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1. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 My name is Andrew Williams. I am a qualified Urban Designer, Chartered Landscape Architect and Managing Director of the Birmingham office of Capita Lovejoy (formerly Lovejoy), an international Town Planning, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture practice, containing over 20 professional staff in its Birmingham office.

1.1.2 Since gaining my first degree in Landscape Architecture from the University of Central England in 1996 I have worked as a landscape architect for Marchant Cole Associates, a Birmingham based architectural practice, before joining Lovejoy as a consultant in 2000, becoming an Associate in 2001, Associate Director in 2003 and Director in 2005. I gained a postgraduate diploma (distinction) in Urban Design from Oxford Brookes University in early 2005. I was appointed Managing Director of Capita Lovejoy’s Birmingham office in March 2008.

1.1.3 All of my professional work has been at the interface between built development and the public realm and I have advised on projects where the concept for development along with its built layout, massing, design, environment and visual impact are key considerations of its success. I have significant experience of undertaking urban design audits, Green Belt assessments, tall building assessments, townscape character appraisals, public realm assessments, heritage asset studies and visual impact assessments, both for Local Planning Authorities and the private sector.

1.1.4 I have worked on projects in most sectors, but have primarily focused on residential, leisure, commercial and mixed-use schemes. Recent and current projects of particular relevance to this inquiry include:

- Preparation of an urban design audit, heritage assessment and visual impact for a 3-10 storey mixed use scheme involving 730 residential units, 665m² of retail and 8,115m² of office use in Rainham, Essex (September 2010).

- Preparation of a landscape character and Green Belt assessment to inform the re-definition of the Green Belt boundary north of Harlow to accommodate over 10,000 new homes, in accordance with policy HA1 of the East of England Plan (2008-9).

- Urban design audit of an mixed use scheme in Basingstoke, comprising 200,000ft² College campus, 220,000m² retail and commercial development, 480 residential units
and associated public realm and public open space, resulting in a revised planning application which was permitted in August 2010.

- Preparation of an urban design audit, heritage and visual impact assessment for a 20 residential scheme of 450 residential units adjacent to Metropolitan Open Land in Harrow (March 2010).
- Preparation of an urban design audit including public realm and visual impact for a 10 storey mixed use scheme in Harrow (2009).
- Preparation of townscape and visual impact assessment, public realm design and urban design advice relating to three 8 storey mixed use buildings adjacent to Nottingham Castle, permitted in 2008.
- Masterplanner and urban design consultant as part of a successful competition entry with Places for People for Bilston Urban Village, a regeneration project in the West Midlands involving 900 residential units, office, cafes / bars, metro station and associated parkland and public realm (2008 – present).
- Winning competition entry for Birmingham City Council’s ‘Golden Square’ international competition for a new public square in the city’s historic Jewellery Quarter as the first project of the Big City Plan, this project formed the basis of a 2010 CABE, RTPI and English Heritage Building in Context seminar and has won a Landscape Institute award (September 2009 to present).

1.1.5 I have been appointed by Pinewood Studios Ltd to carry out an appraisal of the refused scheme, considering general urban design and landscape matters as well as the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding Green Belt. I was appointed in November 2010 and had no previous role in the project.

1.1.6 The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal in this proof of evidence is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

1.1.7 My evidence considers Green Belt, urban design, landscape and townscape assessment and arboricultural issues. In doing so, it addresses reasons for refusal no. 1, 2, 6 and 7 relating to outline planning application reference 09/00706/OUT, reasons for refusal 1, 2 and 5 relating to the detailed planning application reference 09/00707/FUL and reasons for refusal 1 and 2 relating to the detailed planning application reference 09/00708/FUL. Other reasons for
refusal (as well as separate views on the above reasons for refusal) are being considered by others.

1.2 Evidence Structure

1.2.1 This evidence is structured in the following way:

Section 2 provides a basic description of the scheme.

Section 3 identifies the relevant urban design, landscape and Green Belt policy considerations (national, regional and local), concluding with an overview of the key issues.

Section 4 contains an urban design audit of the appeal scheme

Section 5 assesses the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding Green Belt using a desktop appraisal and analysis of representative viewpoints.

Section 6 considers the landscape and townscape character of the area adjacent to the appeal scheme and the proposed developments impact on these character areas

Section 7 reviews the detailed landscape matters (specifically the impact of loss of vegetation on landscape amenity) relating to the three separate applications.

Section 8 considers South Buckinghamshire District Council’s reasons for refusal relating to Green Belt, landscape character and landscape amenity in light of evidence presented in the earlier sections, concluding with a brief assessment of how the proposed development performs against the relevant planning policies.

Section 9 provides an overall conclusion and summary of evidence.
2. **APPEAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION**

2.1.1 The Appeal scheme proposes the “Development of a living and working community for the creative industries comprising external streetscapes for filming, employment uses, educational provision, residential development, landscaping and re-profiling of a former landfill area, formal and informal recreation provision, local retail and community facilities, an energy centre, access roads, car parking, and ancillary facilities.”

2.1.2 Detailed planning applications were also made for; “Highway improvements to the Denham Road/ Seven Hills Road junction”, and; “Highway improvements to the Five Points Roundabout”.

2.1.3 A Design and Access Statement was submitted in support of this application, which explains the proposed development. It provides a commentary on the issues that have been assessed and the way in which they have been incorporated into the masterplanning process to inform the final proposed design.

2.2 **Elements of the Scheme**

2.2.1 The elements of the scheme are as follows:

**Streetscapes for Filming**

2.2.2 The development proposes up to 46 ha of land for the creation a living and working community for the creative industries. It is intended to include streets, which will be designed to represent a range of generic streetscapes from around the world, to provide a backdrop for use in film, television, advertisements, music videos, etc. and replicating the ambience of cities or areas of the world that are popular and frequently used in film and television.

2.2.3 All properties will have two entrances with the intention that during filming residents have access to their properties through an alternative entrance. This ‘private’ side of the street, which will not be used for filming purposes, will include private or communal gardens, access and car parking.

2.2.4 Up to 1,400 residential units are proposed in a mix of unit sizes ranging from one bedroom apartments to five bedroom houses. The mix of units will be distributed throughout the site. It is anticipated that the majority of the apartments will be located in the higher density central area. A greater proportion of houses and larger dwellings will be located towards the edge of the development in lower density areas.
2.2.5 A proportion of the housing will be provided as affordable housing. This will be integrated within the development.

2.2.6 The Management and Operational Strategy, which forms an appendix to the Environmental Statement (Document 6), sets out the basis upon which the development is intended to be operated and managed.

**Creative Industries Uses**

2.2.7 Up to 8,000 sq m of employment floorspace is proposed for the creative industries. This will comprise of a mixture of incubator and start up commercial units. The employment floorspace is intended to be designed for use by businesses within the creative industry.

2.2.8 The floorspace for the creative industries will be located within the central area of The Main Site. It will also be directly linked to commercial spaces, including cafés, restaurants, local shops and facilities that will seek to encourage networking.

2.2.9 A Screen Crafts Academy of up to 2,000 sq m is proposed. It is proposed that it will focus on training in practical skills and ‘hands-on’ experience, offering one year foundation courses in around 20 craft assistant roles with capacity for training 120+ students per year, specifically aimed towards the creative industries businesses both within Pinewood and Pinewood Studios.

2.2.10 The floorspace for the industrial use is intended to be predominantly B1 use, to cover office, workshop and creative business floorspace.

2.2.11 An element of this floorspace may be sought as *sui generis* at the detailed stage which could be retained by PSL for use for internal filming purposes. This may comprise one residential unit on each street frontage, to enable the street to be used from both the inside and outside for filming purposes.

2.2.12 The Screen Crafts Academy will come within Use Class D2 (education)

**Community and Retail Uses**

2.2.13 Up to 4,000 sq m of community floorspace, including a primary school, multi-purpose community building, and up to 2,000 sq m of local retail floorspace is proposed to meet the needs of the development. The community floorspace will be D1 (non residential institutions)/D2 (assembly and leisure) and the retail A1/2/3/4 (shops/ financial and professional services/ restaurants and cafes/ drinking establishments).
2.2.14 An open-air theatre is planned for use by the creative industries and wider community.

**Open Space and Recreation**

2.2.15 Open space amounting to 25.7 ha is proposed within the site to include a mixture of informal open space and landscaped areas/fields, ecological areas including water bodies, habitats and green corridors and formal areas for recreation provision, including sports pitches, games areas and footpaths.

2.2.16 Private and semi-private open space will be provided for residents and users of the built creative cluster area.

2.2.17 The land uses within the scheme can be summarised as follows:

| Net Built Area for Main Site (exc. Open Air Theatre which is part of open space, but includes the school and its associated playgrounds and sports fields @1.14ha) | 15 ha |
| Gross Built Area for Main Site (inc primary roads, car parks, land acquisitions for transport upgrades, existing structures i.e. Sauls Farm) | 21.6ha |
| Un-built Area for Main Site (inc formal and informal open space and primary school playing fields (0.84ha)) | 25.7ha |
| Application Site Area - Main Site | 46 ha* |
| Application Site Area - Seven Hills Road Junction | 1.6 ha |
| Application Site Area - Five Points Roundabout Junction | 3.3 ha |

2.2.18 School playing fields (0.8ha) and public squares (0.5ha) are included in both the built and un-built figures due to the dual nature of the land.

2.2.19 The amount of accommodation within the scheme can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative Industries</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Screen Crafts Academy</th>
<th>Ancillary filming/services</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,000 sqm</td>
<td>1,400 units</td>
<td>2,000 sqm</td>
<td>1,000 sqm</td>
<td>4,000 sqm</td>
<td>2,000 sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.20 Following an internal safety audit carried out by Buckinghamshire County Council and Jacobs, alternative junction designs were prepared by the design team for Five Points roundabout and Seven Hills junction, in liaison with Buckinghamshire County Council and Jacobs. These alternative design solutions were formulated into two separate planning applications, which were submitted on 16th February 2011.
3. **URBAN DESIGN POLICIES AND GUIDANCE**

3.1.1 A number of national, regional and local urban design, landscape and Green Belt related policies and guidance have been reviewed below. This list provided a brief overview of current policy and guidance of particular relevance to this Public Inquiry.

3.2 **National Policies**

**PPS1 CBD/1**

3.2.1 Planning Policy Statement 1 sets out national policy on land use planning, which includes matters of design. It promotes good design as being indivisible from good planning and advocates design that responds to its context, as identified in paragraph 34:

> Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.

**PPS1 Companion – By Design - Urban Design in the planning system: towards better practice CDB/1A**

3.2.2 This companion guide to PPS1 (originally PPG1) aims to promote higher standards of urban design through the establishment of key aims and objectives to achieve the creation of successful places. It uses the following objectives as a useful way of structuring this guidance:

- **Character**: A place with its own identity
- **Continuity and enclosure**: A place where public and private spaces are clearly distinguished
- **Quality of the public realm**: A place with attractive and successful outdoor areas
- **Ease of movement**: A place that is easy to get to and move through
- **Legibility**: A place that has a clear image and is easy to understand
- **Adaptability**: A place that can change easily
- **Diversity**: A place with variety and choice

**PPG2 Green Belt CBD/2**

3.2.3 This policy aims to keep tracts of land permanently open to deliver the following five purposes:

i. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

ii. to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;

iii. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
iv. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
v. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

**PPS3 CBD/3**

3.2.4 Planning Policy Statement 3 sets out the DCLG’s national policy on housing, and states the importance of the following matters in paragraph 16, when considering the subject of design quality of development proposals:

- Is easily accessible and well-connected to public transport and community facilities and services
- Provides, or enables good access to, community and green and open amenity and recreational space (including play space) as well as private outdoor space such as residential gardens, patios and balconies.
- Is well integrated with, and complements, the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access.
- Facilitates the efficient use of resources and seeks to adapt to and reduce the impact of, and on, climate change.
- Takes a design-led approach to the provision of car-parking space
- Creates, or enhances, a distinctive character that relates well to the surroundings
- Provides for the retention or re-establishment of biodiversity

**PPS3 Companion: Better places to live by design**

3.2.5 This companion guide to PPS3 (originally PPG3) aims to improve the standard of housing design and identifies the following attributes of successful schemes:

- **Movement** A movement framework which is safe, direct and attractive to all users
- **Mix** A rich mix of housing opportunities
- **Community** A sense of neighbourhood and community ownership
- **Structure** A coherent structure of buildings, spaces, landscape and routes for movement
- **Layout** Street layout and design which is appropriate to use and context
- **Place** Attractive and clearly defined public and private spaces
- **Amenity** Pleasant gardens and private amenity space
- **Parking** Convenient but unobtrusive car parking
Safety  A safe and secure environment
Space  Well planned homes which provide space and functionality
Adaptability  Housing which is robust and adaptable to changing requirements
Maintenance  An environment which can be well maintained over the long-term
Sustainability  Housing designed to minimise resource consumption
Detail  Well considered detailing of buildings and spaces

PPS7 Sustainable development in rural areas CBD/6
3.2.6  Planning Policy Statement 7 sets out the national policy in respect of rural areas, including country towns and villages and the wider, largely undeveloped countryside up to the fringes of larger urban areas. It seeks to facilitate and promote sustainable patterns of development and communities in rural areas, to sustain, enhance and, where appropriate, revitalise country towns and villages and for strong, diverse, economic activity, whilst maintaining local character and a high quality environment. It also looks to focus new, and affordable, housing on existing centres while ensuring that all development in rural areas is “well designed and inclusive, in keeping with its scale and location, and sensitive to the character of the countryside and local distinctiveness” (Para 1 (iv)). It is also important that the quality and character of the wider countryside is protected and, where possible, enhanced.

3.3  REGIONAL POLICIES (South East Plan)

SP5 Green Belt
3.3.1  This is one of six spatial planning principles underpinning the Regional Spatial Strategy for the south east.

“Respecting and maintaining the general pattern of the South East’s settlements and undeveloped areas, through the protection of the region’s identified Green Belts.”

3.3.2  This supports the extent and function of existing Green Belts within the South East region, especially with regard to maintaining a separation of settlements. It notes that a review of the Green Belt boundaries may be required in certain areas. It also proposes that if land is subsequently lost from the Green Belt then a broader review should identify additional land that could be designated to replace it.


**WCBV5 The Colne Valley Park**

3.3.3 This policy states that “The local authorities will work together and with other agencies in pursuance of the agreed aims of the Colne Valley Park:

1. to maintain and enhance the landscape (including settlements) and waterscape of the Park, in terms of their scenic and conservation value and their overall amenity;
2. to resist urbanisation of the Colne Valley Park and to safeguard existing areas of countryside from inappropriate development;
3. to conserve the nature conservation resources of the Park through the provision of green infrastructure networks and protection and management of its diverse plant and animal species, habitats and geological features;
4. to provide accessible facilities and opportunities for countryside recreation where this does not compromise 1, 2 or 3.”

### 3.4 Local Policies

**South Buckinghamshire District Local Plan**

**GB1 - Green Belt boundaries and the control over development in the Green Belt**

3.4.1 This sets out the general types of development that may be permissible within the Green Belt area. It does not include the type of development proposed by the appeal site except with regard to the open space and recreational components. Where development is permissible it should not adversely affect the character or amenities of the Green Belt, nearby properties or the locality in general and should be in accordance with other relevant policies within the Plan (particularly EP3 concerning issues of Use, Design and Layout of Development – see below).

