hedge boundaries to the existing fields.
- 4.6 Parcel size increases away from the village, with substantial compartments lying in the most distant parts of the Setting Areas, where the valley slopes meet the adjacent large scale plateau farmland. For example, Parcel 3d comprises a number of small to medium sized fields based around the stream valleys that incise the valley slopes on the eastern banks of the River Colne, the slopes rising gently from the edge of the floodplain on the western boundary to the brow of the adjacent plateau in the vicinity of Purlishill.

- 4.7 Similarly, the form of the Parcels differ where they are based around the floodplain and slopes associated with the River Colne and minor tributaries that connect with it. These meandering valley forms result in more sinuous Parcels in Setting Areas 2, 4 and 5, such as Parcel 2b which is based on the stream valley that rises from the River Colne towards the hamlet at Highstreet Green. On the eastern banks, Parcel 5a comprises a swathe of arable farmland that runs parallel with the river on the lower valley slopes south of Castle Hedingham.

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 SH - 05 Parcel evaluation):

High and Medium to 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 Sible Hedingham.

Medium Landscape Capacity

- 4.11 Parcels in three of the Landscape Setting Areas, on the western and southern fringes of the village, have been identified as having Medium Capacity to accommodate development. The Parcel location largely corresponds with the findings of the earlier Landscape Capacity Analysis, given that they lie adjacent to the existing settlement fringes, where they respond to the existing landscape features and visual characteristics:

- 2a Abbey Meadow

- 4.12 Lying alongside the north western fringes of the village, the Parcel is characterised by an area of grassland fringed with hedgerows and groups of trees, connecting with a cluster of small fields and gardens associated with properties along the lane as it extends west from the village towards

Highstreet Green. A former dairy site adjacent to the south-eastern boundary is fully enclosed by a band of trees and hedging, minimising any impression of the redundant structures from within the Parcel.

- 4.13 Public views are moderately open from the footpath which runs diagonally across the Parcel between Abbey Meadow & adjacent countryside on western fringes of the village. The appraisal notes that this footpath corridor is to be safeguarded and reinforced with additional connections as part of any development proposals. The field in the northernmost half is visible from properties in the adjacent Friars Close, such views extending to the hedgerow on the western boundary which filters views of the farmland landscape beyond.
- 4.14 The analysis notes the opportunities to integrate the existing abrupt village fringe at Friars Close and Abbey Meadow with a framework of vegetation based on the gently undulating landform within the Parcel. Any new development should be focussed on the eastern fringes of the Parcel, adjacent to the existing residential developments, to safeguard the setting of the stream valley in Parcel 2b directly to the north-west. Measures to mitigate such built development include new hedge and tree planting around this northern boundary, to ensure the tranquil nature of the slopes to this valley landscape are protected and reinforced.
- Parcels 2f School Road and 3a School Farm
- 4.15 The Parcels are based on a spur of high ground overlooking south western fringes of the village, between the minor stream valleys falling towards the Church Street Conservation Area to the north, and running through Cobbs Fen to the south. They have close connections with the existing settlement edge, with views across the falling valley slopes including buildings such as St Peter's Primary School on School Road and residential areas on the south western fringes of the village in the vicinity of Hawkwood Road apparent in close and mid-distance.
- 4.16 Based on the level or gently falling valley slopes of the River Colne, the Parcels comprise a mix of arable farmland, village allotment site, primary school building and associated sports pitches. The intermittent hedge alongside School Road provides glimpses across the slopes in Parcel 3a, which comprises three medium to large fields that are well enclosed by hedges with trees. Visibility of Parcel 2f is limited to the footpath on the south-western boundary, which follows the hedge boundary to the allotment site, beyond which the absence of a field hedge to the arable field in the north of the Parcel allows views across the valley slopes towards the Church Street Conservation Area.
- 4.17 The presence of the school and allotment site to the west of the school grounds on the western fringes of the Parcel creates a close association with the town to the south, with the eastern parts of School Lane widened to accommodate cars and buses accessing the school car park. West of this car park, School Road narrows to a single track lane well-enclosed with hedges and trees that follows the spur of high ground towards Harrow Cross.

