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1. Introduction

1.1. The purpose of this appraisal is to identify if there are any areas of land around the existing Little Kimble settlement, but outside of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Green Belt, that could be brought forward for residential development as part of the new Local Plan. The study area is identified in the map below. This appraisal comprises an assessment of the landscape sensitivity and capacity of any areas of land with potential for development within the study area, taking particular account of the setting of the Chilterns AONB, which is immediately adjacent to the east.
2. Process

2.1. Main considerations:
- Landscape character is described in the Wycombe District Landscape Character Assessment (LUC, Oct 2011) which shows that three landscape character areas (LCA) fall within the study area (LCA 8.13 Longwick Vale, LCA 10.6 Risborough Chalk Foothills, LCA 11.3 Coombe Hill & Whiteleaf Chalk Escarpment).
- Contours indicate high likelihood of strong intervisibility of study area with AONB (the AONB falls within LCA 10.6 Risborough Chalk Foothills and LCA 11.3 Coombe Hill & Whiteleaf Chalk Escarpment).
- Flat topography and limited boundary vegetation means landscape of LCA 8.13 Longwick Vale (in which study area is located) is characterised by long, open views.
- Bucks & Milton Keynes Historic Landscape Character assessment (HLC) shows historic character of field parcels in the study area are a mix of pre-18th century enclosures, 19th century parliamentary enclosures and 20th-century prairie fields.
- Two long distance paths cross the study area (North Bucks Way and Aylesbury Ring) plus a comprehensive network of other public rights of way (PRoW).

2.2. Stage 1 - Following a desk and field survey of the landscape outside of Little Kimble settlement, some field parcels in the area of search were immediately discounted from further appraisal. These included any that were highly visible from major public viewpoints in the AONB (Whiteleaf Cross, Coombe Hill and Beacon Hill) and any fields which had surviving evidence of their pre-18th century enclosure field pattern, being more likely to have higher landscape sensitivities.

2.3. Stage 2 - a landscape sensitivity and capacity study (LSCS) was carried out on the remaining nine field parcels within the area of search (Fig.2), which included consideration of views from the long distance paths. These assessments are included in the pages to follow. The methodology for the LSCS is included at Appendix 1.

2.4. This LSCS is a high level document that has been conducted to highlight landscape sensitivities within the field parcels and to inform potential (not final) capacities for development. It is not a landscape and visual assessment (LVA), which would be carried out at a later stage to assess the impact of any specific development proposal. The results of an LVA would inform the final capacity of each field parcel and the layout of any development.
Fig. 2 Study area with nine field parcels identified for further assessment.
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3. **Landscape** Sensitivity and Capacity Assessments.

**SITE:** Field parcel 1.

**ASSESSMENT:** (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH  
Long views in all directions across flat, open arable field. Strong intervisibility with Chilterns escarpment on high ground to east. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. Long views out towards Aylesbury to north west. Aylesbury Ring long distance path runs through site. Mitigation of some development possible without impacting on public views. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW  
Large scale pre-18\textsuperscript{th} century regular enclosure. Flat topography, no historic or conservation designations, good condition (productive agricultural land). Low level boundary hedge with few trees. Noticeable road noise from B4009. Some existing housing backs onto site along part of south-eastern boundary and a single dwelling on the south-western boundary. Limited light pollution. |
| 4.   | Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM (Combination of steps 2+3) |
5. **Wider Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM**
   Good physical and visual links with adjacent settlement. Strong visual links with wider landscape including AONB and contributes to rural setting of Smoky Row.

6. **Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM (Combination of steps 4+5)**

7. **Landscape Value = MEDIUM**
   Landscape undesigned and commonly found with no protected species or habitats. However, in good condition and has value to local community for recreation through long distance PRoW connecting with nationally important landscapes.

8. **Landscape Capacity: MEDIUM (Combination of steps 6+7)**
   The area could be able to accommodate areas of new development in some parts, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing development and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are landscape constraints and therefore key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

**CONCLUSION:**
3.1. The assessment finds the site to have MEDIUM capacity for development.

3.2. The visual sensitivity of the site resulting from the PRoW running through the site is a key consideration, as is the contribution of the site to the rural landscape when viewed from the Chilterns escarpment in the AONB. This visual sensitivity has limited the capacity of this site.

3.3. These sensitivities lessen in the south-western corner which is also influenced by existing residential development and road noise from B4009. There is potential to focus development in this area where impact on views from the AONB are likely to be limited and the long, open views from the site out towards the Chiltern escarpment to the south-east and Aylesbury to the north-west would not be affected (see Fig. 12).
**SITE:** Field parcel 2.