**L6 – Colne Valley Park**

3.4.2 This policy is very similar to that of WCBVS of the South East Plan and states that proposals within the Colne Valley Park will only be permitted where:-

a) they maintain and enhance the landscape, waterscape and townscape of the Park in terms of its character, its scenic and conservation value and its overall amenity; and

b) they safeguard existing areas of countryside from inappropriate development and do not involve urbanisation of the Park; and

c) they conserve the nature conservation resources of the Park; and

d) where outdoor sport or outdoor recreation is involved it does not compromise (a) or (b) or (c) above.
3.4.3 The policy tries to address concerns over the historic degradation and fragmentation of countryside areas within the Colne Valley Park and Metropolitan Green Belt in respect of continuing pressures for development. It acknowledges the desire to promote recreation within the Park but not at the expense of the existing landscape, character and amenities of the area.

L7 – Protection of green space

3.4.4 This policy gives protection to a number of Green Spaces identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map, particularly with regard to extents, visual amenity and function. The nearest designated Green Spaces to the appeal site are located within the nearby Iver Heath housing area. No Green Spaces have been designated within the Green Belt as other policy measures are considered to be robust enough to provide adequate protection. Where Green Spaces have been identified, they are considered to make a positive contribution to the local character and setting and are either publicly accessible or visible from public areas.

L10 - Proposals involving felling or other works affecting trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order

3.4.5 This policy sets out the importance given to trees that are covered by a Tree Preservation Order, especially with regard to public amenity or character, but acknowledges that there are some situations where the loss of the tree may be necessary (for health reasons for example). However, appropriate consents must be sought for works affecting protected trees and in cases where the loss cannot be avoided there will usually be a requirement for a replacement tree of comparable quality. There may be some cases where the council will allow permission for the loss of a tree on the basis of sufficient mitigation being provided as part of the proposals and subject to conditions that safeguard the amenity of the locality.

EP3 – The use, design and layout of development

3.4.6 This policy states:

“Development will only be permitted where its scale, layout, siting, height, design, external materials and use are compatible with the character and amenities of the site itself, adjoining development and the locality in general. Poor designs which are out of scale or character with their surroundings will not be permitted.”

It goes on to expand on the key categories of scale, layout, siting, height, design, external material and use and places particular emphasis on the relationship to existing buildings and spaces in the locality, especially with regard to character and amenity. It also makes provision for the use of conditions, in cases where permission is granted, to minimise the impact on
adjacent uses to an acceptable level. The overriding philosophy is to promote innovative and high quality developments that are respectful of their site and surroundings, take design cues from adjacent buildings and do not appear incongruous within the locality.

**EP4 – Landscaping**

3.4.7 This policy places emphasis on providing integral landscaping proposals, especially with regard to maintaining and reinforcing local character and contributing to attractive settings for new development. It places particular importance on vegetation, with a desire to retain valued existing features (especially where these are important to local character) and to provide additional tree and shrub planting (including native species), where appropriate. It also acknowledges the importance of retained vegetation in helping to integrate proposed development into its surroundings. Provision is also made for the maintenance of new and existing planting, to ensure the successful establishment and longevity of any proposed landscape proposals.

**EP5 – Daylight and sunlight**

3.4.8 This policy states that development will only be permitted where its design and layout allows for adequate daylight (and preferably sunlight) to reach into spaces around and between buildings and other physical features and would not result in a significant loss of daylight or sunlight to adjacent buildings or land. This is to protect the amenity and usage of adjoining land and properties.

**EP6 – Designing to reduce crime**

3.4.9 This policy states:

*Development should be designed and laid out to reduce the opportunity for crime against both people and property. In particular, developments should:*

(a) clearly demarcate private from public areas; and

(b) ensure that areas to which the public have easy access are overlooked for security reasons; and

(c) incorporate the provision of facilities which would discourage crime.

It recommends engaging in consultation with the Police Architectural Liaison Officer (ALO) and refers to the “Secure by Design” initiative in respect of designing proposals that reduce the opportunity for crime. Particular attention is given to ensuring that public and private spaces are clearly demarcated (especially boundary treatments to private gardens) and that public spaces and sensitive private areas are well overlooked by surrounding properties.
**R4 – Public open space provision in new residential developments**

3.4.10 This policy attaches importance to playspace for its recreational and amenity value. The amount of provision deemed appropriate is guided by the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) standard. Where adequate provision can be demonstrated within a safe and easy walking distance there will not normally be a requirement for the developer to make further provision. This will also take into account the types of unit and amount of garden space proposed. Preference is for provision to be consolidated in a small number of more substantial playspaces, rather than a scattering of much smaller ones, as they have a perceived higher recreational value and are easier to maintain.

**H9 – Residential layout and design**

3.4.11 This policy reiterates some of the principles of Policy EP3 (see above) but relates it specifically to the issues and pressures associated with proposed residential schemes. This includes respecting surrounding character and amenity, providing adequate levels of daylight, limiting the loss of existing vegetation, providing appropriate amenity space, accommodating access for emergency and refuse collection, and ensuring the effective and efficient use of land. It places higher sensitivity on areas designated as a Residential Area of Exceptional Character.

**South Buckinghamshire District Adopted Core Strategy February 2011**

**CP5 - Open space, sport and recreation**

3.4.12 This policy places importance on open spaces for their recreational and social value and their contribution to Green Infrastructure (GI). It notes that currently South Bucks is relatively well provided for in terms of open space provision, although much of this is fragmented and under pressure from the surrounding urban areas. The policy is resistant to the loss of open space, sport and recreation facilities except under a number of defined “exceptional circumstances”.

**CP8 - Built and Historic environment**

3.4.13 This policy recognises the importance of the Districts historic assets and heritage features, especially the contribution that they make to local character. It affords higher protection to those that are designated nationally. It also highlights the potential threat to local character from insensitive and intensive infill development, partly due to the pressures imposed by the surrounding Green Belt and the need to make efficient use of land. For all new development, it promotes a high standard of design that makes a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area. The policy also sets out the preferred approach of new development in considering Climate Change, Secured by Design principles and the efficient use of land.
(especially in respect of proposed densities). For new development, the densities proposed should be appropriate to the site accessibility and the surrounding context.

**CP9 - Natural environment**

3.4.14 This policy highlights the importance of landscape character and nature conservation within the District, especially with regard to the protection of designated features and the contribution to Green Infrastructure (GI) objectives. In particular, the policy states that generally the landscape characteristics and biodiversity resources within South Bucks will be conserved and enhanced.

**CP12 - Sustainable energy**

3.4.15 In order to combat Climate Change, this policy sets out some of the ways in which it is expected that new development will help contribute to objectives to reduce the demand for energy and the domestic carbon footprint across the District, particularly through improved energy efficiency and the use of renewable technologies/energy sources.

**CP13 - Environmental and resource management**

3.4.16 This policy advocates a responsible approach to the use of existing resources, with a view to reducing consumption. It promotes best practice in sustainable design and construction and makes specific reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes initiative. It highlights particular concerns over the use of water, contaminated land issues (especially industrial and former industrial sites), protection of sensitive nature conservation features, air quality management (especially in the vicinity of the motorways), noise exposure, waste management and flooding. Vulnerable development will be guided towards areas of lowest flood risk and developers must submit a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) where proposals affect areas that are liable to flood.

**Other forms of guidance**

*Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment ‘Guideline for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’, 2002*

3.4.17 This document represents current guidance with regard to landscape and visual impact assessment (particularly chapter 7 ‘identification and assessment of landscape and visual effects’).

**3.5 Conclusion**

3.5.1 There are a wide variety of policies that have a bearing on urban design, landscape and Green Belt within the regional, local and adopted core strategy planning guidance.
3.5.2 A number of these policies have a very specific relevance to the appeal scheme, typically grouped into those that consider

- Green Belt (SP5, GB1)
- Colne Valley (WCBV5, L6); and
- Environmental Concerns/Climate Change (L7, L10, CP8, CP9, CP12, CP13)

3.5.3 The appeal scheme is tested against the relevant policies in Section 8.
4. URBAN DESIGN AUDIT

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The following urban design audit follows a series of questions that have evolved from two documents; PPS1’s companion ‘By Design – urban design in the planning system, towards better practice’ CBD/1 (2001) and CABE’s Building for Life initiative (2009) CDD/2. The former provides a series of urban design objectives that relates to all forms of land use, whilst the latter provides the national standard for well design homes and neighbourhoods, representing CABE, the HBF, HCA, Design for Homes and the Civic Trust, focussing on residential land use. The urban design audit has involved reviewing the planning application document, visiting the existing site and through discussions with the design team and client.

4.2 Urban Design Audit

Character (see Figure 3B/C)

a) Is the design specific to the scheme?

4.2.1 Yes, the nature of the scheme ensures it will be unique and will not incorporate standard, repeated components.

b) Does the scheme exploit existing buildings, landscape or topography?

4.2.2 The scheme does exploit the mature hedgerows and woodland ‘The Clump’ within the site that provides a well wooded appearance, particularly from the south and east. The mature hedgerow trees are up to 25 metres in height and form an impressive structure for the proposed development to sit within whilst softening its appearance in the landscape. These hedgerow corridors are crossed occasionally by access routes, requiring the removal of 6-10% of the existing trees (although the design strategy for crossing these routes has selected locations where lower quality trees require removal – see Figures 6A-6E). Otherwise, the scheme benefits from a strong axis between the existing entrance building to Pinewood Studios and the heart of Project Pinewood that helps reinforce the living and working connection between these two areas.

c) Does the scheme feel like a place with a distinctive character?

4.2.3 Yes, the scheme will feel and appear unique. The variety of worldwide streets being used as inspiration for the proposed streetscapes will create an environment with a distinct character.
4.2.4 How does the scheme respond to the existing layout of buildings, streets and spaces?

To the west, the scheme has a direct axis with Pinewood Studios, which creates a strong connection between the two facilities. To the south, the scheme backs on to the rear of existing Pinewood Green properties (with a landscape strip between the two), retaining the public right of way linking to Ashford Road. In this south east corner of the site the scheme promotes public open space, retaining the undeveloped character of the adjacent public footpath route. To the east lies the M25, which generates some acoustics issues resolved through localised bunding / rear garden fencing, beyond this is Sevenhills Road, which provides access into the scheme from the north and east. Way’s Farm, Alderbourne Farm and Sevenhills Road lie to the north of the site, with the scheme promoting 2/3 storey housing and open space along this boundary. The approach to where development is located on the site has clearly evolved through an iterative process (see page 159 of the DAS), culminating in what I consider to be an arrangement with clear and successful design principles.

e) How have the scale, massing and height of the proposed development been considered in relation to its context?

4.2.5 The residential context is predominantly 2 storeys, although Pinewood Studios itself has buildings up to 6/7 storey (residential equivalent) in similar proximity to the scheme. The nature of the scheme necessitates some development at 5-6 storeys (see Figure 3H) to create the Parisian square, whilst also requiring some 2/3 storey to create the lower density streetscapes, such as the Tudor village. The decisions which have guided the arrangement and location of these different height groupings appear to me to be sound and based on the following principles:

- The higher / bulkier buildings will be in the heart of the scheme and closest to Pinewood Studios and the higher existing buildings.
- The lower / smaller scale buildings will be located around the edge of the higher density core, with 2/3 storey housing to the south, east and northern development edges.
- The position of public open space to the east and west of the site ensures built form sits within the central part of the site (whilst retaining ecological features), meaning development does not extend eastwards beyond the line of existing properties to the east of Ashford Road or north westwards towards the junction of Sevenhills Road and Pinewood Road.
Continuity and Enclosure (see Figure 3D)

a) Are public and private areas well defined?

4.2.6 Generally, the public and private areas are well defined. The nature of the scheme inevitably creates a potential conflict between what is public space and that used by film crews for filming purposes. The Design and Access Statement communicates the principles whereby this arrangement will be managed (pages 88-89 and 282-283) which relies on residents agreeing to use secondary access points during filming times, informed through a community portal website. Secondary access points will exit onto ‘non-filming’ streets and spaces, the detail of which would emerge through the development of a design code.

4.2.7 Specific surveillance units are used at the corners of blocks adjacent to the public open space areas and mature hedgerow corridors to ensure an appropriate degree of natural surveillance.

b) Does the scheme establish a coherent and consistent building line with main access from the block’s frontage?

4.2.8 Yes, the building lines form consistent street frontages, some typologies create very strong ‘back of pavement’ frontages (such as Paris), whereas some typologies have a lower density arrangement with development set further back from the street (such as Chicago Suburban Street). Main access remains from the street, with filming streets having alternative secondary access points during times of filming, as described above.

Public Realm (see Figure 3F)

a) Is there a convincing hierarchy and variety of public spaces within the scheme?

4.2.9 Public space is very well catered for within the scheme, with just over half of the appeal site providing public open space and feature squares. Its hierarchy is convincing and, in combination with the character groupings and density, creates a series of highly legible, walkable districts served by streets, public squares and open space.

b) Do buildings and spaces dominate, rather than highways and parking?

4.2.10 Buildings and spaces do dominate, with streets being pedestrian friendly. Car parking is spread over a variety of different typologies including on street (34%), private garaging (16%), off street podium (26%), off street basement (5%), off street driveway (1%), off street surface parking (10%) and separate overspill spaces (9%) (approximate percentages given). This, in
combination with the quality of built form and public space, ensures the streets are not highway dominant.

c) Is car parking well integrated and does it support the streetscene?

4.2.11 Yes, as defined above, there is a wide variety of parking typologies, with on-street parking being most popular. In principle this will deliver a well integrated approach, although it is recognised that a detailed design code will be needed to provide greater detail as to how the parking will appear and be controlled in design terms.

d) Does the scheme integrate with existing streets, paths and surrounding developments?

4.2.12 The existing streets, paths and development contrast greatly with the nature of the appeal scheme. Due to the nature of the scheme, a high level of design integration is very unlikely. The appeal scheme does, however, integrate movement routes with Pinewood Studios (via the direct street axis between the studios and the appeal scheme) and the wider green network of publically accessible routes (via public footpath extensions to the east, south and north west). As a result of these connections, the wider area is well connected to the appeal scheme and will benefit from the network of public spaces and amenities, such as the extensive parkland.

e) Is there an appropriate level of surveillance of open space?

4.2.13 Areas of open space benefit from appropriate surveillance either from development overlooking these spaces or public activity and movement within the spaces themselves. Figure 5E of this proof of evidence provides additional information to the Design and Access Statement (CDG/1 Doc 3) with regard to the inclusion of surveillance units looking over areas of public open space.

Movement (see Figure 3G)

a) Is there a clear, connected movement network for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles?

4.2.14 Yes, the appeal scheme promotes a perimeter block arrangement which provides a clear network of pedestrian movement routes within the developed area. Beyond this area, the scheme also benefits from additional footpath, cycle and bridleway connections (both surfaced and unsurfaced) which provide a network of paths within the public open space, connecting back into the public footpath network to the north and south east of the appeal site.
b) *Do movement routes address urban design considerations and not just vehicular?*

4.2.15 Yes, the movement routes within the scheme are part of the urban environment and filming streets and therefore reflect the street typology being re-created.

**Legibility (see Figure 3I)**

a) *Does the scheme design reinforce the distinctive qualities of the site, considering existing buildings and views?*

4.2.16 The distinctive qualities of the site are primarily ‘The Clump’ and the mature hedgerows, both of which are retained within the scheme. Legibility is considered further in the arrangement and quality of the different street typologies, which together form recognisable character areas (such as the central core area), punctuated by more distinct landmarks (such as the Parisian Square or the canal). The selection of streetscenes being generic of the different locations rather than notable individual streets assists this balanced approach to legibility, as it takes emphasis away from the character of individual buildings and streets for those living and working in the appeal scheme.