- 4.18 New built development in the Parcel has the potential to integrate the existing settlement edge with the adjacent farmland landscape, integrating the geometric arrangement of the dwellings on Hawkwood Road and Hills Road within a softer landscape framework in keeping with local landscape character. The setting of the Conservation Area which lies directly to the north of the Parcel would need to be safeguarded as part of any development proposals.
- 4.19 The landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees would need to be safeguarded as part of any development proposals, with the field at the northernmost tip of Parcel 3a reflecting the 18th-19th century pattern of enclosure. The reinforcement of the characteristic framework of hedges and trees on the north-eastern boundary, would filter views of potential development from the adjacent properties on Hawkwood Road and Hills Road. Similarly, the reinstatement of hedgerows and trees on the westernmost tip of Parcel 2f would limit the visibility of any new built forms from the adjacent Parcel 2d and the farmland landscape on the western fringes of the village.
- 4.20 The opportunity to enhance footpath linkages within the Parcels is identified, to improve access between Hills Road and Hawkwood Road and the stream valley landscape at Cobbs Fen on the south western fringes of Sible Hedingham.
- Parcel 4d Swan Street & Potter Street
- 4.21 The landscape is characterised by the lower valley slopes on the south-eastern fringes of the village, which fall gently to the east where they meet the floodplain of the River Colne in the adjacent Parcel 6. Land cover is based on a framework of medium sized arable fields and grassland, with the pre 18th century field pattern apparent in the northern parts. Fields are arranged perpendicular to the river valley corridor, and are generally well-enclosed with good condition hedgerows and associated trees. The hedgerows connecting with a band of vegetation along the edge of the floodplain in northern parts of the Parcel, this distinction becoming less apparent in southern parts where the removal of hedges and trees allows views into the floodplain, with views of the river channel and opposite valley slopes limited by geometric stands of poplar trees.
- 4.22 The Parcel is overlooked by scattered properties aligned with Swan Street and Potter Street, which fall within the Alderford Conservation Area that extends as a tail from the southern fringes of the village. The setting of the numerous Listed Buildings along this road corridor would need to be safeguarded as part of any development proposals, with new hedgerow and tree planting providing a landscape buffer to new development, whilst retaining key views to landmark features in the river valley and landscape beyond. The appraisal identifies that new development should be focussed around the existing built form alongside the A1017 road corridor, away from the intersection of the lower valley slopes with the floodplain, to safeguard the setting of the River Colne and footpath network associated with it.
- 4.23 There is potential to enhance the landscape framework and semi-natural habitat associated with the edge of the floodplain, to provide definition to the river valley corridor in keeping with adjacent

Parcels. Although there is a strong band of vegetation south of Alderford Street in northern parts, this reduces further south in the vicinity of Wash Farm.

Medium to Low Landscape Capacity

- 4.24 The appraisal found that the landscapes around the more distant fringes of Sible Hedingham have Medium to Low capacity to accommodate development. Such Parcels often occupy the upper and lower valley slopes of the River Colne, with clear visibility from both within and from adjacent landscapes, particularly where the characteristic landscape framework has been altered by the removal of hedgerows to field boundaries and roadsides. For example, Parcels 1a Yeldham Road and 4c Wash Farm are visible in full from the adjacent A1017 and lane to Hull's Mill, any new built development being clearly visible as a consequence. Any scope to mitigate such development is limited or moderate, given the complexities of screening rooflines that follow rising ground. The appraisal noted that, should any new development be necessary in Parcel 1a, it should be focussed on the easternmost boundary, to form a cluster around the existing properties at Crouch Green.
- 4.25 The combination of a sense of a distinctly rural farmland landscape, an overall sense of tranquillity, the presence of an intact network of historic field enclosure, and a robust framework of boundary hedgerows and woodland blocks reduce the capacity of the landscape to absorb new residential or employment development without significantly affecting these key characteristics. A number of Parcels, such as those on the south-eastern at Foxborough Hill and alongside the Hedingham Road are either isolated from, or have limited associations with the existing urban fabric, this sense of separation exaggerated by the linear form of the village and Alderford Conservation Area which forms a tail on the south side of the village.
- 4.26 Other Parcels, such as 3b Cobbs Fen and 2e Church Street, are characterised by landscapes are rich in pattern, texture and scale, within which numerous footpaths result in the moderate visibility of these features. Despite their proximity to the existing settlement edge, and a moderate association with the existing urban fabric, the strength of character and condition of the stream valley landscapes of these Parcels reduces their capacity to absorb new residential or employment development without significantly affecting these key characteristics.
- 4.27 The presence of numerous Listed Buildings often set within farmsteads on the falling valley slopes, such as Sparrow Farm and Eckfield Farm in Parcel 4b, the gently undulating ground around the stream valley south of Washland's Farm in Parcel 2c, the tranquil nature of the landscape east of Grave's Hall in Parcel 1c, and numerous paths such as those in the vicinity of Hostage Farm in Parcel 2d, further to reduces the capacity of these landscape to absorb new built development.