![Fig 4. Field parcel 2.](image)

**ASSESSMENT:** (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM  
No public access onto site but passing, open views into site from Marsh Rd and Kimblewick Rd. Generally strong intervisibility with Chilterns escarpment on high ground to east although less so in eastern side of site where mature vegetation around Little Kimble filters views into site. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. From site, long views available in all directions across flat, open arable field. From site, lower levels of escarpment and existing development in Little Kimble screened by mature trees and hedgerows associated with historic field pattern and settlement of Little Kimble. Long views out towards Aylesbury to north west. Mitigation of some development possible without impacting on character or views. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW  
Large scale prairie field. Flat topography, no historic or conservation designations, good condition (agriculturally productive). Simple pattern. Low boundary hedgerows with few boundary trees except adjacent to settlement to east and a few on top north-western boundary near cricket pitch. Distant road noise perceivable but no visually or audibly intrusive features and no light pollution. |
4. Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW (Combination of steps 2+3)

5. Wider Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH
   The site forms part of the rural setting of Little Kimble when approaching from the north and in views from the AONB, with limited visual links and no PRoW links with the settlement. Adjacent PRoW in the south link out to wider rural landscape to the south and east, and towards Smoky Row settlement in the south. Good habitat links to the wider landscape via hedgerows. In both landscape character terms and physically the site shares stronger links with the rural landscape to the north, south and west than it does to Little Kimble in the east.

6. Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM (Combination of steps 4+5)

7. Landscape Value = MEDIUM/LOW
   Landscape undesignated and commonly found with no protected species, habitats or public access. In good condition and a limited area in north-east makes contribution to rural setting of settlement.

8. Landscape Capacity: MEDIUM/HIGH (Combination of steps 6+7)
   There are is able to accommodate development, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. Certain landscape and visual features in the area may require protection.

CONCLUSION:

3.4. The assessment finds the site to have MEDIUM/HIGH capacity for development.

3.5. The rural, tranquil nature and strong intervisibility of most of the site with the AONB are key considerations. The visual sensitivity reduces on the eastern side and the lack of public access and any landscape or ecological designations results in an overall reduction in sensitivity in these areas.

3.6. In landscape terms there is potential to focus development in this area, adjacent to the existing settlement, where sensitivities are reduced and where there would be limited impact on views from the AONB (see fig. 12). However the more southern area might be challenging in terms of access and connectivity with the existing settlement, whereas the norther area could be directly accessed from Marsh Road. Any development should have regard to the lower density of adjacent housing and the rural setting of the settlement.
SITE: field parcel 3.

ASSESSMENT: (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH  
     Intermittent, close views over whole site over/through hedgerow from adjacent long distance footpath North Bucks Way. Good intervisibility with Chilterns escarpment to the east. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. Close views of whole site visible over/through roadside hedgerow from B4009 and from open amenity area in centre of village on the eastern boundary. Mitigation of some development possible without impacting on character or views. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM  
     Medium scale, pre 18th century irregular enclosure. Flat topography, no historic or conservation designations but some notable bird species recorded using site. Good condition (agriculturally productive). Simple pattern. Boundary hedge around most of field with intermittent trees on some sides. Mature line of trees alongside part of the B4009 are of particular note although are outside the field boundary. Very noticeable road noise from B4009. No light pollution. Some existing housing and associated land backs on to the site along the north-eastern boundary. |
| 4.   | Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH (Combination of steps 2+3) |
5. Wider Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH
No physical public access but close public views over site from several directions. Strong visual links with wider landscape including AONB. Good habitat links to wider landscape via hedgerow and trees. Contributes to rural setting to Smokey Row in views when approaching from south-west.

6. Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH (Combination of steps 4+5)

7. Landscape Value = MEDIUM
Landscape undesignated and commonly found with some potential to support protected species. In good condition and makes significant contribution to rural setting of settlement.

8. Landscape Capacity: MEDIUM/LOW (Combination of steps 6+7)
The site may be able to accommodate some development but it will be severely constrained by the need to avoid any adverse impact on the landscape character and providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are landscape constraints and therefore the key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

CONCLUSION:
3.7. The assessment finds the site to have MEDIUM/LOW capacity for development.

3.8. The visual sensitivity of much of the site in close views from the adjacent PRoW, the busy B4009 and the open amenity area in centre of village is a key consideration, as is its contribution to the rural landscape when viewed from the Chilterns escarpment in the AONB. The mature trees that line the road are also a key consideration as they make a particularly positive contribution to the street scene and contribute to the special sense of place.