**Adaptability**

a) *Does the scheme promote simple, robust building forms that could provide a wide range of future uses?*

4.2.17 The nature of the film street concept does support very robust building typologies, which could support a wide variety of uses within the buildings as time goes by.

**Diversity**

a) *Is there an appropriate mix of uses and tenures within the scheme to provide variety and choice?*

4.2.18 The appeal scheme provides for a complementary mix of uses, including 1400 homes, 8000m² creative businesses, 2000m² of film academy, 4000m² community uses and 2000m² of retail, delivering a healthy mix of uses. The variety of street types will create a wide variety of housing types, both in terms of individual unit and its setting, both of which is considered to be a significant benefit to the success of the scheme.

**Community (see Figure 3J)**

a) *Does the scheme provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafes?*
4.2.19 A small number of community facilities are found locally, such as convenience shops, a health centre, schools, post office and public houses. The scheme provides a primary school, 2000m$^2$ of retail and 4000m$^2$ of community uses which will expand the local provision significantly.

**Environment**

a) **Does the scheme have any features that reduce its environmental impact?**

4.2.20 A separate Environmental Statement has been prepared which considers the full environmental impacts of the scheme. In additional, section 7 of the Design and Access Statement considers environmental impact as part of a sustainable masterplan strategy. The key outputs of this process are:

i. The focus on low consumption design, both in the built fabric of the buildings (air tightness / insulation...etc) as well as how residents and workers travel and consume energy (greater on site live – work and walk able communities);

ii. The provision of a Combined Heat and Power energy centre serving the appeal scheme;

iii. The creation of on and off site ecological habitats;

iv. The provision of a car club, car sharing plan, new bus routes running through the site between Gerrards Cross and Slough, new offsite pedestrian and cycle routes to Uxbridge and Slough and inclusion of Smart (realtime) public transport information within the development.

b) **Are the environmental standards of the scheme defined, and how do these relate to current expectations / good practice?**

4.2.21 The residential properties are to be a minimum of Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 and non-residential properties meeting a minimum of BREEAM ‘very good’ standard. Both of these performance levels are to be expected in a contemporary scheme.

4.3 **Overall assessment**

4.3.1 Project Pinewood is an exciting and well designed new community that sensitively handles the task of stitching together a wide variety of international streetscenes into one location. This is successful, in my view, due to the generic form of these streetscenes and the way in which they are grouped together to form complementary character areas (for example Amsterdam makes the transition to Venice on a sharp corner ensuring direct comparison cannot be
made). This avoids the potential (and very real) risk of creating a theme park of distinct but non complementary streetscenes, with individual buildings competing for attention. The network of streets, spaces and open space is generous, of a high quality and will greatly benefit the new community whilst providing significant amenities for surrounding residents and employees of Pinewood Studios. The retention and incorporation of environmental features in the design, such as ‘the Clump’ and the mature hedgerows, provides an immediate strong setting and sense of place for the scheme, as does the clear axis connection to Pinewood Studios. The proposed development’s commitment to sustainability is evident through both the design process documented and the efforts made to enhance the site’s connectivity to its surroundings.

4.3.2 The concept and design principles of the appeal scheme are therefore considered to be very successful. It is important that this level of quality is applied to the detailed and construction design of the scheme and the construction works itself, matters which the outline planning application could not address (also identified by CABE in their July 2009 design review). It is for this reason I consider a Design Code to be an essential piece of information, to be prepared and delivered via a planning condition. The Design Code process is a well established way of providing such detail and will allow the full consideration of, and consultation on, the emerging details.
5. **GREEN BELT ASSESSMENT**

5.1 **Methodology**

5.1.1 This section of evidence investigates the impact of the proposed development on the qualities and purposes of the Green Belt. It is recognised that the proposed development is, by definition, inappropriate and therefore harmful to the Green Belt. This assessment investigates, through the consideration of a series of representative viewpoints, the visual experience of the proposed development in the context of the Green Belt and how these visual experiences relate to the relevant purposes of the Green Belt, as set out in PPG2.

5.1.2 The audit process involves the following stages:

a) Desktop review of the LVIA chapter of the Environmental Statement, including a review of the representative viewpoint locations and assessment in regard of the sensitivity of the receptor, the magnitude of effect of the proposed development, its significance and nature of effect;

b) Review of the relevant national, regional and local planning policies with regard to Green Belt;

c) Visiting the representative viewpoints and wider area to consider its key Green Belt related qualities, review the location and extent of the representative viewpoints, and identify and record any additional viewpoints required;

d) Prepare verified photomontages for the representative viewpoints where the development can be seen;

e) Assess the existing views and proposed photomontages against four of the five key purposes of Green Belt (as set out in para 1.5 of PPG2) to consider how the proposed site performs against these purposes before and after the proposed development (urban regeneration has not been tested as this is a generic principle rather than a spatial and visual purpose, and therefore cannot be tested against each viewpoint in this assessment). Each view is assessed as performing to a high, moderate or low standard for the individual PPG2 purposes considered;

f) Summarise the impact of the proposed development on the purposes of the Green Belt from the representative viewpoints.
5.2 Relevant best practice issues

**Photomontage preparation**

5.2.1 The process of producing the photomontages follows current best practice, as communicated within the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (2002). In basic terms, the methodology involves the following stages (a detailed methodology for technical montage production is provided in Appendix B at the rear of this proof of evidence):

i. Identify key viewpoint areas;

ii. Evaluate each location to determine the representative viewpoint locations (and any other locations that need consideration);

iii. Photograph each view using an appropriate lens camera using a tripod set vertically and horizontally level at 1.6m height;

iv. Laser survey up to 10-20 vertical and horizontal reference points from each viewpoint (including tripod location);

v. Prepare cylindrical projection of panoramic photos;

vi. Create a detailed, rendered built form model to accurately communicate the details of the refused planning application; and

vii. Insert the rendered building into the photograph using vertical and horizontal references and adjust image to ‘camera match’ the render to the atmospheric conditions of the photograph.

5.3 Representative Viewpoint Assessment (see Figure 4A/B)

5.3.1 A number of representative viewpoints were identified and agreed with South Buckinghamshire District Council as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process. The review of the representative viewpoints identified a number of further viewpoints that were considered important to the assessment process. Of the extended list of representative viewpoints, a number of those (where the appeal scheme can be seen) had verified photography and photomontages prepared (highlighted in bold below) and formed the basis of a detailed Green Belt Assessment. The viewpoints where the appeal scheme could not be seen were considered to be unharmed by the appeal scheme, with no further visualisations or Green Belt Assessment undertaken. The full list of representative viewpoints are:

- Viewpoint 1 – Blanchard’s Farm Public Footpath
5.3.2 Viewpoints 2 and 3 have had a night-time photo and photomontage prepared, as these viewpoints represent the more distant representative views.

5.3.3 Viewpoints 11 and 12 have had ‘mature’ landscape photomontages added, as in these views the growth of the landscape solution is seen as being a relevant consideration. Mature landscape is shown at 12 years after planting or 6 years after the adjacent development is completed (the northern part of the development will not be completed until 6 years post commencement, whilst the strategic landscape will be planted in the first available planting season pre / post construction).

5.4 Detailed Viewpoint Assessments

Viewpoint 1 – as existing (Figure 4C)

5.4.1 This viewpoint is taken from a Bridleway linking Hollybush Lane to Sevenhills Road and allows only short range views over an unimproved area of scrub/pasture. Infrastructure associated with the M40/M25 link road is visible in the foreground. Distant visibility is obscured by tree planting in both the near and far distance.

5.4.2 Urban Sprawl – The lack of any evident urban areas within the view confirms this function of Green Belt is not applicable.
5.4.3 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.4 *Countryside encroachment* – With no built development within the view there is no perception of encroachment into the open countryside. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.5 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 1 – as proposed (Figure 4C)**

5.4.6 *Changes to viewpoint description* – There will be no change to the view in light of the development at Pinewood.

5.4.7 *Urban Sprawl* – The lack of any evident urban areas within the view confirms this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.8 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.9 *Countryside encroachment* – With no built development within the view there is no perception of encroachment into the open countryside. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.10 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 1 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt....</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Viewpoint 2 – as existing (Figure 4D)**

5.4.11 This viewpoint is taken from a Bridleway linking Hollybush Lane to Southlands Road, and permits wide ranging views extending from the edge of Uxbridge in the east round to Junction 1a of the M40/M25 (directional as opposed to visible). The elevated nature of this viewpoint provides medium to long range views into the surrounding landscape, which is fragmented in part by intervening vegetation.

5.4.12 Key features within the view include large mature blocks of vegetation, an overhead line crossing the view in the middle distance and the 007 stage visible along the distant horizon. The view is predominantly rural in nature although noise from the nearby motorways is readily apparent.

5.4.13 *Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl within the current view confirms that the Green Belt performs highly in this regard.

5.4.14 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – The settlement of Uxbridge is visible from this viewpoint in the east. When following the panorama west, there is little in the way of other built from until the 007 stage, and other development associated with Pinewood Studios, is visible along the south-western horizon. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.15 *Countryside encroachment* – The presence of the Green Belt provides a limiting constraint to the further growth of both Uxbridge, and on a more local scale, Pinewood. Notwithstanding this, however, development at Pinewood is visible along the distant horizon, indicating that some visual encroachment is evident. The Green Belt is therefore moderately successful in this respect.

5.4.16 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 2 – as proposed (Figure 4D)**

5.4.17 *Changes to viewpoint description* – Project Pinewood will be visible extending across the skyline in front of the 007 stage, and will be a perceptible feature within the view. The range of colours and textures utilised within the development will, however, somewhat moderate this perceptibility.

5.4.18 *Urban Sprawl* – Project Pinewood is visible extending across a reasonable portion of the distant horizon and could therefore constitute urban sprawl of the Pinewood settlement. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this regard.
5.4.19 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – The settlement of Uxbridge is visible from this viewpoint in the east. When following the panorama west, there is little in the way of other built from until Project Pinewood becomes visible to the right hand side of ‘The Clump’. There is a distinct break between these two settlements, and on this basis the Green Belt is considered to perform highly in this respect.

5.4.20 *Countryside encroachment* – The presence of the Green Belt provides a limiting constraint to the further growth of both Uxbridge, and on a more local scale, Pinewood. Notwithstanding this, however, development at Pinewood is visible along the distant horizon, indicating that some visual encroachment is evident. The Green Belt is therefore moderately successful in this respect.

5.4.21 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 2 – as proposed – NIGHT (Figure 4)**

Viewpoint 2 has had a night-time photo (existing) and photomontage (proposed development) prepared to allow an assessment of the proposed development, from the more distant representative viewpoints identified, on the night-time landscape. The existing viewpoint 2 clearly shows the street lighting ‘glow’ of Uxbridge to the left of the image, the road lighting to the M25, down lighting to the 007 Stage at Pinewood Studios and distant street lighting ‘glow’ of Iver Heath. The proposed view shows the development modelled and the impact of street and property lighting on the night-time landscape. The impact of the proposed development is minor, with the lighting ‘glow’ of Uxbridge, Iver Heath and the M25 remaining dominant and the proposed development adding relatively little additional lighting effect to the night time landscape.

**Viewpoint 2 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt....</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Viewpoint 3 – as existing (Figure 4E)**

5.4.23 The viewpoint is positioned on a public footpath linking Chandlers Hill in the east to Iver Heath in the west. The viewpoint is focussed in a north-westerly direction and overlooks a foreground of agricultural land which gives way to a densely vegetated minor ‘ridge’ which runs concurrent with Denham Road. Various built form is evident along this road, although it is largely screened by the mature vegetation that surrounds it.

5.4.24 The viewpoint permits a panorama of 180 degrees, and takes in the periphery of Uxbridge to the east whilst other detractors such as overhead pylons are also evident within the view. Noise emanating from the M25 is also a feature at the viewpoint.

5.4.25 *Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl within the current view confirms that the Green Belt is successful in this regard. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.26 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.27 *Countryside encroachment* – Built form is present within the view, both in the middle distance and on the horizon, but does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.28 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 3 – as proposed (Figure 4E)**

5.4.29 *Changes to viewpoint description* – The Project Pinewood development will be more visible across the distant horizon than the existing 007 stage but will still only form a very minor component of the wider view.

5.4.30 *Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl within the current view confirms that the Green Belt is successful in this regard. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.31 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.32 *Countryside encroachment* – Built form within the view is restricted to the vegetated area in the middle distance, and some development along the distant horizon, and does not evidently
spread into the surrounding countryside areas. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.33 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 3 – as proposed – NIGHT (Figure 4)**

5.4.34 Viewpoint 3 also has had a night-time photo (existing) and photomontage (proposed development) prepared. This view provides a more close up view of the street and property lighting of Iver Heath and confirms that, due to the almost invisibility of the proposed development, the night-time effect of the scheme is negligible.

**Viewpoint 3 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewpoint 4 – as existing (Figure 4F)**

5.4.35 *Viewpoint description* – The view takes in an area of informal public open space extending across to the residential properties along Ashford Road and Pinewood Green. The view is foreshortened by these properties and the vegetations associated with them. The view would be experienced by those using the POS within the view.

5.4.36 *Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl within the current view confirms that the Green Belt is successful. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.37 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.38 *Countryside encroachment* – Built form within the view is restricted to the residential area in the near distance and does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.
5.4.39 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 4 – as proposed (Figure 4F)**

5.4.40 *Changes to viewpoint description* – There will be no change to the view in light of the development at Pinewood.

5.4.41 *Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl within the current view confirms that the Green Belt is successful. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.42 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.43 *Countryside encroachment* – Built form within the view is restricted to the residential area in the near distance and does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.44 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 4 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewpoint 5 – as existing (Figure 4G)**

5.4.45 *Viewpoint description* – The view is one characterised by residential property set within a suburban setting. Views are foreshortened by vegetation and built form and no longer distance views are available. The view would be experienced by those using the nearby public right of way.

5.4.46 *Urban Sprawl* – With longer distance views outwith the immediate urban area unavailable this function of Green Belt is not applicable.
5.4.47  *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.48  *Countryside encroachment* – With no surrounding countryside evident within the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.49  *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 5 – as proposed (Figure 4G)**

5.4.50  *Changes to viewpoint description* – There will be no change to the view in light of the development at Pinewood.

5.4.51  *Urban Sprawl* – With longer distance views outwith the immediate urban area unavailable this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.52  *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.53  *Countryside encroachment* – With no surrounding countryside evident within the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.54  *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 5 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewpoint 6 – as existing (Figure 4H)**

5.4.55  The viewpoint is positioned alongside the main road between the Five Points roundabout in the south and Pinewood in the north. The view from this location is largely restricted by the nearby built development with longer range views only available when viewing northwards
directly along the road. Mature trees marking the line of the road also add to the visual screening within this area.

5.4.56 *Urban Sprawl* – With no real appreciation of the wider landscape available, this function of Green Belt is not applicable from this location.

5.4.57 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.58 *Countryside encroachment* – Built form within the view is restricted to the residential area in the near distance and does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas, where longer range views are available along the road corridor. The limited perception of this, however, confirms that the Green Belt is considered to be moderately successful in this respect from this location.

5.4.59 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 6 – as proposed (Figure 4H)**

5.4.60 *Changes to viewpoint description* – Project Pinewood will be visible both in the distance when viewing along the road and also as additional built form on the right hand side of the road. The development would appear at a similar scale to those existing properties within the view and do not change it markedly.