Low Landscape Capacity

- 4.28 The capacity of the floodplain of the River Colne and west facing valley slopes that extend southwards from Castle Hedingham to accommodate new residential or employment development is Low, with

the exception of Parcels 5c Maiden Ley Farm and 5d at Alderford Farm. Characterised by the gently falling valley slopes of the River Colne that are incised by a series of minor streams in southern parts, settlement in the Parcel is limited to a number of dispersed houses and farmsteads.

- 4.29 Parcel 6 is based on the valley floor of the upper reaches of the River Colne. Despite the fact that, in physical terms, development within the Parcel would form a natural extension of the easternmost edges of the settlement, the evaluation finds that the floodplain has Low landscape capacity. Any such development would have an extensive impact on a landscape with high value, with scope to mitigate these impacts being very limited over the medium to long term. The landscape around the river channel itself is intimate and organic, with richness in pattern, texture and scale which translates into strong character in a good condition. The open character of the adjacent valley slopes results in clear visibility to the valley floor and onwards to neighbouring Parcels on the opposite banks. The effect of potential development would be to affect the setting of the river valley landscape, built form being prominent in the landscape and affecting the function and characteristics of the existing bridging points.
- 4.30 The impact of potential development on the physical and visual separation between Sible Hedingham and Castle Hedingham which, although different in size and form, straddle the river corridor to face each other on opposite sides of the valley, is a factor that affects the capacity of the floodplain to accommodate such development.
- 4.31 The potential effect of coalescence on the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development is also evident in the stream valley landscapes that stretch from the western fringes of the settlement towards the plateau landscape, the brow of which is approximately 2km from the village itself. The hamlets of Highstreet Green, Forry's Green and Southey Green are loosely based on this transition from upper valley slope to the plateau landscape on which the former RAF Gosfield was located. Despite their small size, the effect of development in the landscape along the gently rising stream valleys would affect the definition of these settlements on the brow between plateau and valley slopes, whilst also affecting the characteristics of the loosely spaced properties and historic farmsteads. Development would affect the distinctly rural characteristics of Parcels 2b Rookwoods and 3d Southey Green, and have only limited associations with the existing urban fabric, with only glimpses of features on the Sible and Castle Hedingham skylines possible in distant views along the length of the stream valleys.

Figures

Appendices

Landscape capacity analysis form

Parcel No.:

Settlement:

Landscape Setting Area:

Surveyor:

Date surveyed:

Parcel description

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

Strength of character/condition:

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

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

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures

Appendix B

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

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

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1a Yeldham Road

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							19

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)		✓				6
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)				✓		3
Sub total							15.5
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 to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Potential to restore the field hedgerow along the Yeldham Road, with groups of trees where possible, to improve the landscape setting on the northern fringes of the village
- New hedge planting to road and field boundaries would provide wildlife linkages in the farmland landscape
- If any development is necessary within the Parcel, it should be focussed on the easternmost boundary, to form a cluster around the existing properties at Crouch Green