3.9. Sensitivities are reduced on the eastern side, where there are more urban influences from existing development and the road network. There is potential to focus development in this area where impact on views from the AONB are likely to be limited and there are good connections with the existing settlement (see Fig.12).
SITE: field parcel 4.

Fig 6. Field parcel 4.

ASSESSMENT: (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

Table. 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH  
Open, expansive, close views over whole site from B4009 and long distance PRoW North Bucks Way which crosses site. Strong intervisibility with Chilterns escarpment on high ground to south and east. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. Mitigation of some development potentially possible without impacting on character or views. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW  
Large scale prairie field. Flat topography, no historic or conservation designations but some notable species including badgers, western polecat and birds recorded as using site. Good condition (productive). Simple pattern. No boundary hedgerow along B4009 near to Smokey Row but more boundary vegetation adjacent railway along south-eastern boundary and further away from settlement to south. Existing housing backs onto site along north-east boundary. Noticeable road noise from B4009. Little light pollution. |
4. Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM (Combination of steps 2+3)

5. Wider Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH
   Strong physical and visual links with wider landscape via PRoW through site and intervisibility with AONB. Good habitat links to wider landscape in south and east via hedgerow and trees. Contributes to rural setting to Smoky Row in views when approaching from south-west.

6. Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH (Combination of steps 4+5)

7. Landscape Value = MEDIUM
   Landscape is undesignated and commonly found but is in good condition and protected species recorded using site. Has value to local community for recreation through long distance PRoW connecting with nationally important landscapes and makes significant contribution to rural setting of settlement.

8. Landscape Capacity: MEDIUM/LOW (Combination of steps 6+7)
   The site may be able to accommodate some development but it will be severely constrained by the need to avoid any adverse impact on the landscape character and providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are landscape constraints and therefore the key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

CONCLUSION:
3.10. The assessment finds the site to have MEDIUM/LOW capacity for development.

3.11. The visual sensitivity of the site in close views from the PRoW that runs through the site and the adjacent, busy B4009, is a key consideration, as is its contribution to the rural landscape when viewed from the Chilterns escarpment in the AONB. Along with this, the contribution the site makes to the rural setting of Smoky Row when approaching from the south-west limits the capacity of this site.

3.12. Sensitivities are reduced on the north-eastern side, where there are more urban influences from adjacent development. There is potential to focus development in this area where impact on views from the AONB are likely to be more limited and new development would be seen against the back drop of existing development when viewed from the PRoW (see fig.12).
**SITE:** field parcel 5.

**ASSESSMENT:** (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW  
Glimpsed close views into site through hedgerow from adjacent long distance PRoW the Aylesbury Ring which runs along northern boundary. Glimpsed, fleeting views from railway line along eastern boundary. Good intervisibility with Chilterns escarpment on high ground to east. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. Mitigation of some development possible without impacting on character or views. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW  
Small scale paddock, part of larger field. Fairly flat topography, no historic or conservation designations, reasonable condition. Simple pattern. Good boundary vegetation alongside railway to south-east and reasonably intact hedgerow and trees along north-east boundary with PRoW. Housing backing onto site along south-western boundary and post a |
wire fencing separating paddock from wider field. Noticeable road noise from B4009. Some limited light pollution from housing.

4. Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW (Combination of steps 2+3)

5. Wider Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW
   Some visual links to the wider landscape but no public access and influenced by adjacent housing along south-western boundary and railway on south-eastern boundary. Good habitat links to wider landscape in south and east via hedgerow and trees, particularly along railway.

6. Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW (Combination of steps 4+5)

7. Landscape Value = MEDIUM/LOW
   Landscape is undesignated and commonly found. It is in reasonable condition with no known protected species or habitats or notable local value.

8. Landscape Capacity: HIGH (Combination of steps 6+7)
   Much of the site is able to accommodate development providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.

CONCLUSION:

3.13. The assessment finds the site to have HIGH capacity for development.

3.14. The intervisibility between the site and the AONB is a key consideration, as are the views from the adjacent PRoW, making the north-eastern side the more sensitive part of the site.

3.15. However, the overall sensitivity of the site is reduced by the urban influences from existing adjacent development and the disturbance of the site from the existing land uses.

3.16. There is potential to accommodate development over much of the site, with new development being seen against the backdrop of the existing settlement in views from the AONB (see fig.12). By incorporating new, structural planting through the site and using lower development densities on the more sensitive, north-eastern side, impacts on views from the AONB and the adjacent PRoW could be mitigated to an acceptable degree.
**SITE:** field parcel 6.