5.4.61 *Urban Sprawl* – With no real appreciation of the wider landscape available, this function of Green Belt is not applicable from this location.

5.4.62 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.63 *Countryside encroachment* – Although the proposed development is visible in the longer distance portions of the view, i.e. along the road, the appreciation of the wider ‘countryside’ is limited to such an extent that no encroachment is perceived. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.64 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.
Viewpoint 6 Summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt....</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewpoint 7 – as existing (Figure 4I)**

5.4.65 *Changes to viewpoint description* – This viewpoint represents the view from the footpath running through Black Park Country Park, a well used facility in the local area. Views are largely restricted (especially in summer) by the vegetation that lines the route.

5.4.66 *Urban Sprawl* – Where longer distance views outwith the immediate footpath corridor are available there is no evidence of urban sprawl. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.67 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.68 *Countryside encroachment* – The wider countryside is not evident from this location and therefore this function of the Green belt is not applicable.

5.4.69 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 7 – as proposed (Figure 4I)**

5.4.70 *Changes to viewpoint description* – There will be no change to the view in light of the development at Pinewood.

5.4.71 *Urban Sprawl* – Where longer distance views outwith the immediate footpath corridor are available there is no evidence of urban sprawl. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.
5.4.72 Merging of neighbouring towns – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.73 Countryside encroachment – The wider countryside is not evident from this location and therefore this function of the Green belt is not applicable.

5.4.74 Historic town setting – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

Viewpoint 7 Summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewpoint 8 – as existing (Figure 4J)

5.4.75 The viewpoint is positioned on a public footpath linking Denham Road in the south to Sevenhills Road in the north, and is positioned on the junction of the footpath and Sevenhills Road. The viewpoint is focussed in a south-westerly direction and provides only a shortened view, with further visibility restricted by nearby hedgerows and large scale built development within the Pinewood development in the middle distance. Views are also restricted in this direction owing to the underlying topography.

5.4.76 The only built form within the view is the 007 stage which is a conspicuous element within it. The M25, which runs to the ‘rear’ of the viewpoint, is also an appreciable element courtesy of the noise it creates.

5.4.77 Urban Sprawl - The lack of any evident urban sprawl of the Pinewood settlement within the current view confirms that the Green Belt is successful. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.78 Merging of neighbouring towns – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.
5.4.79 *Countryside encroachment* – The presence of the 007 stage within the view indicates a level of encroachment within a view which contains no other built development. This development is, however, outwith the Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt is considered moderately successful in this respect.

5.4.80 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 8 – as proposed (Figure 4J)**

5.4.81 *Changes to viewpoint description* – The view from this location will see the development of Project Pinewood as a key component of the view. The view will change from one with little built form (although on a large scale) to one significantly influenced by it.

5.4.82 *Urban Sprawl* – The presence of Project Pinewood within the foreground landscape will result in the perception of sprawl of the settlement of Pinewood, notwithstanding the fact this settlement is not visible from this location. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this respect.

5.4.83 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.84 *Countryside encroachment* – With the viewpoint only providing a short range view, the perception of the wider countryside is minimal. However, the proposed development makes the view one more urban in nature. Mature woodland planting and a ‘parkland’ style foreground creates a pleasant setting, but will not entirely obviate the urbanisation of the view. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this respect.

5.4.85 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 8 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 9 – as existing (Figure 4K)

5.4.86 The viewpoint is positioned on the inside bend of Pinewood Road where it meets Sevenhills Road, to the north of Pinewood. The view is focussed in an easterly direction and views beyond the immediate road corridor are largely restricted by roadside hedgerow planting. There are no particular features within the view although the proximity of the viewpoint to the road makes this the overriding feature within it.

5.4.87 Aside from the road there is no other built development within the view.

5.4.88 Urban Sprawl – With no appreciation of the wider landscape available, this function of Green Belt is not applicable from this location.

5.4.89 Merging of neighbouring towns – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.90 Countryside encroachment – With no built development within the view there is no perception of encroachment into the open countryside. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.91 Historic town setting – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

Viewpoint 9 – as proposed (Figure 4K)

5.4.92 Changes to viewpoint description – The proposed development is visible beyond the roadside hedgerow, although given the screening this provides, the overall perception of the development is minimal.

5.4.93 Urban Sprawl – With no appreciation of the wider landscape available, this function of Green Belt is not applicable from this location.

5.4.94 Merging of neighbouring towns – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.95 Countryside encroachment – With only a limited amount of built development present within the view, the level of encroachment into the countryside is considered minimal. The Green belt is therefore considered moderately successful.

5.4.96 Historic town setting – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint 9 Summary table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From this location does the Green Belt...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewpoint 10 – as existing (Figure 4L)**

5.4.97 *Changes to viewpoint description* – This viewpoint is located on the south-western edge of Denham and provides a view in which a plant nursery and dual carriageway are the main elements. Views outwith the foreground are restricted by built form and vegetation.

5.4.98 *Urban Sprawl* – No potential for experiencing urban sprawl exists at this viewpoint and therefore this function of the Green belt is not applicable.

5.4.99 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.100 *Countryside encroachment* – The wider countryside is not evident from this location and therefore this function of the Green belt is not applicable.

5.4.101 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 10 – as proposed (Figure 4FL)**

5.4.102 *Changes to viewpoint description* – There will be no change to the view in light of the development at Pinewood.

5.4.103 *Urban Sprawl* – No potential for experiencing urban sprawl exists at this viewpoint and therefore this function of the Green belt is not applicable.

5.4.104 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.105 *Countryside encroachment* – The wider countryside is not evident from this location and therefore this function of the Green belt is not applicable.
5.4.106 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 10 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewpoint 11 – as existing (Figure 4M)**

5.4.107 The viewpoint is positioned on a public footpath linking Sevenhills Road in the south to Hollybush Lane in the north. The viewpoint is focussed in a south-westerly direction and provides only a limited view, across the M25 cutting, with further visibility restricted by nearby hedgerows and vegetation in the near and middle distance.

5.4.108 The main feature within the view, aside from the M25 whose noise is dominant from here, is the bridge carrying Sevenhills Road across the motorway. Other infrastructure within the view includes lighting columns along the motorway. Visible as a more distant element, The Clump can be seen running along part of the horizon.

5.4.109 *Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl of the Pinewood settlement within the current view confirms that the Green Belt performs highly in this respect.

5.4.110 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.111 *Countryside encroachment* – The dominating presence of the M25 from this viewpoint indicates encroachment within a view which contains no other built development. This has to be taken in context of the nature of the view, however, which would not be described as ‘countryside’ in nature owing to the proximity to the M25. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this respect.

5.4.112 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.
**Viewpoint 11 – as proposed (Figure 4M)**

5.4.113 *Changes to viewpoint description* – The proposed development will be visible on the skyline from this view, although the dominance of the motorway will ensure the proposed development is a secondary element of the view.

5.4.114 *Urban Sprawl* - The visibility of the proposed development from this view, especially by those who are local to it, will result in the minor perception of urban sprawl. The Green Belt is therefore considered moderately successful in this respect.

5.4.115 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.116 *Countryside encroachment* – The proposed development does add an urban element to the view, however it is already an urbanised view due to the Motorway bridge. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this respect.

5.4.117 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 11 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewpoint 12 – as existing (Figure 4N)**

5.4.118 The viewpoint is positioned on the vehicular bridge crossing the M25 and is focussed in a south-westerly direction towards the site. This bridge also provides the link between the public footpaths running within the open countryside to the north and the area containing the development site. As such users of this footpath are subjected to a sequential viewing experience towards the site when walking north to south.
When appreciating this view the main feature is the M25, both in terms of the noise it creates and also its visual characteristics. The Clump is visible on the left hand side of the view but is only a minor element.

*Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl of the Pinewood settlement within the current view confirms that the Green Belt performs highly in this respect.

*Merger of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

*Countryside encroachment* – The dominating presence of the M25 from this viewpoint indicates encroachment within a view which contains no other built development. This has to be taken in context of the nature of the view, however, which would not be described as ‘countryside’ in nature owing to the proximity to the M25. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this respect.

*Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 12 – as proposed (Figure 4N)**

*Changes to viewpoint description* – The proposed development will be a visible element across a measurable portion of this view, above the band of vegetation marking the top of the motorway embankment.

*Urban Sprawl* - The visibility of the proposed development across this view, will result in the perception of urban sprawl, albeit as an extension to the existing urbanised impact of the M25 motorway. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this respect.

*Merger of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

*Countryside encroachment* – the proposed development does encroach into the view, however this is already a view dominated by the M25 motorway and is not considered to be ‘countryside’. The Green Belt therefore performs to a low standard in this respect.

*Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.
Viewpoint 12 Summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewpoint 13 – as existing (Figure 4o)

5.4.129 The viewpoint is positioned on a public footpath linking Denham Road in the south to Sevenhills Road in the north. The viewpoint is focussed in a south-westerly direction and provides a relatively foreshortened view, with longer distance visibility restricted by the properties along Pinewood Green and mature vegetation within hedgerows and woodland blocks in the surrounding landscape.

5.4.130 There is very little built form evident within the view, with the mature vegetation largely screening the properties along Pinewood Green. Some rooflines and white painted walls are visible but these are very minor in the context of the view. To the right of the view, just out of shot, The Clump frames the view in this direction.

5.4.131 *Urban Sprawl* - The lack of any evident urban sprawl within the current view confirms that the Green Belt performs highly in this respect.

5.4.132 *Merging of neighbouring towns* – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.133 *Countryside encroachment* – Built form within the view is restricted to the limited parts of the residential area in the middle distance and does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.134 *Historic town setting* – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

Viewpoint 13 – as proposed (Figure 4o)

5.4.135 *Changes to viewpoint description* – There would be more vegetation visible within the view owing to the landscape proposals adopted as part of the proposed development.
5.4.136 Urban Sprawl - The lack of any evident urban sprawl within the current view confirms that the Green Belt performs highly in this respect.

5.4.137 Merging of neighbouring towns – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.138 Countryside encroachment – Built form within the view is restricted to the limited parts of the residential area in the middle distance and does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas. The Green Belt therefore performs highly in this respect.

5.4.139 Historic town setting – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

Viewpoint 13 Summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewpoint 14 – as existing (Figure 4P)

5.4.140 The viewpoint is positioned alongside the main road between the Five Points roundabout in the south and Pinewood in the north. The view from this location is largely restricted, and focussed, by the nearby residential development and vegetation along the Pinewood site boundary, with fragmented longer range views only available when viewing northwards directly along the road.

5.4.141 Built form within the view is limited to the residential properties along the east of the road, which are well integrated with the surrounding vegetation.

5.4.142 Urban Sprawl – With no real appreciation of the wider landscape available, this function of Green Belt is not applicable from this location.

5.4.143 Merging of neighbouring towns – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.
5.4.144 **Countryside encroachment** – Built form within the view is restricted to the residential area in the near distance and does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas, where longer range views are available along the road corridor. The limited perception of this, however, confirms that the Green Belt is considered moderately successful in this respect from this location.

5.4.145 **Historic town setting** – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 14 – as proposed (Figure 4P)**

5.4.146 **Changes to viewpoint description** – An almost imperceptible increase in built form will be visible from this view, when directly along the road corridor.

5.4.147 **Urban Sprawl** – With no real appreciation of the wider landscape available, this function of Green Belt is not applicable from this location.

5.4.148 **Merging of neighbouring towns** – With no neighbouring towns within the context of the view, this function of Green Belt is not applicable.

5.4.149 **Countryside encroachment** – Built form within the view is restricted to the residential area in the near distance and does not evidently spread into the surrounding countryside areas, where longer range views are available along the road corridor. The limited perception of this, however, confirms that the Green Belt is considered moderately successful in this respect from this location.

5.4.150 **Historic town setting** – With no historic towns within the vicinity, this function of the Green Belt is not applicable.

**Viewpoint 14 Summary table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt….</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. preserve the setting and special character of historic towns?;</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 Overall assessment

5.5.1 Project Pinewood does have some adverse impacts on the purpose of the Green Belt in the vicinity of the proposed development, however these impacts are focused upon a small number of views, with many representative viewpoints unaffected by the appeal scheme. The table below identifies that viewpoints 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 have had certain aspects of how the Green Belt purposes are perceptible from these viewpoints harmed by the appeal scheme.

Summary table of detrimental impacts on representative viewpoints / Green Belt purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 The following representative viewpoints were considered to have no Green Belt purposes to be harmed as a result of the appeal scheme (viewpoints in bold are locations where part of the appeal scheme is visible and therefore verified montages and a detailed assessment has been made):

- Viewpoint 1 – Blanchard’s Farm Public Footpath
- **Viewpoint 3 – Chandlers Hill Public Footpath**
- Viewpoint 4 – Denham Road Public Footpath
- Viewpoint 5 – Pinewood Close
- **Viewpoint 6 – Pinewood Road #1**
- Viewpoint 7 - Black Park Public Footpath
- Viewpoint 10 – Denham
- **Viewpoint 13 – The Clump Public Footpath #2**
- **Viewpoint 14 – Pinewood Road #2**
5.5.3 The appeal scheme, therefore, has an adverse impact on the Green Belt, however this is only perceptible from a small number of viewpoints close to or immediately abutting the appeal site. Only one distant representative viewpoint (no. 2) can be identified where the appeal scheme can be viewed in the wider context of the Green Belt, and in this case only the purpose relating to urban sprawl is affected. Overall, therefore, the ‘additional’ harm to the Green Belt (beyond that due to its classification as inappropriate development) is relatively limited for a development of this scale.
6. LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT

6.1 Methodology

6.1.1 The assessment of the landscape and townscape character areas surrounding the appeal site commences with a desktop review of relevant local landscape character studies and designations as well as consideration of the existing topography and vegetation pattern. This exercise is followed by a series of site visits to record the key landscape and townscape qualities of the area surrounding the appeal site. The outcome of this process is the definition of a series of detailed character areas which, depending on the transition between them, may have an abrupt or gradual transition from one area to the next.

6.1.2 The assessment goes on to consider the:

- **Sensitivity** of each landscape/townscape character area with regards to accommodating change within the development site;
- **Quality** of each landscape/townscape character area;
- **Magnitude** of effect of the development proposals on the landscape/townscape character area (or perception of landscape/townscape character areas for those areas the development proposal does not sit within);
- Significance, nature and duration of the effect.

6.1.3 This assessment follows the principles contained within the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Institute of Environmental Assessment and Landscape Institute 2002), specifically section 7.

**Sensitivity of the character area**

6.1.4 In carrying out the baseline assessment consideration is given to the sensitivity of the character resource regarding to what degree the character area can accommodate physical change from within the appeal site without detrimental effect on its key characteristics. For character areas that do not include the development proposal (and therefore cannot receive direct physical changed), the perception of change to the character area is considered. **Sensitivity** is defined as being **high**, **medium** or **low**.

**Quality of the character area**

6.1.5 The quality of the respective character areas are also considered at the baseline stage. Key factors influencing the determination of quality include:
• Any local designations relating to quality;
• The outward aesthetics and appearance of the character area; and
• How successful the area functions and how well it is used.

6.1.6 **Quality** is defined as being **high**, **medium** or **low**.