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1b Crouch Green
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			3
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
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)			✓			4.5
Sub total							20
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2+ 3) =38.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- If any development is necessary within the Parcel, it should be focussed on the easternmost boundary, to form a cluster around the existing properties at Crouch Green
- Reinforcing the vegetation along the north eastern fringes of the Parcel would help define the edge of the floodplain and setting to the River Colne beyond

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 1c Grave's Hall
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			3

Sub total							16
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)			✓			4.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)				✓		3
Sub total							15
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 34							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- New hedge planting to road and field boundaries would provide wildlife linkages in the farmland landscape
- Opportunities for footpath linkages between the northern fringes of Sible Hedingham and the farmland landscape around Highstreet Green

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2a Abbey Meadow

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			3

Sub total							16.5
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)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2+ 3) = 44							

Overall Capacity: Medium

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Opportunity to integrate the existing abrupt village fringe at Friars Close and Abbey Meadow with a framework of vegetation based on the gently undulating landform within the Parcel
- The footpath corridor between Abbey Meadow & adjacent countryside on western fringes of the village to be safeguarded and reinforced with additional connections as part of any development proposals
- The tranquil nature of the slopes to the minor stream valley on the north western fringes of the Parcel to be safeguarded and the existing vegetation along this boundary line to be reinforced with new planting
- Any new development to be focussed on the eastern fringes of the Parcel, adjacent to the existing residential developments

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2b Rookwoods

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			3
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Sub total							15.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2+ 3) = 33.5							

Overall Capacity: Low

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2c Highstreet Green

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							15

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Sub total							16.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 34.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- New hedge planting along roadsides in more open sections, in keeping with local landscape character
- Provide a landscape buffer to the minor valley that runs through the Parcel, to define it as a feature in the farmland landscape and provide a wildlife corridor linking with adjacent woodlands and hedgerows

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2d Hostage Farm
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							16.5

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)				✓		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)			✓			4.5
Sub total							19.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 39							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- New hedge planting along roadsides in more open sections of the Wethersfield Road and School Road, in keeping with local landscape character
- Opportunities to improve north to south footpath links across the Parcel, improving connections between the School Lane area of the village and the footpath network south of Highstreet Green

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2e Church Street
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Condition	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Sub total							16

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)				✓		2
Sub total							2
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 40.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- The setting of the Conservation Area, which lies directly to the east of the Parcel, to be safeguarded as part of any development proposals
- Provide a landscape buffer to the stream valley and associated flood alleviation ponds within the Parcel, to reinforce it as a feature on the village fringes and provide a wildlife corridor linking with adjacent hedges and trees
- Opportunities to improve north to south footpath links across the Parcel, improving connections between the School Lane area of the village and the footpath network south of Highstreet Green

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 2f School Road
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							15.5

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)		✓				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) = 42.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- The setting of the Conservation Area, which lies directly to the north of the Parcel, to be safeguarded as part of any development proposals
- Integrate existing settlement edge with the gently rising landform & landscape framework within the Parcel
- Opportunities to provide footpaths across the Parcel, improving linkages between the primary school/allotment site, and adjacent countryside on western fringes of the village
- Any new development to be focussed on the north western fringes of the Parcel, adjacent to the existing properties on School Road
- Reinforce the landscape framework on the south western boundary, adjacent to Parcel 2d, to limit/filter views of potential developments from farmland on the western fringes of the village

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3a School Farm
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							16.5

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)				✓		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)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2+ 3) = 44							

Overall Capacity: Medium

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- The setting of the Conservation Area, which meets the northernmost tip of the Parcel, to be safeguarded as part of any development proposals
- Opportunities to integrate the existing abrupt edge of the south western fringes of Sible Hedingham, reinforcing the existing landscape framework on the NE boundary adjacent to properties on Hawkwood Road and Hills Road in order to limit/filter views of potential development
- The framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees, with the field at the northernmost tip reflecting the 18th-19th century pattern of enclosure, to be safeguarded as part of any development proposals
- Opportunities to provide footpaths across the Parcel, improving linkages between the primary school/allotment site, and the valley landscape at Cobbs Fen to the south
- Footpath linkages to be enhanced as part of any development, connecting properties at Hills Road and Hawkwood Road with the stream valley landscape at Cobbs Fen on the south western fringes of the village
- Any new development to be focussed on the north eastern fringes of the Parcel, adjacent to the existing properties on Hawkwood Road and Hills Road