**ASSESSMENT:** (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = HIGH  
Open, expansive views over whole of site and up to the Chilterns escarpment from B4009 and long distance PRoW, the Aylesbury Ring, along south-western boundary. Strong intervisibility with Chilterns escarpment on high ground to east. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. Difficulty in providing mitigation for any development as site is so exposed to close views and there is no existing screening vegetation along B4009 or PRoW to enhance. South and western parts of the site are openly visible from Beacon Hill on the Chilterns escarpment in the AONB. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM  
Medium scale, prairie field. Fairly flat topography, no historic or conservation designations, good condition (agriculturally productive). Simple pattern. Good boundary vegetation alongside railway to south-east, adjacent paddocks to south-west and housing |
to north-east. No frontage boundary vegetation alongside B4009 to north-west. Noticeable road noise from B4009. No light pollution.

4. Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH (Combination of steps 2+3)

5. Wider Landscape Sensitivity = HIGH
   Strong visual links to the wider landscape and strong physical links with wider landscape through PRoW on site. Good habitat links to wider landscape in south and east via hedgerow and trees, particularly along railway. Contributes to rural setting of Smoky Row in views when approaching from north-east and openness of site facilitates views up to Chilterns escarpment when passing by.

6. Landscape Sensitivity = HIGH (Combination of steps 4+5)

7. Landscape Value = MEDIUM
   Landscape is undesignated and commonly found with no known protected species or habitats. However, it is in good condition and makes a significant contribution to the rural setting of Smoky Row, facilitating long views up to Chilterns escarpment.

8. Landscape Capacity: LOW (Combination of steps 6+7)
   The site could not accommodate areas of new development without a significant and adverse impact on the landscape character. Occasional very small scale development may be possible, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.

**CONCLUSION:**

3.17. The assessment finds the site to have LOW capacity for development.

3.18. The openness of the site which facilitates views up to the Chilterns escarpment when in or travelling through the settlement is a key consideration. The role of the site in providing a rural setting for Smoky Row when approaching from the north-west is also key.

3.19. The sensitivity of the site is high overall, particularly because of the intervisibility with the AONB and the openness of the site facilitating unfettered views over the foothills and up to the Chilterns escarpment in the AONB. No development areas are proposed on this site.
**SITE**: field parcel 7.

**ASSESSMENT**: (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

Table. 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH  
Views over much of site from A4010 in south, partly from PRoW in east and west, and intermittently from passengers using railway to west. Strong intervisibility with well-used public vantage points on Chilterns escarpment to south-east. Higher ground in eastern part of site is particularly exposed. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. From site, views out over wider landscape available including up to the Chilterns escarpment, particularly from higher ground in eastern part. Lower levels of escarpment screened by ribbon development along A4010 and mature vegetation associated with the more historic field boundaries in south and south-west. Mitigation through tree planting possible without impacting on character or views depending on numbers and location as tree cover not characteristic of Longwick LCA. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/LOW |
Large scale, open prairie field with shoulder of higher ground in eastern part, dropping westwards. Lowest point in southern corner adjacent to stream. No historic or conservation designations but notable species recorded including black poplar and badgers. Good condition (agriculturally productive). Simple pattern with low boundary hedgerows on most sides, sometimes gappy. More mature vegetation along residential boundaries on southern edge and associated with stream habitat in southern corner, where there is also a flood risk. Noticeable road noise from well used A4010 and intermittent noise from railway. Some visual intrusion from farm buildings on highest part of site but very limited light pollution.

**4.** Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM (Combination of steps 2+3)

**5.** Wider Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM
This dispersed settlement has spread along A4010 in form of ribbon development which has encroached into site along south-eastern edge. Strong ecological links with wider countryside via stream and railway vegetation, and recreational links via PRoW. In landscape character terms the site shares stronger links with the rural landscape than Little Kimble.

**6.** Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM (Combination of steps 4+5)

**7.** Landscape Value = MEDIUM
Landscape undesignated and commonly found but in good condition and known to support notable and protected species near stream. Has local value in contributing to rural setting of settlement and through PRoW connecting to nationally important landscapes.

**8.** Landscape Capacity: MEDIUM (Combination of steps 6+7)
The area could be able to accommodate areas of new development in some parts, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing development and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are landscape constraints and therefore key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

**CONCLUSION:**
3.20. The assessment finds the site to have MEDIUM capacity for development.

3.21. The visual sensitivity of the site resulting from strong intervisibility with the AONB and the two PRoWs is a key consideration, as is the ecological sensitivity of the stream habitat in the south-west of the site.
3.22. Sensitivities are lower along the south-eastern edge which is already influenced by the ribbon development which forms part of this dispersed settlement and the noise from the well-used A4010.