**Magnitude of development proposals effect**

6.1.7 Each character area is evaluated with regard to the magnitude of effect the proposed development has upon it (or for those character areas the development does not sit within, the perceived effect). This is influenced by:

• The visibility of the development proposals;
• The physical accessibility of the development proposals, and;
• The contrast between the development proposal and the character area it sits within or externally influences (for character areas the proposal does not sit within).

6.1.8 Magnitude is defined as being negligible, minor, moderate or major.

**Significance, nature and duration of effect**

6.1.9 The appeal scheme proposals are assessed to consider the significance, nature and duration of the effect the proposed development has upon each character area. This involves the consideration of a number of factors, such as:

• The sensitivity and magnitude of effect (resulting in ‘significance’);
• Whether the visible components of the development proposals enhance the area’s positive characteristics or harm these (nature of effect);
• How the development proposals relate to longer term planning ambitions and change, and;
• Whether the effect is temporary or permanent (duration of effect)

6.1.10 **Significance** is defined as being not significant, of limited significance or significant

6.1.11 **Nature** is defined as being beneficial, adverse or neutral.

6.1.12 **Duration** is defined as being **temporary** or **permanent**. Temporary effects due to demolition and construction are not assessed in this audit.
6.2 Valley Farmland – (see Figure 5H)

Characteristics
6.2.1 This character area mainly comprises a shallow but intimately scaled east-west valley containing the Alder Bourne tributary to the River Colne. It is severed by the M25 motorway close to the junction with the M40, which is carried by a series of cuttings and embankments that respond to the surrounding topography.

6.2.2 Land use is predominantly a mixture of woodland and open pasture land, some of which is used for horse grazing. There is a strong sense of enclosure provided by the surrounding slopes and vegetation, including established hedgerow field boundaries and areas of mature woodlands. This vegetation cover is more concentrated on the higher slopes, effectively containing views within the east-west valley corridor between Fulmer and Hollybush Lane. There is a small isolated area exhibiting similar landscape characteristics (in the form of localised topography and tree cover) to the east of Denham Mount.

6.2.3 At the base of the valley, the Alder Bourne meanders eastwards to meet the River Colne. This is generally screened from view by surrounding vegetation, except where it crosses Cherry Tree Lane as a ford. The few roads crossing the area (Cherry Tree Lane and Hollybush Lane) tend to be narrow and well enclosed by flanking hedgerows, restricting views into adjacent fields. There are few buildings, and where these do occur they can only be glimpsed amongst the surrounding vegetation cover along the fringes of the character area.

6.2.4 To the east of the M25, a public footpath crosses the fields in the vicinity of Gossams Wood and a line of pylons and overhead powerlines crosses the motorway and follows the lower ground along the line of the Alder Bourne. The visual prominence of these pylons is partially softened by the surrounding vegetation cover.

Quality
6.2.5 The landscape is considered to be of moderate value, with the underlying topography, open fields and tree cover combining to produce areas of distinctive and intimately scaled countryside. Screening provided by tree and vegetation cover helps soften the impact of negative features within, or in close proximity to, the character area (including overhead powerlines and the motorway corridors).

Sensitivity
6.2.6 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is moderate, mainly due to the strong underlying landscape features and the lack of prominence of surrounding urbanising
elements, including the motorway corridor and overhead powerlines, primarily due to the screening and enclosure provided by landform and vegetation. The sensitivity of the character area is more elevated in the area around Gossams Wood, to the east of the M25, where an elevated position and west facing slope allows direct exposure to the appeal site.

**Magnitude of effect**

6.2.7 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be moderate, as the proposals will add an increased perception of a built edge into the higher land to the east of the M25. However, this will be mitigated by intervening vegetation and would be viewed alongside the existing motorway and overhead powerlines. The magnitude of effect on other parts of the character area, to the west of the motorway and around Denham Mount, is considered to be minor due to the lack of intervisibility between these areas and the appeal site due to screening by topography and vegetation.

**Significance, nature and duration of effect**

6.2.8 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is of limited significance to this character area, when experienced from higher land to the east of the M25 and of no significance when experienced from elsewhere in the character area. The nature of the perceived change will vary across the character area and will generally be neutral due to the lack of intervisibility between the wider character area and the appeal site. However, in the area to the east of the M25, increased exposure to the appeal site will result in a perceived change whose nature is considered to be adverse, due to the likely increase in built enclosure to an area in which urbanising elements are currently softened by the surrounding landform and vegetation. The effect is permanent.

6.3 **Woodland Residential – (see Figure 5I)**

**Characteristics**

6.3.1 This character area mainly comprises of a wooded band of flatter higher ground on the southern edge of the Alder Bourne, which accommodates a number of residential dwellings. There is a small pocket of similar character along Pinewood Road, to the west of Iver Heath.

6.3.2 To the west the woodland contains Fulmer Rise, a small semi-private gated estate off Fulmer Common Road that is well defined along its southern edge by a continuous close boarded fence boundary. Access to properties is off a curving estate road flanked by mature ornamental shrubs including laurel, holly and azalea. These give a strong sense of privacy and
enclosure, restricting views into the adjacent plots and only allowing occasional glimpses of the buildings beyond. Many plots have entrances that are well defined by gates and gateposts while tightly curving driveways are enclosed by shrubbery, containing and maintaining a sense of privacy. Public access through the estate is via the Beeches Way, a long distance recreational route that is accommodated within the estate road.

6.3.3 Further east, around Langley Corner, some of the frontages of properties are more visible where they are accessed directly from the surrounding public roads (notably Cherry Tree Lane and Fulmer Common Road). They are often set back behind vegetated boundaries and well defined entrance gates and are further enclosed by the canopy of the surrounding woodland. A range of property sizes and styles can be seen from the adjacent roads and these enjoy varying degrees of seclusion and enclosure. There are some notable buildings, such as the Bridgettine Convent along Fulmer Common Road, but in most places the vegetation cover provides the most significant frontage, further reinforcing a strong sense of privacy. Moving north along Cherry Tree Lane the land starts to slope more steeply and dwellings become more dispersed and secluded within the woodland edge.

6.3.4 This character extends beyond the motorway corridor into the remnant woodland of Long Coppice. Properties along the northern edge of Sevenhills Road are similarly integrated into a predominantly woodland setting and a strong sense of enclosure and privacy is provided by a robust vegetated boundary and occasional gated entrances. Further east, around Round Coppice Farm and Denham Road there is a more noticeable parkland character, typified by open grassland and distinctive isolated trees and tree groups, although generally enclosed by surrounding vegetation.

6.3.5 To the south, along Pinewood Road, there is an isolated section of woodland which exhibits similar characteristics to the south of Pinewood Close. This is again typified by large properties set back in secluded locations within woodland. Boundaries alongside the main road are well defined by fencing and vegetation with occasional gated entrances. Properties include a small plant nursery at Little Coppice, which includes a Grade II listed house.

**Quality**

6.3.6 The landscape has a *moderate* quality for the strong, secluded woodland setting and occasional glimpses of buildings beyond. However, the appearance of secure boundary edges alongside public roads, often typified by runs of continuous fencing or uniform swathes of semi-ornamental shrub planting, can present a bland frontage that is only occasionally punctuated by imposing gateways.
**Sensitivity**

6.3.7 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is generally low, as enclosing woodland effectively screens the site from the majority of the character area. There will be some greater exposure to parts of the character area around Sevenhills Road, where the appeal site lies in close proximity to the southern edge. This is, however, only a relatively minor component of the wider character area.

**Magnitude of effect**

6.3.8 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be minor, as there will be little perception of the proposals from within the character area except for exposed sections along Sevenhills Road.

**Significance, nature and duration of effect**

6.3.9 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is of no significance to this character area. The nature of the change will be neutral due to the lack of intervisibility between the character area and the appeal site, mainly due to strong enclosure by surrounding woodland. There may be some greater exposure along sections of Sevenhills Road but in time this edge will become defined by planting associated with the proposed ecological corridor. Supplementary tree planting will gradually reinforce the vegetated enclosure along this edge and provide an appropriate buffer between the appeal scheme and the character area. The effect is permanent.

6.4 **Iver Plateau – (see Figure 5J)**

**Characteristics**

6.4.1 This character area mainly comprises of open fields (predominantly pasture and rough grassland), enclosed by vegetation, on more elevated ground around the edges of the settlement of Iver Heath. Woodland blocks and hedgerows within, and surrounding, the character area provides strong enclosure and compartmentalisation, particularly to the north east and west.

6.4.2 In the plateau areas the curved crown of the land can often be seen forming the immediate horizon within the open fields. While there is a sense of openness and elevation within these locations the strong enclosure by trees and vegetation effectively restricts wider views out to the surrounding areas.
6.4.3 Due to its proximity to the settlement of Iver Heath, the outlying dwellings along Sevenhills Road and development at Pinewood Studios, buildings can sometimes be glimpsed within the vegetated backdrops surrounding the open fields. More prominent examples include properties at Five Points Roundabout, on Denham Road to the east of Iver Heath and the large 007 stage at Pinewood Studios. Stands of trees, including conifers, can sometimes be seen close to the edge of adjacent properties.

6.4.4 The motorway is a significant feature to the east of the character area, where it runs in a wide cutting alongside the plateau area. There are also a number of main roads, including the A412 (Denham Road) and the A4007 (Slough Road). For this reason, traffic noise is a major detractor within the character area. The motorway is partially screened by the topography and establishing woodland planting while the A roads are well contained visually by surrounding vegetation.

6.4.5 There is a small mineral extraction site within the character area to the west of Pinewood Road. This is well contained by the woodland in Black Park Country Park and by planting and frontage along Uxbridge Road and Pinewood Road. Workings are concentrated to the south of the site with the northern section, including Park Lodge, being retained as an open grassed field.

Quality

6.4.6 This character area is considered to be of moderate value comprising a pleasant pastoral plateau landscape enclosed by a wooded backdrop with only occasional glimpses of adjacent properties. However, traffic noise from nearby major roads is a significant detractor.

Sensitivity

6.4.7 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is mainly moderate, as the exposed farmland plateau is generally well contained by surrounding vegetation and there are a number of existing detractors including the built edge of Iver Heath and the motorway corridor.

Magnitude of effect

6.4.8 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be major, although the evident change would be mainly confined to an area north of Iver Heath.

Significance, nature and duration of effect

6.4.9 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is significant to this character area. The nature of the change will be adverse in the area north of Iver Heath,
where open farmland will be replaced with built development of a more significant scale and mass than the existing residential edge. However, over time the maturing of the proposed landscape will help integrate the proposed built edge more successfully into the wider character area. To the south of this character area, the effect is considered to be neutral. The effect is permanent.

6.5 Amenity Woodland – (see Figure 5K)

Characteristics

6.5.1 This character area comprises an area of extensive woodland and common land to the west of Iver Heath. Much of this is within Black Park Country Park. There are occasional open areas within the woodland that accommodate a range of amenity and wildlife features including a lake, a nature reserve and a visitor centre. It is designated as an “Area of Attractive Landscape” (South Bucks Local Plan 1999) and parts of the Black Park woodland are also designated as a SSSI and Local Nature Reserve.

6.5.2 The character area is bordered by Fulmer Common Road to the north where the woodland character bleeds into the adjacent Woodland Residential area. To the south the woodland is well defined by the dual carriageway Uxbridge Road, although elements of the woodland character extend across into Langley Park Country Park further to the south. It is well defined along its eastern edge where the woodland is separated from Iver Heath by private land associated with Pinewood Studios and the mineral workings at Park Lodge.

6.5.3 The only main vehicular route crossing the area is Black Park Road, which separates Black Park Country Park from Fulmer Common. This is a long straight route enclosed by vegetation, and fencing along its eastern edge. There is a more formalised avenue of trees along its northern stretch, which also incorporates part of the Beeches Way recreational route. Woodland planting is quite dense in this area, including a large number of coniferous trees, and there is varied understorey planting cover. Further south, there are some areas of open fields at the edges of the woodland which are enclosed by the surrounding trees.

6.5.4 Main public access throughout the character area is via a network of footpaths and tracks throughout the woodland area, which are well used for informal recreation. This includes a number of pathways in Strawberry Wood to the north of the character area which can be accessed off Fulmer Common Road. A key public focus is to the south west, where there is a large car parking area off Rowley Lane that gives good access to a number of recreational.
facilities including a number of woodland trails, an aerial obstacle course, a visitor centre and the Blackpark Lake.

**Quality**
6.5.5 The landscape has a high quality for the attractive woodland setting and valuable amenity features and facilities, including a lake and a network of recreational footpaths.

**Sensitivity**
6.5.6 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is low, due to the high level of wooded enclosure and physical separation from the site.

**Magnitude of effect**
6.5.7 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be minor, as the wooded enclosure effectively screens the proposals. Pinewood Studios also provides an effective buffer between the public bridleway running along the edge of the character area and the appeal site.

**Significance, nature and duration of effect**
6.5.8 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is not significant to this character area. The nature of the change will be neutral as there is little intervisibility between the character area and the appeal site. The effect is permanent.

6.6 **Pinewood Studios – (see Figure 5L)**

**Characteristics**
6.6.1 Secure commercial film studio site comprising a mixture of buildings, hardstanding, infrastructure and open spaces. Most built development is concentrated in the centre of the site, where there is a densely packed complex of larges sheds, studios and office buildings which house a range of facilities for film and television production. Significant structures include the prominent 007 stage to the north of the complex and the large blue/green screen backdrop to the south.

6.6.2 To the south east of the complex is Heatherden Hall, a Victorian house built in a Georgian style. It is surrounded by formal gardens, including a lake, but is visually well contained by surrounding woodland.
6.6.3 The main entrance into the site is from a roundabout on Pinewood Road. It is well defined by a prominent modern reception building and gatehouse and is bustling with frequent vehicular movements in and out of the site.

6.6.4 All boundaries to the site are secured. To the west (alongside the woodland) and south it is well defined by tall green palisade fencing and security signage alongside public and permitted footpath routes. In some locations this is reinforced by earth mounding and scrub. Along the northern section of Pinewood Road (north of the entrance roundabout) it is more rural in nature, and is generally comprised of hedgerows reinforced by security mesh fencing which are occasionally punctuated by solid metal gates. It mirrors the enclosure on the opposite side of Pinewood Road alongside the adjacent open fields. Further screening is also provided by deciduous planting along the northern edge where it starts to merge into the adjacent woodland around Langley Corner. South of the entrance roundabout the boundary is more urbanised and comprises of close boarded fencing and shrubs alongside Pinewood Road. The old gatehouse and occasional gated accesses are the only notable built features along this stretch of frontage.

6.6.5 The site is generally well screened from the surrounding area except at the main entrance roundabout. There are glimpsed views through security fencing from the adjacent woodland paths and some larger buildings and stages can be seen from the surrounding countryside, mainly to the north east.

Quality

6.6.6 The quality of the landscape is considered to be low to moderate. Much of the built fabric is unattractive and cluttered and there are extensive areas of storage and parking. However, there are some attractive elements, including the exterior and formal gardens of Heatherden Hall, although they are effectively screened from the surrounding area. There is generally a dynamic and interesting character due to the nature of the activities taking place on the site and its history within the film business.

Sensitivity

6.6.7 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is low, as the Pinewood Studios site has a mixed appearance and built character and has experienced a notable degree of change. These changes continue to evolve as new facilities are developed on the site, along with temporary constructions and structures associated with a variety of film making projects.
**Magnitude of effect**

6.6.8 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be major, as the proposals look to provide strong links to the existing film making campus. The appeal site lies in close proximity to the existing main entrance to Pinewood Studios and will be well defined by distinctive building frontages and a connecting street network.