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3b Cobbs Fen
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			4.5
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) = 40							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- The setting of the Alderford Conservation Area, which lies directly to the east of the Parcel, to be safeguarded as part of any potential development proposals
- Any development proposals to reflect the small scale and organic form of the landscape in the Parcel, with a pattern of irregular-shaped fields arranged around the stream valley on the southernmost fringes of Sible Hedingham
- Opportunities to enhance the semi-natural habitat associated with the stream valley running east-west across the Parcel, to enhance wildlife corridors within the Parcel
- Safeguard the landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees, with a number of fields reflecting the pre 18th century & 18th-19th century pattern of enclosure
- Reinforce the landscape framework on the eastern boundary, to limit/filter views of potential development from properties on Swan Street

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3c Lamb Lane

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							15

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)			✓			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) = 40.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- The setting of the Alderford Conservation Area, and properties on Queen Street within it, directly to the east of the Parcel, to be safeguarded as part of any potential development proposals
- Opportunities to enhance the semi-natural habitat associated with the stream valley running east-west along the southern boundary, to enhance wildlife corridors within the Parcel
- Safeguard the landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees, with a number of fields reflecting the 18th-19th century pattern of enclosure
- Reinforce the landscape framework on the western boundary with additional hedge and tree planting, to provide clear definition between the Parcel and the stream valley landscape to the west

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3d Southey Green

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			3
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Sub total							15.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Sub total							2
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2+ 3) = 32.5							

Overall Capacity: Low

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 3e Hedingham Road

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							16.5

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)				✓		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) = 40.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- The setting of the Alderford Conservation Area, which meets the northernmost tip of the Parcel, to be safeguarded as part of any potential development proposals
- Safeguard the landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees, with a number of fields reflecting the pre 18th century pattern of enclosure
- New hedge planting to field boundaries would provide wildlife linkages in the farmland landscape

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 4a Foxborough Hill

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)	✓					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) = 38.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Safeguard the landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees, with a number of fields reflecting the 18th to 19th century pattern of enclosure
- Reinforce hedgerow planting to field boundaries and alongside the Halstead Road, to provide wildlife linkages in the farmland landscape
- Create footpath connections across the Parcel, to improve access to the river valley landscape from the southern fringes of the village

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 4b Eckfield Farm
 Settlement: Sible Hedingham
 Landscape
 Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)		✓				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) = 39.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Existing vegetation around the sewage works to be retain and managed to provide an effective visual screen
- Safeguard the landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees, with a number of fields reflecting the 18th to 19th century pattern of enclosure
- Reinforce the landscape framework on the eastern boundary of the Parcel, to reinforce the definition between the valley slopes within the Parcel and the floodplain landscape to the east

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 4c Wash Farm

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)				✓		3
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Condition	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
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 to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Safeguard the setting of the Alderford Conservation Area which lies directly to the west of the Parcel
- Reinforce the landscape framework on the eastern boundary of the Parcel, to reinforce the definition between the valley slopes within the Parcel and the floodplain landscape to the east
- Opportunities to absorb the geometry of the agricultural reservoir to the east of Wash Farm into the farmland landscape through tree and shrub planting that responds to the lower valley slopes and former network of field enclosure within the Parcel
- Create footpath connections across the Parcel, to improve access to the river valley landscape and Hull's Mill from the southern fringes of the village
- The tranquil nature of the narrow lane to Hull's Mill and fording point on the eastern boundary to be safeguarded, and new hedge planting undertaken to restore a former landscape feature

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 4d Swan Street & Potter Street