3.23. There is potential to focus development in this area where intervisibility with the AONB is limited by the mature vegetation in the vicinity of the Aylesbury Road. Care would need to be taken on the south-western edge nearer the stream habitat. A softer edge with new planting would be required along the boundary with the remaining open countryside to mitigate impacts on views from the two PRoW.
SITE: field parcel 8.

ASSESSMENT: (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

Table 8.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM  
Views over some of the site from Marsh Rd adjacent. Views into site from PRoW to east (through site) and north (nearby), and from rail passengers, are limited by intervening vegetation. Good, but distant, intervisibility of western fields with well-used public vantage points on Chilterns escarpment in AONB to south-east. Site forms part of wider rural landscape visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. From site, views to upper levels of Chilterns escarpment and out over flat fields in Vale to north and west. Views east foreshortened by railway embankment and stream vegetation. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM  
Pre 18th century irregular enclosure in long field along eastern side of site, adjacent to stream. Remaining land 19th century parliamentary enclosure. Field pattern intact. Flat topography, no historic or conservation designations but notable plant species recorded and stream habitat likely to support protected species. Flood risk adjacent stream. Pasture land in good condition. Simple, relatively small scale field pattern with more variety in |

Fig 10. Field parcel 8.
older field system between stream and railway. Some intermittent noise from railway but little road noise or light pollution. Dark and tranquil.

4. Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM (Combination of steps 2+3)

5. Wider Landscape Sensitivity = HIGH
Site is beyond Little Kimble settlement and forms part of rural setting for it. Strong ecological links with wider countryside via stream and railway vegetation, and recreational links via PRoW to wider network to north over Vale and south to AONB. In landscape character terms, shares stronger links with rural landscape than with Little Kimble.

6. Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH (Combination of steps 4+5)

7. Landscape Value = MEDIUM
Landscape undesignated. Largely more common 19th century enclosure but historically interesting field system on eastern side. Site in good condition and known to support notable and protected species near stream. Has local value in contributing to rural setting of settlement and through PRoW connecting to nationally important landscapes.

8. Landscape Capacity: MEDIUM/LOW (Combination of steps 6+7)
The site may be able to accommodate some development but it will be severely constrained by the need to avoid adverse impact on the landscape character, and providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.

CONCLUSION:
3.24. The assessment finds the site to have MEDIUM/LOW capacity for development.

3.25. The sensitivity of the pre 18th-century field system on the eastern side of the site is a key consideration because of its ecological and historical interest, and its prominence in views from the PRoW.

3.26. These sensitivities lessen in the western fields which are distant in views from the AONB. However, the whole site has little influence from the nearby settlement and is strongly rural in character, providing a rural setting for Little Kimble. An extension of the settlement into this area is not considered appropriate at this time and no development areas are proposed on this site.
SITE: field parcel 9.

![Fig 11. Field parcel 9.](image)

ASSESSMENT: (follows methodology in Appendix 1)

Table 9.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify field parcel boundary (see Fig. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.   | Visual Sensitivity = MEDIUM  
Views over some of the site from Marsh Rd (east) and Kimblewick Rd (west) adjacent. No public access to site. Good intervisibility with well-used public vantage points on Chilterns escarpment in AONB to south-east. Site forms part of wider rural landscape distantly visible from key viewpoints up on the Chiltern escarpment. From site, views to upper levels of Chilterns escarpment and out over flat fields in Vale in all directions. |
| 3.   | Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM  
Flat topography, geometric field pattern of 19th-century parliamentary enclosures is intact. Boundaries mainly low hedgerows with scattered trees. Archaeological Notification Site in south-east corner and notable plant, mammal and insect species recorded using site, including badgers. Little road noise or light pollution. Tranquil and dark with strong rural character. |
4. **Landscape Character Sensitivity = MEDIUM** (Combination of steps 2+3)

5. **Wider Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH**
   - The site is distinctly separate and beyond the Little Kimble settlement and forms part of the rural landscape. Although it has no recreational links and limited ecological links with wider landscape, the intervisibility with the AONB and lack of urban influences makes its relationship stronger with the rural landscape than with Little Kimble.

6. **Landscape Sensitivity = MEDIUM/HIGH** (Combination of steps 4+5)

7. **Landscape Value = MEDIUM**
   - The landscape is undesignated, commonly found and has no public access. However, it supports some protected species and some historic value is evident by the archaeological notification site.