**Significance, nature and duration of effect**

6.6.9 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is of limited significance to this character area. The nature of the change will be beneficial as the proposals will provide an important resource and community for the film making industry in close proximity to the existing Pinewood site. Clear visual connections and movement routes between the existing site and the appeal site will reinforce these links. The effect is permanent.

6.7 **Motorway Corridor – (see Figure 5M)**

**Characteristics**

6.7.1 This character area comprises the junction and movement corridors of two major infrastructure routes moving traffic in and around London - the M25 and the M40

6.7.2 Both motorways comprise wide carriageways of 3 lanes width, and a hard shoulder in both directions, separated by a central reservation incorporating lighting columns. These are carried level through the surrounding topography by a combination of embankments and cuttings and are generally well contained by the landform and extensive woodland planting alongside the motorway.

6.7.3 Curving slip roads connect the two motorways at junction 16/1A with the M25 passing beneath the M40. A number of bridges carry local roads over the motorway, providing connections between the area around Iver Heath/Pinewood and Gerrards Cross, Denham and Uxbridge to the north and east.

6.7.4 Traffic on these routes is very heavy and there is a strong contrast between the very static, intrusive forms of the motorway structures and the more dynamic forms of the vehicles moving along them. Traffic noise is a major detractor within the landscape although this is partially contained by cuttings in some locations. The colour and foliage of surrounding woodland provides seasonal interest and effective screening in most areas.
Quality

6.7.5 The landscape has a low to very low quality due to the dominance of the road infrastructure and the volume of traffic. This is partly offset by the enclosure of the surrounding woodland.

Sensitivity

6.7.6 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is low, as the motorway corridor is dominated by road infrastructure and high levels of traffic and is relatively well contained by surrounding tree planting.

Magnitude of effect

6.7.7 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be minor, as there is limited intervisibility between the appeal site and the motorway corridor, mainly due to intervening vegetation and localised topography (including cuttings).

Significance, nature and duration of effect

6.7.8 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is of no significance to this character area. The nature of the change will be neutral as the proposals will be accommodated within a wider backdrop that is generally well defined by robust woodland and tree planting. Due to the speed of traffic and the nature of movements around a busy motorway interchange any glimpsed views towards the proposed development are likely to be incidental and brief. The effect is permanent.

6.8 Colne Valley Fringe – (see Figure 5N)

Characteristics

6.8.1 This character area mainly comprises open pasture and grassland stretching eastwards, from the higher plateau land around Iver Heath and north of the motorway junction, down to the urban fringes of Denham and Uxbridge on lowland in the Colne Valley.

6.8.2 The expansive west facing slopes and open aspect allow a much greater depth of view across the wide valley and there is limited screening by vegetation. There are few woodlands and planting is mainly confined to hedged field boundaries and occasional groups of trees. By virtue of the openness and localised topography the built and urbanising elements appear as more intrusive visible features within the landscape. These include transmission lines and pylons, the M40 motorway corridor, polytunnels and residential development at Denham and Uxbridge.
6.8.3 Other notable features include large farm buildings. These are often prominent within the landscape, appearing at the edge of fields and with little screening by vegetation. Associated land uses are mainly pasture with some horse grazing and rough grassland. Occasionally there will be some visible intensification of fields around dwellings and farmsteads. There are some scattered residential dwellings along Southlands Road associated with the remnant old road network before its severance from Denham by the M40. Roads are generally well contained by scrubby hedgerow vegetation.

**Quality**

6.8.4 The quality is generally considered to be low due to negative built and urbanising elements that are prominent within the landscape including pylons and transmission lines, the motorway corridor and the visible development edge of nearby settlements. This is due to the expansive east facing views out across the broad river valley and the lack of woodland enclosure that is prevalent further to the west around Iver Heath.

**Sensitivity**

6.8.5 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is low, as it is physically separated from the site by intervening topography and the motorway corridors. There are also a number of visible urbanising influences within the character area, including the built edges of Denham and Uxbridge and a number of prominent pylons and overhead powerlines.

**Magnitude of effect**

6.8.6 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be minor, as there is limited intervisibility.

**Significance, nature and duration of effect**

6.8.7 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is of no significance to this character area. The nature of the change will be neutral as the proposals will be accommodated within a distant and well vegetated backdrop and will not be discernible from the majority of the character area. The effect is permanent.

6.9 **Iver Heath Residential (North) – (see Figure 50)**

**Characteristics**

6.9.1 This character area comprises predominantly residential estate housing between Pinewood Road and Church Road (A412) on the northern edge of Iver Heath.
6.9.2 The majority of the area was laid out as a planned estate in the post war period and is typified by 3 distinctive elongated interconnected loops made up of The Parkway and Longstone Road, Thornbridge Road and Ashford Road, and Pinewood Green. Dwellings fronting on to these roads are predominantly semi detached and detached properties, often finished in white render and with many featuring distinctive large hipped rooflines and dormer windows. These are set back behind pavement, a wide grassed verge and front gardens of over 5m depth, many of which accommodate front driveways and access to side and integral garages. For this reason the streets appear quite spacious. Tree and shrub planting is mainly within the dwelling curtilage and provides a mixed appearance and variety of enclosure along the edges of the streets. There are also distinctive stands of trees within triangular islands at the corners of each loop that are strong focal features within the road layout. There is a slight variation in building styles in the later parts of the estate, along the northern edge of Pinewood Green, where brick properties and more conventional pitched roofs feature more heavily. These properties turn their back on the surrounding countryside.

6.9.3 Off the main estate roads there are a number of cul-de-sac developments of varying ages and styles. To the west is Pinewood Close, a small housing area of substantial detached brick properties with distinctive tiled gables and roofs, set back behind open grassed lawns and looped driveways. These date from a similar post war period to the wider estate.

6.9.4 To the east of this, within an attractive woodland setting is a small modern infill estate of large detached properties at Cedar Close and Firs Close. These are arranged around curving roads branching off an access from Thornbridge Road where they are integrated amongst existing mature trees, including a distinctive stand of conifers. They feature brick and render frontages, some with exterior timber detailing.

6.9.5 Along the eastern edge, close to the junction of Thornbridge Road and Church Road there is a small local centre featuring an arcade of shops (including a small supermarket), parking area and pub. This is a bustling area with many traffic movements around the roundabout junction on the A412 and congestion on the approach into Thornbridge Road by parked cars accessing the local shops. To the west of this centre is an area of 3 storey apartment blocks and bungalows arranged around a central lawn and served by garage parking courts. This is perceived to be of lower quality than the surrounding estates.

6.9.6 There is also a small housing estate at Wood Lane Close to the south east of the Five Points roundabout, west of Wood Lane. This has been included within the character area as it is of a
similar period to the wider estates north of Church Road and is also arranged around a loop road. Houses are mainly brick, some with gabled features.

**Quality**

6.9.7 The character area has a *moderate* quality, with the majority of substantial properties arranged around a series of looped estate roads displaying a homogenous character through the use of rendered finishes and distinctive tiled roofs. There are some variations, due to age and use of materials, and subsequent infill is of mixed character and quality, especially close to the local centre on Church Road. Cedar Close is a modern cul-de-sac of substantial detached dwellings that benefits from the strong character of surrounding woodland and retained mature trees.

**Sensitivity**

6.9.8 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is *moderate*, as there is a strong underlying character of planned estate housing, focussed on three distinctive looped roads, but with variations around the periphery, and as infill, including a modern cul-de-sac.

**Magnitude of effect**

6.9.9 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be *moderate*, as the proposals will generally be screened from the wider estate by residential frontage along Pinewood Green. However, the appeal scheme will introduce notable built form into an area of open fields close to the rear of properties along the northern edge of Iver Heath.

**Significance, nature and duration of effect**

6.9.10 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is of *limited significance* to this character area. The nature of the change will generally be *neutral* as it will be screened from the majority of the residential area by the existing residential frontages. It will be *adverse* from properties along the immediate edge of Iver Heath, where views across open fields will be replaced by built enclosure. However, this will be partially buffered by the inclusion of a linear open space between the proposed scheme and the existing housing as part of the proposals. The effect is *permanent*. 
6.10  Iver Heath Residential (South) – (see Figure 5P)

**Characteristics**

6.10.1 Much of the character area is contained within a triangle of roads formed by Church Road (A412), Slough Road (A4007) and Bangors Road South, with an additional area extending south of Slough Road. It is predominantly residential. Several public services and facilities (including a health centre, school and playing fields) are located in the centre of the triangle and are screened from the surrounding main roads by housing. Public houses feature prominently at each of the three corners and the church at Iver Heath is a significant landmark when approaching the settlement from the south west. While the majority of the housing has its foundations in the post war period there are numerous examples of modern infill, usually within individual or subdivided plots, and indicates the constant recycling of the built fabric. This is likely to be due to the constraints on development by the surrounding green belt.

6.10.2 The arrangement of housing within the triangle is mainly composed of a series of cul-de-sac developments with separate entrances off Church Road (to the north) and Bangors Road South (to the east). There are also a number of much smaller infill developments with entrances on the northern edge of Slough Road. Many of these are connected by pedestrian alleys and there is only one through vehicular route, where Glaisyer Way links through to Trewarden Avenue.

6.10.3 Within the triangle the older development is concentrated to the north east, close to the junction of Bangors Road South and Church Road and backing on to a playing field and childrens play area. This comprises of Anslow Gardens to the south, a formal linear cul-de-sac characterised by semi detached housing in a symmetrical housing arrangement, and Rostrevor Gardens to the west, which is a curving cul-de-sac and turning head surrounded by bungalows. Both cul-de-sacs feature examples of modern infill development within the overall built fabric, most notably at Birch Close off the entrance to Anslow Gardens.

6.10.4 Further development has occured in the northern corner at St Davids Close and spreading out along the A roads to the south and west (dating from the 1960s onwards). Of significance is the network of cul-de-sacs branching off Heath Way to the north of Slough Road, which is characterised by rows of short terraces and semi detached 2 storey brick housing. These are set back behind front gardens that are generally well defined by clipped hedges or low front walls. Many have gated private drives but there is a noticeable on street parking presence, possibly due to the close proximity of the school, which is accessed through the estate. At St
Davids Close there are also a number of 3 storey brick and render housing blocks, some set perpendicular to the main carriageway. A small arcade of local shops links through to Church Road to the north.

6.10.5 There has also been significant infill development in the centre of the triangle in the form of a long, linear estate development at Trewarden Avenue. Along its eastern extent, 2 storey brick housing either fronts, or is set perpendicular to, the main carriageway. Where it is set perpendicular, the housing fronts on to small open landscape or parking areas but often exposes rear boundaries to the street. At its centre is a sheltered housing complex and a health centre set back beyond a grassed open space.

6.10.6 Further to the south, Slough Road is a busy main road with a mixture of housing development along its northern edge, including a small row of shops, but a generally more set back frontage, occasionally behind separate private driveways, along its southern edge. Topography is more noticeable in the housing areas beyond Slough Road, as the land starts to drop away towards the south. These mainly comprise of bungalow and 2 storey housing. Notable features are the occasional black timber clad dwellings that can be seen within the estate around Swallowdale to the south west.

Quality

6.10.7 The landscape has a low to moderate quality due to the mix and condition of the general housing.

Sensitivity

6.10.8 The sensitivity of the character area to the appeal scheme is low, as the built character is made up of a disparate collection of cul-de-sac and infill developments and it is physically separated from the appeal site by estate development to the north of Church Road.

Magnitude of effect

6.10.9 The magnitude of effect of the appeal scheme to the character area is considered to be minor, as the proposals will be separated from this area by existing housing development. It is also a character area that is used to ongoing change, typified by a number of infill developments.

Significance, nature and duration of effect

6.10.10 As a result of its sensitivity and magnitude of effect, the appeal scheme is of no significance to this character area. The nature of the change will be neutral as there will be little perception of the appeal scheme from the character area. The effect is permanent.
6.11 Overall assessment

6.11.1 The detailed assessment of landscape and townscape characters adjacent to the appeal site, identified the following nine character types:

1. Valley Farmlands
2. Woodland Residential
3. Iver Plateau
4. Amenity Woodland
5. Pinewood Studios
6. Motorway Corridor
7. Colne Valley Fringe
8. Iver Heath Residential (North)
9. Iver Heath Residential (South)

6.11.2 Of these character types, the effect of the appeal scheme is considered to be significant to one, of limited significance to three and of no significance to five. Of those character areas with a significant effect or effect of limited significance, the nature of effect was typically adverse, with the exception of Pinewood Studios character area, which was considered to have benefitted from the appeal scheme.

6.11.3 Of these adverse impacts, the effect is further reduced by being limited to small geographic areas within each character area, such as:

- Valley Farmlands – the area of adverse effect is limited to a small area of high land to the east of the M25 roundabout (viewpoint no. 2 is within this area).
- Iver Plateaus – the area of adverse effect is limited to the development site itself and an area to the immediate south east of the site.
- Iver Heath Residential (North) – the area of adverse effect is limited to the fringe of residential buildings directly abutting the site boundary.

6.11.4 The net effect of this reduced impact is for the appeal scheme to have a remarkably contained impact on the surrounding character, with harm only resulting to the appeal site itself, the rear of adjacent properties immediately to the south and a small area of high land to the east of the M25 motorway.
7. **ON SITE LANDSCAPE AND ARBORICULTURAL MATTERS**

7.1 **Introduction**

7.1.1 The proposed development requires the selective removal of a number of trees and hedgerows, many of which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (SBDC TPO no. 23 2010 and TPO no. 24, 2010, Eton Rural District TPO 1970, and BCC TPO 1950).

7.1.2 The proposed removal of trees and hedgerows are required due to:

   a) The necessary movement network within the development crossing the existing hedgerows (including mature native trees), which have TPO status.

   b) The highway improvements proposed to Five Points roundabout being constructed on land which contains TPO trees and at Seven Hills junction on land partly occupied by an existing hedgerow and tree belt.

7.1.3 These individual areas of tree and hedgerow loss are explored further below with regard to the nature and effectiveness of the proposed mitigation of tree and hedgerow loss along with an assessment of how this loss impact on the local landscape character.

7.2 **Project Pinewood Site**

**Tree and Hedgerow Loss**

7.2.1 The Project Pinewood site benefits greatly from its setting of mature hedgerows which contain large, mature native trees and the woodland know as ‘The Clump’, the latter being protected by a Woodland TPO, the former by an Area TPO. These features have quite rightly been identified as key elements of the site and have been incorporated as such within the masterplan proposals. Whilst ‘The Clump’ can be incorporated within the masterplan with landscape benefits (such as improved access and a long term management programme) the alignment of the existing hedgerows does require access routes to cross them. This requirement necessitates the removal of the following trees within the Area TPO (SBDC no. 23 2010):

   i. Four trees to the hedgerow abutting Pinewood Road (10% of the corridor – four out of a total of 40 trees). Of these trees, one is recommended for removal, two are of secondary standard and one is of tertiary standard (see Figure 6A)
ii. Five trees to the hedgerow aligned west – east from the proposed site entrance to ‘The Clump’ (8% of the corridor – five out of a total of 60 trees). Of these trees, one is recommended for removal, one is of secondary standard and three are of tertiary standard (see Figure 6B).

iii. One tree (tertiary standard) to the less wooded hedgerow aligned approximately north – south from the proposed site entrance to ‘The Clump’ (8% of the corridor – total 13 trees) (see Figure 6C).