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)					✓	1
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							23.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 41.5							

Overall Capacity: Medium

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Safeguard the setting of the Alderford Conservation Area which lies directly to the west of the Parcel
- Any development proposals to reflect the linear form of the landscape framework in the Parcel, with a pattern of rectangular fields arranged perpendicular to the river valley corridor to the east
- Safeguard the landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and blocks of trees, with a number of fields reflecting the pre 18th century pattern of enclosure
- Reinforce the landscape framework on the eastern boundary of the Parcel, to reinforce the definition between the valley slopes within the Parcel and the floodplain landscape to the east

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 5a Sheepcot Road

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie	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 conserve
---	-----------------------------

Capacity analysis							
Criteria	Importance	A	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)				✓		3
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Condition	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Sub total							15.5

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)				✓		3
Sub total							12
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Sub total							2
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2+ 3) = 29.5							

Overall Capacity: Low

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 5b Little Lodge Farm

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			3
Sub total							16

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)					✓	1
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)				✓		3
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Sub total							13
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Sub total							2
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 31							

Overall Capacity: Low

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 5c Maiden Ley Farm

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)		✓				4
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Sub total							18.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 37							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Safeguard the landscape framework of fields enclosed by hedgerows and trees, with a number of fields reflecting the 18th to 19th century pattern of enclosure
- New tree and hedge planting/management to provide wildlife linkages between the floodplain of the River Colne to the west, and the farmland landscape to the east. Vegetation along the western boundary to be strengthened to reinforce the edge of the floodplain and boundary with the adjacent setting area

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 5d Alderford Farm

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

Strength of character/condition			
Strength of character	Weak	Moderate	Strong
S1/ Impact of landform	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S2/ Impact of landcover *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S3/ Historic pattern *	Insignificant	Apparent	Dominant/Prominent
S4/ Tranquillity	Discordant	Moderate	Tranquil
S5/ Distinctiveness /rarity	Frequent	Unusual	Unique/rare
S6/ Visual unity	Incoherent	Coherent	Unified
Totals * Prime character if a tie		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	B	C	D	E	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)			✓			3
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)	✓					7.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Sub total							20.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Sub total							3
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 39							

Overall Capacity: Medium to Low

Guidelines for development and mitigation measures:

- Opportunities to improve access to the Colne Valley Path that follows the edge of the floodplain on the eastern side of the village. The path is currently imperceptible within the Parcel, sitting in a tree and hedge lined cutting
- If new development is necessary within the Parcel, it should safeguard the setting of the existing cottages at Alderford Farm in the eastern fringes of the Parcel
- Reinforce the existing vegetation cover within the Parcel, reinforcing the edge of the floodplain and boundary with the adjacent setting area

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 5e Purlshill

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

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

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

Capacity analysis							
Criteria	Importance	A	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Condition	Secondary (x1)					✓	1
Sub total							13.5

2/ Visual features							
Openness to public view	Secondary (x1)			✓			3
Openness to private view	Secondary (x1)		✓				4
Relationship with existing urban conurbation	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Prevention of coalescence	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)			✓			4.5
Sub total							17.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)				✓		2
Sub total							2
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2 + 3) = 33							

Overall Capacity: Low

Landscape capacity appraisal form

Parcel No.: 6 River Colne

Settlement: Sible Hedingham

Landscape

Surveyor: SL

Date surveyed: February 2015

Parcel description

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

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

Capacity analysis							
Criteria	Importance	A	B	C	D	E	Total
1/ Landscape features							
Slope analysis	Primary (x1.5)				✓		3
Vegetation enclosure	Primary (x1.5)		✓				6
Complexity / scale	Secondary (x1)					✓	1
Condition	Secondary (x1)					✓	1
Sub total							11

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)			✓			4.5
Scope to mitigate the development	Primary (x1.5)					✓	1.5
Sub total							18.5
3/ Landscape value							
Strength of character and condition	Secondary (x1)					✓	1
Sub total							1
Overall capacity profile (1 + 2+ 3) = 30.5							

Overall Capacity: Low