8. **Landscape Capacity: MEDIUM/LOW** (Combination of steps 6+7)
   - The site may be able to accommodate some development but it will be severely constrained by the need to avoid any adverse impact on the landscape character and providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are landscape constraints and therefore the key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

**CONCLUSION:**

3.27. The assessment finds the site to have MEDIUM/LOW capacity for development.

3.28. The strong rural character and its relative remoteness from any settlement raise the overall sensitivity of the site and is a key consideration.

3.29. Its visual sensitivity is reduced in the southern part, which has greater vegetative screening from the AONB, but this area is strongly rural in character, providing a rural setting for Little Kimble and is separated from Little Kimble by field parcel 2. The site would not be suitable for development in isolation and an extension of the settlement into this area is not considered appropriate at this time. No development areas are proposed on this site.
4. **Summary**

The results of the sensitivity and capacity assessment are summarised in Figure 12 below, along with the areas considered to have potential to accommodate development. Six of the nine field parcels are found to have some potential development areas. Further assessment would be required to inform final housing numbers, layouts and mitigation to ensure any development sits comfortably within the landscape around Little Kimble and the setting of the AONB.

Fig. 12. Field Parcel Capacity Plan.
Appendix 1: METHODOLOGY
Methodology

1.1 This methodology is based on:
- ‘An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment’ (Natural England, 2014)

1.2 It also draws on the method used in:
- ‘Landscape Capacity Assessment for Sites on the Edge of Larger Villages in South Oxfordshire’ by Kirkham Landscape Planning LTD.
- ‘Landscape Assessment of Strategic Sites’ (WDC, 2014)

1.3 The methodology is based on similar studies for other local authorities and has been tested at both examination in public and through the LDF public consultation process.

1.4 As in current best practice, sensitivity and capacity should be assessed against a specific change, and for this study, all of the sites have been assessed for their sensitivity and capacity to residential development.

1.5 Best practice guidance also recognises that a landscape with a high sensitivity does not automatically mean that landscape has a low capacity for change, but that ‘capacity is all a question of the interaction between the sensitivity of the landscape, the type and amount of change and the way that the landscape is valued’ (Topic Paper 6, 2006, p12). Proposals for any development would need to include appropriate, detailed and specialist input into siting, layout and design. A full landscape and visual impact assessment should accompany further site-specific proposals. Other studies including ecology, archaeology, arboriculture, traffic, flooding may also be required to accompany specific proposals.

Appraisal process

1.6 Following a desk and field study where information about the site is collected, each site is assessed for its sensitivity and capacity by following the following steps.

Step 1: Identify boundary of area to be assessed

Step 2: Assessment of visual sensitivity (using matrix 1, notes in Table 1 and professional judgement)

Step 3: Assessment of landscape sensitivity (using matrix 2, notes in Table 2 and professional judgement)

Step 4: Determination of resulting landscape character sensitivity (combining steps 2 & 3 using matrix 3)

Step 5: Assessment of wider sensitivity (using criteria in para 1.10)

Step 6: Determination of resulting landscape sensitivity (combining steps 4 & 5 using matrix 4)

Step 7: Assessment of landscape value (using table 3)

Step 8: Determination of resulting landscape capacity (combining steps 6 & 7 using matrix 5)
Determination of Visual Sensitivity (Step 2)

1.7 The assessment considers the types of views (general visibility), the nature of the viewers (population) and the potential to mitigate visual impact on the identified viewpoints (mitigation). The level of visual sensitivity is influenced by the number of viewpoints, the level of exposure, the sensitivity of the viewers and the opportunities to mitigate the impact without harm to the landscape and visual attributes of the area. At this stage each level has been given a score from low = 1 to high = 5 and the scores are added up to help guide the final assessment which is based on professional judgement.

Matrix 1: Visual sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General visibility</th>
<th>L (1)</th>
<th>L/M (2)</th>
<th>M (3)</th>
<th>M/H (4)</th>
<th>H (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>L (1)</td>
<td>L/M (2)</td>
<td>M (3)</td>
<td>M/H (4)</td>
<td>H (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>L (1)</td>
<td>L/M (2)</td>
<td>M (3)</td>
<td>M/H (4)</td>
<td>H (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visual Sensitivity