7.2.2 An arboricultural survey has been carried out to inform the hedgerow crossing strategy, which has resulted in the minimal tree loss possible, whilst maintaining the necessary vehicle and pedestrian access across these corridors. The flexibility set within the parameters of the outline planning application (see page 123 of the DAS - CDG/1 Doc 3) allows variation to the building footprint. This flexibility will be useful at design code and reserved matters design stages to ensure the protection of trees to be retained (see Figures 6D-6E).

Impact on local landscape character
7.2.3 The sensitive design strategy has resulted in a remarkably low number of trees identified for removal, considering in parts the dense coverage of mature native trees along these hedgerow corridors. The net effect of this approach is that the required tree loss has an insignificant impact on the landscape resource of the hedgerows themselves, and of their visual amenity. The integrity and character of the existing hedgerows are retained to the benefit of the scheme.

7.3 Five Points Roundabout

Tree and Hedgerow Loss
7.3.1 Five Points roundabout is identified as requiring improvements to its layout (detailed planning application 09/00707/FUL) and, as a result, requires additional land take to deliver these improvements. Part of the proposed land take involves two separate Tree Preservation Orders (Eton TPO (1970) and SBDC TPO no. 24 (2010) which contains mature native woodland blocks to the north and north east of this road junction. These woodlands are currently in an unmanaged state, but contribute to the immediate environment of the roundabout being partially enclosed by mature woodland. The proposed junction improvement requires the removal of 143 trees in mitigation, a total of 101 no. native trees are proposed to be planted to recreate the wooded nature of this junction.
Impact on local landscape character

7.3.2 The loss of mature native trees has a detrimental impact on the immediate setting of the roundabout. However, the TPO area only has a localised contribution to the wider landscape character (see Figure 6H) and whilst the proposed mitigation planting will not re-create the form of the existing TPO woodland, it will in time recreate the localised, well wooded enclosure to this roundabout. It should also be noted that the mature trees that are retained within the proposals are in a prominent position.

Revised design solution

7.3.3 A design safety audit of the proposed scheme has been carried out by Buckinghamshire County Council resulting in the development of an alternative junction design which provides junction efficiencies and results in a reduced land take. This design solution is subject to a recent detailed planning application and reduces the proposed tree loss from 143 no. trees to 61 no. trees (53 of which are TPO) allowing the retention of 75% of TPO no. 24 and 40% of Eton TPO (1970). This design solution has reasonably significant landscape benefits over the original scheme in the long term; the perceived impact of tree loss on the localised, well wooded nature of the junction is reduced through the increased retention of trees in the main tree group between Slough Road and Church Road, resulting in the previously identified localised impact being obviated. Figure 6H highlights the broad areas of tree loss for both the original and alternative junction solution.

7.4 Seven Hills Junction

Tree and Hedgerow Loss

7.4.1 Seven Hills junction has been identified as requiring safety and capacity improvements involving enlargement of the highway corridor, necessitating some land take from the adjacent highway verge and field boundary (detailed planning application 09/00708/FUL). This results in the loss of 29 no. native hedgerow trees and 34 no. hedgerow shrubs and their replacement with 21 no. native hedgerow trees and 580m² of hedgerow planting.
Impact on local landscape character

7.4.2 The tree and hedgerow loss is localised and has a very small impact on the nature of the environment and has negligible impact on the wider landscape character of the area. The proposed planting will successfully realise a native tree and hedgerow field boundary.

Revised design solution

7.4.3 A design safety audit of the proposed scheme has been carried out by Buckinghamshire County Council, resulting in the development of an alternative junction design encompassing a signalised junction, rather than a roundabout. Whilst this revised design is understood to have highway benefits it has a very similar landscape solution to the determined scheme, requiring the loss of 27 no. trees and 34 no. shrubs and their replacement with 21 no. native hedgerow trees and 485m² of native hedgerow planting. Figure 6i highlights the broad areas of tree loss for both the original and alternative junction solution.

7.5 Overall assessment

7.5.1 The integrity, character and visual amenity of the mature hedgerows within the Project Pinewoods site are successfully retained with impacts on biodiversity successfully mitigated. The sensitive design approach, and flexibility in the building footprint parameters, has ensured these high quality trees are a feature of the scheme with minimal tree loss (10% or below of the total number of hedgerow trees) to provide vehicular and pedestrian access, with none of the trees lost being of the highest standard and the majority being either of secondary or tertiary standard.

7.5.2 The tree loss required at Five Points has a detrimental impact on the immediate landscape character insofar as the wooded enclosure of the roundabout junction will be lost. This tree loss will not have an impact on this wider landscape character or purposes of the Green Belt due to its reduced visibility (see Figure 6H). The revised design solution for this roundabout would, in my view, obviate this impact to the localised landscape character due to the retention of an increased amount of the principal tree group, combined with the proposed complementary native tree and shrub planting.

7.5.3 The tree loss at Seven Hills junction will be suitably mitigated through native tree and shrub planting. The proposed tree loss is not prominent and does not play an important role in the local or wider landscape character or have any influence on the purposes of the Green Belt.
This impact of the original junction design upon the landscape is broadly the same as when compared with the alternative scheme (see Figure 6i).
8. REASONS FOR REFUSAL AND POLICY ASSESSMENT

8.1.1 This proof of evidence considers reasons for refusal 1, 2, 6 and 7 for the outline planning application for the principal development (09/00706/OUT), reasons for refusal 1, 2 and 5 for the detailed application for highway related works at Five Points Roundabout (09/00707/FUL) and reasons for refusal 1 and 2 for detailed application for highway related works at Seven Hills Junction (09/00708/FUL).

8.1.2 Reasons for refusal relating to 09/00706/OUT are shown below. Reasons 1 and 2 are identical to reasons for refusal 1 and 2 for applications 09/00707/FUL and 09/00708/FUL.

1. This site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt where there is a presumption against development other than for a specified list of categories. The development in question does not fall within any of these categories and as such constitutes inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. As well as being unacceptable in principle, the development represents a prominent physical and visual intrusion into the Green Belt and the applicant has not advanced any special circumstances sufficient to warrant an exception to the normal operation of Green Belt policy. As such the development is contrary to Green Belt principles as set out in PPG2 and to policies GB1 and EP3 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted in March 1999) and Policy SP5 of The South East Plan.

2. The site is located within the Colne Valley Park wherein proposals will only be permitted where, amongst other criteria, they maintain and enhance the landscape in terms of character, its scenic and conservation value and its overall amenity. Furthermore proposals should safeguard existing areas of countryside from inappropriate development and should not involve urbanisation of the park. The proposal that is the subject of this application is not consistent with these aims and as such the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policy L6 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) and Policy WCBV5 of The South East Plan.

3. The proposals have failed to take proper account of the trees on site, the subjects of Bucks County Council Tree Preservation Order No. 3 of 1950 and South Bucks District Council Tree Preservation Order No. 23 of 2010. The trees and woodland in and around this site are important features of the local landscape making positive contributions to the visual amenity of the area. The loss of these trees and woodland and the impact of the proposed developments upon existing trees would be detrimental to this visual amenity.

6. The scheme has therefore failed to take account of existing landscape features that are an important element in the character and appearance of the site. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies L10 and EP4 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999).

7. The proposals would result in the loss of 100 metres of important hedgerow by dissecting the hedgerows with major and minor roads and an overall loss of 376
condition metres because the retained segments of hedgerow will be ‘cut-off’ from the surrounding offsetting mitigation measures. Even after ‘offsetting’ the proposals would result in the residual effect of an estimated loss of 178 condition metres. The fragmentation of important hedgerows would result in the loss of significant amenity and the important ecological features. Important hedgerows are a priority habitat in the Buckinghamshire and UK Biodiversity Action Plans and are protected by The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 it is therefore considered that the proposals have not made a positive use of the intrinsic qualities and features of the site and are therefore contrary to Policy EP3 (b) of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999).

8.1.3 Reason for refusal no. 5 of application 09/00707/FUL at Five Points Roundabout is added below:

5. The proposals have failed to take proper account of the trees on site, the subjects of Eaton Rural District Tree Preservation Order, No 2 of 1970 and the South Bucks District Council Tree Preservation Order 24 of 2010. The trees and woodland in and around this area are important features of the local landscape making positive contributions to the visual amenity of the area. The loss of these trees and woodland and the impact of the proposed developments upon existing trees would be detrimental to this visual amenity. The scheme has therefore failed to take account of existing landscape features that are an important element in the character and appearance of the site. As such the proposal fails to comply with policy L10 and EP4 of the South Bucks Local Plan (adopted March 1999).

8.1.4 I consider below the reasons for refusal identified above, along with an assessment of how the scheme performs against each policy test identified within the relevant reason for refusal.

8.2 Planning Application 09/00706/OUT

Reason for refusal 1

Harm to Green Belt / PPG2

8.2.1 Chapter 5 of this proof of evidence assesses the impact of the appeal scheme on the purposes of the Green Belt. This assessment recognises that the proposed development is, by definition, inappropriate and therefore harmful to the Green Belt. This assessment identifies that, of the 14 viewpoints selected as being representative of how the appeal site will be viewed in the context of the Green Belt, nine viewpoints had no impact on the purposes of the existing Green Belt. Of the remaining five viewpoints, all but one had an impact on an individual purpose of the Green Belt, whilst the remaining viewpoint (Viewpoint 8) impacted on two of the four Green Belt purposes tested. In light of this, it is recognised that the appeal
scheme has a detrimental impact on the purposes of the Green Belt, however this impact is not widespread and is contained to a small number of viewpoints, only one of which is a relatively distant view. This impact needs to be considered against the exceptional circumstances and other benefits the appeal scheme will result in (as considered in evidence by others).

SBDC Policy GB1

8.2.2 As identified above, it is recognised that the appeal scheme is by definition inappropriate for the Green Belt, however the actual harm caused by the appeal scheme to the purposes of the Green Belt is contained to a relatively small number of viewpoints.

SBDC Policy EP3

8.2.3 This policy considers the use, layout and design and development under a series of headings, the appeal scheme is considered alongside these headings below:

Scale

8.2.4 The appeal scheme is between 2 and 6 storeys in the context of a predominantly 2 storey suburban setting but with some individual buildings (007 Stage) the equivalent of 6/7 residential storeys. An implicit part of Project Pinewood’s aim is to create international street typologies which, in certain locations, require this height and scale. The higher ‘core’ of the appeal scheme is located near to the existing Pinewood Studios, with the lower density 2 and 3 storey properties located to the external parts of the site which have most contact with the surrounding environment.

Layout

8.2.5 An urban design audit (Chapter 4) has found the appeal scheme makes positive use of existing features, does not adversely affect the character or amenity of surrounding properties, and provides a pleasant, well structured and legible series of streets, and spaces

Height

8.2.6 As explained above, the height of buildings in the area is predominantly two storeys, with some notable exceptions up to seven storeys. The appeal scheme does promote buildings of up to seven storeys, however these are located in a way that does not adversely impact on residential amenity and is a requirement of the project brief.
Building form
8.2.7 The appeal scheme does not aim to replicate its context, which is typically suburban and non distinct. It introduces a variety of building forms which improve the built character and quality of the area.

Materials
8.2.8 This level of detail will be considered through a design code and reserved matters stages, however it should be noted that the street typologies proposed will necessitate the use of high quality materials.

Use of land and buildings
8.2.9 The appeal scheme is compatible with its context. The public open space and low density development to the periphery of the site assists this, as does the strong axis to Pinewood Studios. The scale of development, whilst at its ‘core’ is quite different to the suburban context, does not adversely affect the suburban character or amenity, as notable from representative viewpoint no. 5.

SEP Policy SP5
8.2.10 This policy repeats the objectives of PPG2 and is primarily concerned with maintaining the separation of settlements and the review of Green Belt boundaries and therefore does not add to the points raised above.

Reason for refusal 2
SBDC Policy L6
8.2.11 The appeal site is located within the Colne Valley Park, and therefore policy L6 is of relevance. Policy L6 considers the following matters, with the appeal site being considered against each:

Character, conservation, amenity and scenic quality
The appeal scheme has been assessed against its surrounding landscape character types (Chapter 6) and has been found to have adverse impacts on three of the nine character types surrounding the site. Of these three types, the adverse impact is located to small geographic areas which further reduce the impact of the scheme on this policy.
Inappropriate development and urbanisation

8.2.12 The appeal scheme is by definition, inappropriate, however the visual impact of the development on the wider landscape is contained, with only one distant view identifying the appeal scheme within the wider Colne Valley Park landscape.

Nature conservation

8.2.13 The appeal scheme does not have a detrimental impact on the nature conservation interests of the Colne Valley Park and is promoting a number of off-site conservation enhancement measures.

Outdoor sport or recreation

8.2.14 The appeal scheme promotes public access to the site, over half of which is parkland and public open space with new pedestrian, cyclist and bridleway access and therefore improves this aspect of the site, which is currently with limited access and of limited recreation value.

SEP Policy WCBV5

8.2.15 This policy broadly repeats the considerations of policy L6 as is not considered further, see L6 above.

Reason for refusal 3

TPO

8.2.16 The appeal scheme necessitates the removal of a small number of TPO trees (see Chapter 7), these represent less than 10% of the total trees within the hedgerow corridors affected and of those trees to be removed the majority are of secondary or tertiary quality. A detailed survey and sensitive design exercise assisted this exercise to ensure pedestrian and vehicular crossing points have minimal impact on the hedgerows, resulting in the integrity, character and visual amenity of these tree corridors being unaffected by the appeal scheme. It is also recognised that these mature trees will form part of a future management strategy, to be prepared and agreed to discharge a planning condition.

Reason for refusal 4

SBDC Policy L10

8.2.17 As identified above, the TPO tree loss identified above is not considered to damage the amenity or contribution of the trees to the character of the area. Quite the opposite, insofar
that the public can now gain access to experience the mature trees and the future management strategy will carefully manage these trees to maximise their longevity.

**SBDC Policy EP4**

8.2.18 The scheme carefully integrates hard and soft landscape, evident in the quality of both the public open space and urban streets and squares. The design code and reserved matters will develop further the detailed design of these matters. The appeal scheme sensitively addresses the retained mature hedgerows as a key feature of the masterplan and promotes appropriate native planting as part of the public open space strategy, the maintenance and management of which will require a detailed strategy to be agreed as part of a planning condition.

**Reason for refusal 7**

**Hedgerow loss**

8.2.19 The detailed surveying of the key hedgerow corridors within the appeal site, along with the adjustment of pedestrian and vehicular access routes has resulted in only 10 trees being removed in total, the majority of which are of secondary and tertiary quality. I consider this solution to be sensitive and appropriate and a positive aspect of the appeal scheme. Whilst the severance of hedgerows will have a minor impact upon biodiversity at a small number of crossing points, sensitive design will allow for minimising this impact, through the avoidance of the most mature hedgerow trees and the re-connection of corridors using underpasses beneath crossings and/or canopy connections over them.

**SBDC Policy EP3 (b)**

8.2.20 The appeal scheme has been found to incorporate the mature hedgerows within the masterplan responsibly and creatively (4.2.2 and 7.2), making use of the very positive contribution of these features with minimal tree loss and without detriment to the integrity of the hedgerow, their contribution to landscape character or their visual amenity.

**8.3 Planning Application 09/00707/FUL**

**Reason for refusal 1**

**Harm to Green Belt / PPG2**

8.3.1 The proposed junction improvements require the removal of 143no. trees which will have an impact on the localised landscape character until such time as the tree and shrub planting forms enclosure with the retained woodland. This is, however, a local landscape and arboricultural matter (see Figure 6F), and whilst PPG2 has an overarching objective to prevent
urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, it is difficult to see how this strategic objective relates to a fine scale highway improvement scheme. The junction improvements do not create unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, allows towns to merge, encroach into ‘countryside’, affect the setting of historic towns or compromise urban regeneration.