- 3-4 = low;
- 5-7 = med/low;
- 8-10 = med;
- 11-13 = med/high;
- 14-15 = high

Table 1: Notes on Visual Sensitivity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Higher sensitivity</th>
<th>Lower sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Visibility</strong></td>
<td>Sequenced and exposed views</td>
<td>Fleeting and limited views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of site area visible</td>
<td>Little of site area visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site is a key focus in available wider</td>
<td>Site is an incidental part of wider views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site includes prominent and key</td>
<td>No landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important vistas or panoramas in/out</td>
<td>Unimportant vistas or panoramas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prominent skyline</td>
<td>Not part of skyline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong intervisibility from adjacent landscapes or sensitive viewpoints</td>
<td>Limited intervisibility from adjacent landscapes or sensitive viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>Large extent or range of key sensitive</td>
<td>Lack of sensitive receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large number of people see site</td>
<td>Few can see site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key view from a sensitive receptor</td>
<td>Views of site are unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site is part of valued view</td>
<td>Site does not form a part of a valued view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site in key views to/ across/out</td>
<td>Not part of setting of settlement view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation not very feasible</td>
<td>Mitigation possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation would interrupt key views</td>
<td>Would not obscure key views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation would damage local</td>
<td>Mitigation would not harm local character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determination of Landscape Sensitivity (Step 3)

1.8 The assessment considers the natural physical factors which make up the landscape character of the site, the cultural and built-form and the perceptual features. The level of sensitivity is influenced by existing landscape interest and diversity, the presence of historically important features and cultural associations, level of access, perceptions of tranquillity and strong landscape pattern. At this stage each level has been given a score from low = 1 to high = 5 and the scores are added up to help guide the final assessment which is based on professional judgement.

Matrix 2: Landscape sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural factors</th>
<th>L (1)</th>
<th>L/M (2)</th>
<th>M (3)</th>
<th>M/H (4)</th>
<th>H (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td>L (1)</td>
<td>L/M (2)</td>
<td>M (3)</td>
<td>M/H (4)</td>
<td>H (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual features</td>
<td>L (1)</td>
<td>L/M (2)</td>
<td>M (3)</td>
<td>M/H (4)</td>
<td>H (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Sensitivity</strong></td>
<td>3-4 = low; 5-7 = med/low; 8-10 = med; 11-13 = med/high; 14-15 = high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Notes on Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Higher sensitivity</th>
<th>Lower sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Varied landform and distinctive features of the area</td>
<td>Uniform landform and lack of topographical features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant water feature(s)</td>
<td>No water feature(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant tree or vegetation cover</td>
<td>Significant tree or vegetation cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong hedgerow structure with or without hedgerow trees</td>
<td>Weak hedgerow structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of valued wildlife habitats and/or designated sites</td>
<td>Absence of valued wildlife habitats and/or designated sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse mosaic of habitats</td>
<td>Little ecological diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High potential to support protected/notable species and habitats</td>
<td>Low potential to support protected/notable species and habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive contribution to wider landscape</td>
<td>Limited contribution to wider landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rare or valuable landscape resource</td>
<td>Widespread or well catered landscape resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronounced Geology</td>
<td>Lack of geological features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soils significantly contribute to landscape features</td>
<td>Soils are not an important feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area in floodplain or prone to flooding</td>
<td>Area not in floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Evidence of surviving part of an historic landscape</td>
<td>No evidence of historic landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complex historic landscape pattern with good time depth</td>
<td>Simple modern landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation area and/or listed buildings present or their setting</td>
<td>Conservation area and/or listed buildings or their setting not present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Determination of Landscape Character Sensitivity (Step 4)

1.9 The landscape sensitivity and visual sensitivity are combined, as shown in matrix 3, to give the landscape character sensitivity.

**Matrix 3: Landscape character sensitivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptual</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Med/High</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Med/Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument present</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument not present</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/L</td>
<td>M/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally distinctive built form and pattern</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic built form</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of visible social cultural associations</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social cultural associations</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access land or common land present</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No open access land or common land present</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area well used or appreciated by the public</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area inaccessible by the public</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important PRoW present</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No PRoW present</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful and tranquil</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible and audible signs of human activity</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet area</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy area</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of detracting features and/or intrusive elements</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detracting features and/or intrusive elements present</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark skies</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of light pollution</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open / large scale landscape</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed visually contained landscape</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified landscape with strong landscape structure</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented and/or featureless landscape</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Determination of Wider Sensitivity (Step 5)

1.10 Steps 2 to 4 have led to a comprehensive assessment of the intrinsic landscape sensitivity of the individual sites. However the sensitivity of each of these to development is also affected by its importance and contribution to the adjacent wider landscape as well as the influence of patterns and uses within the settlement edge. In addition, the wider sensitivity is informed by existing landscape character assessments. The assessment of the wider sensitivity of each site is aided by the following criteria:

- **Low wider sensitivity** – The site is heavily influenced by the built form of the adjacent urban settlement and not an important part of the adjacent wider landscape
- **Medium/Low wider sensitivity** – The site is heavily influenced by urban fringe uses and has views of the some parts of the adjacent urban settlement but shares some of the characteristics of the adjacent wider landscape
• **Medium wider sensitivity** – The site is partly influenced by urban fringe uses but shares many of the characteristics of the wider landscape, with good physical and visual links to the wider landscape

• **Medium/High wider sensitivity** – The site has strong physical and visual links to the wider landscape and these outweigh any minor impacts from the adjacent urban settlement

• **High wider sensitivity** – The site is an important part of the wider landscape with which it has strong visual and landscape links. The nearby settlement has little impact on the site.

**Determination of Overall Landscape Sensitivity (Step 6)**

1.11 The overall landscape sensitivity is determined by combining the landscape character sensitivity with the wider sensitivity as shown in matrix 4. This includes the contribution of the site to the wider landscape and settlement edge pattern.

**Matrix 4: Overall Landscape sensitivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Character Sensitivity</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Med/High</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Med/Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/High</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>L/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>M/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/Low</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/L</td>
<td>M/L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Med/Low</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med/High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Determination of Landscape Value (Step 7)**

**Table 3: Landscape Value Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Typical criteria</th>
<th>Typical scale</th>
<th>Typical examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High**  | High importance (or quality) and rarity. No or limited potential for substitution | International National | World Heritage Site  
National Park/ AONB  
SSSI  
EH Register of Parks and Gardens  
Grade I and II* listed buildings and their settings  
National recreational route or area e.g. Thames Path/Open Access |
| **Medium/High** | High importance (or quality) and rarity. Limited potential for substitution | National Regional Local | National Park/AONB  
AGLV/other local landscape designation  
Landscape value identified in SPD  
SINC/Conservation Areas  
Grade II listed buildings and their setting  
Local Wildlife sites |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Medium importance (or quality) and rarity. Limited potential for substitution</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Undesignated but value expressed through publications, VDS Local buildings of historic interest and their settings Local recreational facilities of landscape value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium/ Low</td>
<td>Low importance (or quality) or rarity</td>
<td>Local Site has some value (redeeming feature/benefit to the community)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low importance (or quality) or rarity</td>
<td>Local Area of little value and identified for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.12 The location of the site within a designated area, or the presence of a designated area within the site, is an important measure of the value society gives to the landscape of the site. These include landscape, historic and ecological designations and recreational routes at a national/international level, regional or district level, or at the local level.

1.13 However, the lack of a designation does not mean a site is not valued and consideration is given to areas, which are known to be of great value to the community.

**Determination of Landscape Capacity (Step 8)**

1.14 Landscape capacity is the ability, or otherwise, of the site to accommodate areas of residential development. The landscape capacity is determined by combining the overall landscape sensitivity with the landscape value as shown in Matrix 5.

Matrix 5: Landscape Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Landscape Sensitivity</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Med/High</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Med/Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Value</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Med/Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.15 The results from the matrix are subsequently tested against the following classifications for each level of landscape capacity.

- **Low capacity** – The site could not accommodate areas of new development without a significant and adverse impact on the landscape character. Occasional, very small scale development may be possible, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.

- **Low/Medium capacity** – The site may be able to accommodate some development but it will be severely constrained by the need to avoid any adverse impact on the landscape
character and providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are significant landscape constraints and therefore the key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

- **Medium capacity** - The site could be able to accommodate areas of new development in some parts, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. There are landscape constraints and therefore the key landscape and visual characteristics must be retained and enhanced.

- **Medium/High capacity** – The area is able to accommodate development, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas. Certain landscape and visual features in the area may require protection.

- **High capacity** – Much of the area is able accommodate significant areas of development, providing it has regard to the setting and form of existing settlement and the character and the sensitivity of adjacent landscape character areas.

1.16 Conclusions of the main landscape issues and influences affecting each site is provided at the end of each site assessment, along with a description of any areas on the site which may have capacity to accommodate residential development in landscape terms.

1.17 At the end of the document, the results of all the assessments are summarised on a plan which also indicates any areas where development should be focussed.

**Constraints and Limitations of the study**

1.18 The sites have been assessed from the publicly accessible viewpoints including the three main public viewpoints on the Chiltern escarpment, the local road network, the local public rights of way, particularly the long distance paths. Views from private houses and from private land have not been assessed.

1.19 General intervisibility between the sites and surrounding countryside and settlement has been noted, but a full landscape and visual impact assessment should accompany any further site-specific proposals.