_SBSDC Policy GB1_

8.3.2 As per my view on PPG2 above, the proposed junction improvements involve the removal of a number of trees which have an impact on the localised landscape until such time as the proposed planting matures to the extent that it forms a composition with the retained mature trees and increases the enclosure of the junction. Whilst this mitigation will take a significant amount of time to realise its full effect, the retention of some key mature trees ensure that the junction retains some enclosure from mature vegetation.

_SBSDC Policy EP3_

8.3.3 The proposal have made positive use of the intrinsic qualities of the area through the retention of prominent mature trees within the junction design, although due to the nature of the junction improvements required a large number of trees are to be removed. It should be noted that a design review exercise has led to a revised scheme solution, for which a planning application has been recently submitted, that is more concise and as a result requires significantly reduced tree loss and provides greater enclosure of the junction by vegetation from the outset. This revised junction design is the preferred solution in landscape and arboriculture terms.

_SEP Policy SP5_

8.3.4 This policy repeats the objectives of PPG2 and is primarily concerned with maintaining the separation of settlements and the review of Green Belt boundaries and therefore does not add to the points raised above.

_Reason for refusal 2_

SBDC Policy L6

8.3.5 The appeal site is located within the Colne Valley Park, and therefore policy L6 is of relevance. Policy L6 considers the following matters, with the appeal site being considered against each:

Character, conservation, amenity and scenic quality

8.3.6 The junction improvements result in highly localised landscape effects and do not, in my view, have an impact on the wider landscape character areas as identified within chapter 6 of this
proof of evidence. There is a detrimental impact on landscape amenity through the loss of TPO trees, which is mitigated by the proposed tree and shrub planting, which will take a significant amount of time to fully realise its mitigation potential.

**Inappropriate development and urbanisation**

8.3.7 The junction improvements extend the amount of highway; however the retention of mature vegetation at the centre of the junction and replanting of the western field boundary will maintain a rural character for the surroundings of the junction.

**Nature conservation**

8.3.8 The appeal scheme removed vegetation and, in part, replaces this with native tree and shrub planting. It is recognised that this process will have some short-term, minor adverse effects on ecological interests.

**Outdoor sport or recreation**

8.3.9 This aspect is not applicable.

*SEP Policy WCBVS*

8.3.10 This policy broadly repeats the considerations of policy L6 as is not considered further, see L6 above.

**Reason for refusal 5**

*TPO*

8.3.11 The proposed junction improvements require the removal of 143no. trees, many of which are within Eton TPO (1970) or SBDC TPO no. 24 (2010). This tree loss does create a localised detrimental impact, mitigated by the retention of a prominent group of trees and proposed tree and shrub planting. Figure 6F highlights just how localised this impact is, as this viewpoint is some 70-80 metres from the junction and the group of trees to be removed forms a relatively minor component of the view. A central, prominent tree group is retained and incorporated into the road junction layout.

*SBDC Policy L10*

8.3.12 As identified above, whilst the TPO tree loss identified above has a localised impact, it is not considered to greatly damage the contribution of the trees to the character of the area.
8.3.13 The scheme retains a number of the TPO trees, although the existing tree group is not considered to be important elements of the wider area as their presence is only evident in close quarters. An appropriate planting solution is proposed, which will be subject to a maintenance and management condition.

Conclusion

8.3.14 The proposed junction improvement at Five Points roundabout requires the removal of a number of mature trees within a group Tree Preservation Order. The impact of this tree removal is, however, highly localised and is mitigated by the retention of a prominent tree group and further native tree and shrub planting. This impact is reduced further through the recently made revised planning application which delivers a more concise junction arrangement.

8.4 Planning Application 09/00708/FUL

Reason for refusal 1

Harm to Green Belt / PPG2

8.4.1 The appeal scheme requires the removal of some riparian trees and hedgerow, although does not break the existing hedgerow line and provides significant mitigation planting. The junction improvements do not create unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, allows towns to merge, encroach into ‘countryside’, affect the setting of historic towns or compromise urban regeneration.

SBDC Policy GB1

8.4.2 As per the above, the junction improvements provide highly localised highway changes, requiring a minor amount of additional land to deliver these changes (see Figure 6G). The impact of the appeal scheme (and the revised and recently submitted scheme) is not viewed as impacting on the success of the Green Belt in its overarching aim of keeping land open of the more detailed five purposes described in paragraph 3.2 of the South Buckinghamshire Local Plan.

SBDC Policy EP3

8.4.3 The minor amount of tree and hedgerow removal is considered to be acceptable in light of the highly localised contribution this vegetation makes to the character of the area, the lack of ‘puncture’ to the field boundary and the proposed native tree and shrub planting.
**SEP Policy SP5**

8.4.4 This policy repeats the objectives of PPG2 and is primarily concerned with maintaining the separation of settlements and the review of Green Belt boundaries and therefore does not add to the points raised above.

**Reason for refusal 2**

*Harm to Colne Valley Park*

**SBDC Policy L6**

8.4.5 The appeal site is located within the Colne Valley Park, and therefore policy L6 is of relevance. Policy L6 considers the following matters, with the appeal site being considered against each:

**Character, conservation, amenity and scenic quality**

8.4.6 As above, the tree loss required to deliver this scheme (and the recently submitted alternative scheme) is minor with a localised change which has a negligible impact on the Colne Valley Park due to the minor contribution the existing trees make to the wider landscape character, the lack of ‘puncture’ to the field boundary and the appropriateness of the proposed native tree and shrub planting.

**Inappropriate development and urbanisation**

8.4.7 The junction improvements extend the amount of highway; however the retention of mature vegetation at the centre of the junction and replanting of the western field boundary will maintain a rural character for the surroundings of the junction.

**Nature conservation**

8.4.8 The appeal scheme removed vegetation and, in part, replaces this with native tree and shrub planting. It is recognised that this process will have some short-term, minor adverse effects on ecological interests.

**Outdoor sport or recreation**

8.4.9 This aspect is not applicable.

**SEP Policy WCBV5**

8.4.10 This policy broadly repeats the considerations of policy L6 as is not considered further, see L6 above.
8.5 Other policy considerations

**PPS1**

8.5.1 This document advocates design that responds to its context. The street typologies are, by necessity, very bespoke when compared to the character of the local area, replicating a variety of streetscapes from around the world. Conceptually, however, the idea of using the local context as the backdrop to filming is not without historical precedent for the countryside surrounding Pinewood Studios. The aspirations placed upon the site are also unique and these stem from its close proximity to a world renowned film and television studio, which also forms part of its context.

8.5.2 The masterplan also seeks to respond to its more sensitive interfaces in an appropriate manner, by providing landscape buffers between the residential edge of Iver Heath and the new development, reducing the scale of development in terms of heights and density along the southern edge, retaining existing trees and hedgerows (where possible) and providing an appropriate setting for existing rights of way. It will also provide an opportunity to make improvements to the open space and wildlife habitats surrounding the site.

**PPS3**

8.5.3 With regard to paragraph 16

- The proposed development will facilitate improvements to the existing public transport and community services, while planned junction improvements will provide easier access to the site and Pinewood Studios.

- The scheme will provide a range of outdoor amenity and habitat spaces within easy reach of the proposed housing and the nearby existing community. Access to private outdoor space will be dependent on the house types within the various character areas and will range from private gardens to communal courtyards.

- Due to the nature of the proposals, there will be some deviation from the prevailing housing character neighbouring the site in terms of scale and density. In this respect it draws closer parallels with the type of development that can be seen on the nearby Pinewood Studios site. In terms of layout and access, the proposed scheme is a planned estate accessed from Pinewood Road, and in this respect shares certain characteristics with the 1960s development that currently defines the northern edge of Iver Heath.
• The masterplan will incorporate a number of measures to improve energy efficiency and use of resources. These are outlined in more detail in Section 7 of the Design and Access Statement.

• Parking demand will be met within the site through a combination of on-street, on-plot, off-street, and underground parking solutions. Alternative parking will be in place to deal with temporary loss of access to spaces when filming.

• The street typologies will create a series of distinctive character zones. The proposed hierarchy of streets and spaces, the retention of existing hedgerows and woodland and the provision of useable and attractive open spaces will also provide a strong contribution to character within the redeveloped site. Retained vegetation and supplementary landscape buffers will also help integrate the more imposing elements of the proposals into their surroundings.

• Biodiversity interests will be maintained across the site through the retention of significant hedgerows and woodland features and the creation of enhanced habitat areas within the wildlife buffer. This will also strengthen links to surrounding habitats. The Design and Access Statement asserts that there will be no net loss of biodiversity from implementing the proposals (P130 & 219).

8.5.4 With regard to the companion guide, most of the attributes identified in successful schemes are aspirations of the proposed scheme and are outlined in more detail in Section 4 of the Design and Access Statement. Central to this will be the unique character attributes and detailing which are inherent within the filming streetscapes.

PPS7

8.5.5 Pinewood Studios is a notable employer in the local area. The establishment of a mixed use community that expands on the available film making resources would bring benefits to the local economy in a predominantly rural location. It would not be isolated as it would be close to the nearby residential centre of Iver Heath.

SBDC Policy L7

8.5.6 There are no designated “Green Spaces” within close proximity of the appeal site, except for the small incidental spaces within the housing estate to the south. The site itself is more robustly covered by Green Belt policy and has therefore not been designated as a “Green Space”, although there are areas of the site which show informal use by the public.
SBDC Policy EP5

8.5.7 With regard to daylight and sunlight the Design and Access Statement makes certain commitments (P262) to achieve good levels of daylight within the proposed development. These include:-

- the careful arrangement of buildings and massing within the masterplan,
- orientating living spaces to face south wherever possible,
- limiting single aspect apartments facing north, and
- allowing good light penetration into courtyards and surrounding open spaces.

8.5.8 A landscape buffer will be provided along the northern edge of Iver Heath to protect some of the daylight amenity of the adjacent existing houses. The height of proposed buildings along this edge will also be restricted.

SBDC Policy EP6

8.5.9 The Design and Access Statement states that it has followed the principles established in “Secured by Design” (P86) in line with aspirations contained within Policy EP6. This includes:-

- an integrated approach to masterplanning;
- engendering feelings of ownership through the provision of a high quality and attractive living environment;
- the establishment of active frontages to provide natural surveillance to public routes and spaces;
- sensitive landscape design; and
- the provision of appropriate site maintenance and security.

8.5.10 Filming requirements along certain frontages will necessitate some dual entrance arrangements, where secondary access for residents is sometimes required to the rear of dwellings. This may lead to a blurring of what constitutes public and private space. This will be dealt with through management and the careful design of communal and access areas, to ensure an appropriate level of surveillance is maintained.
SBDC Policy R4
8.5.11 The Design and Access Statement sets out the quantum of open space that will be provided as part of the proposals (P142). This demonstrates that it will exceed the requirements set out in the National Playing Fields Association standards which form the basis of Policy R4. This includes a range of informal and formal recreation areas, sports courts and pitches and children play areas.

SBDC Policy H9
8.5.12 This policy sets out general policy on the layout and design of proposed residential areas.
8.5.13 The scale and character of the development proposed is very different to that of the surrounding residential areas, by virtue of the detailing and character that is required to produce a range of effective and convincing filming backdrops. However, the masterplan locates taller elements in a cluster at the centre of the site, where it relates better to the larger scale development that is characteristic of the adjacent Pinewood Studios. Development then steps down in height to the edges of the development, to around 2-3 storeys, where it more closely reflects the height and scale of existing housing on the northern edge of Iver Heath.
8.5.14 The site is not close to any “Residential Areas of Exceptional Character” that may elevate the sensitivity of the existing adjacent housing edge.
8.5.15 Emergency and refuse collection access, provision of amenity space and appropriate level of daylighting will be accommodated within the masterplan and are set out in more detail in Sections 4 & 7 of the Design and Access Statement. There will be minimal loss of existing trees and vegetation. The provision of a landscape buffer and a restriction on building heights along the southern edge of the proposed development will seek to limit the impact on the adjacent housing area.

SBDC CS Policy 5
8.5.16 The proposals will offset the loss of open land with the provision of a range of attractive, usable and accessible open spaces that will make improvements to both the amenity and biodiversity of the land to the north of Iver Heath.

SBDC CS Policy 8
8.5.17 There are no significant historic assets or heritage features within close proximity of the appeal site. Pinewood Studios lies adjacent to the site and is an established and world renowned film studio.
8.5.18 The scale and nature of the development proposed will only affect housing areas on the northern edge of Iver Heath and will not be damaging to the wider character of the settlement. It does not constitute infill development.

8.5.19 Features to minimise the impact of crime and climate change are included within the masterplan and are covered in more detail within Sections 4 and 7 of the Design and Access Statement.

**SBDC CS Policy 9**

8.5.20 The replacement of Green Belt land with development will have a detrimental impact on landscape character locally, but will have no net loss of biodiversity. As part of the scheme, a wildlife buffer will be provided. This will include the provision of areas of species-rich grassland and wetland habitats, supplementary planting and flood attenuation features. These will contribute to local biodiversity targets on a site that lies within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area (designated within the Core Strategy). A substantial proportion of the site (56%) will be retained as open land and the retention of key existing landscape features, including mature hedgerow trees and “The Clump” woodland, will maintain ecological connections across the site.

**SBDC CS Policy 12**

8.5.21 The Pinewood scheme aims to be a low carbon development. It will do this through a variety of measures including energy efficient buildings, gas and biomass fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP), and improvements to public transport.

**SBDC CS Policy 13**

8.5.22 The Pinewood scheme takes a responsible approach to environmental and resource management in line with the aspirations of Policy CS13.

8.5.23 Noise barriers will be used in appropriate locations to reduce the impact of noise from the nearby motorway corridors.

8.5.24 All dwellings will achieve at least Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Design and Access Statement P252).

8.5.25 A water strategy will seek to reduce water consumption across the site and manage rainfall. This will include Green/Brown Roofs on buildings, capturing rainwater in water butts for use in gardens, using water efficient fixtures and fittings within new homes and using “grey” water
for flushing toilets. SUDS will be utilised within the masterplan to manage runoff, provide flood alleviation and contribute to wetland habitat creation.

8.5.26 Waste will be managed on site to reduce the amount going into landfill. This will include recycling and composting. Electric vehicles will be used for waste collection from households.

8.6 Overall assessment

Application 09/00706/OUT

8.6.1 The appeal scheme by definition is inappropriate development within the Green Belt; however its impact on the purposes of the Green Belt and on the character of the wider area is remarkably contained. The appeal scheme can only be perceived in the wider context of the Green Belt from one representative viewpoint (no. 2). Whilst the impact on character is restricted to the appeal site itself, the rear of adjacent properties immediately to the south of the site and a small area of high land to the east of the M25 motorway.

8.6.2 The masterplan has clearly treated the existing mature vegetation on the site with sensitivity, promoting these natural features as key components of the design. In particular I consider the manner in which the mature hedgerows have been retained as being highly appropriate and a very positive part of the scheme (see 4.2.2 and 7.2).

Application 09/00707/FUL

8.6.3 The proposed junction improvement at Five Points roundabout requires the removal of a number of mature trees within a group Tree Preservation Order. The impact of this tree removal is detrimental but is localised and is mitigated by the retention of a prominent tree group and further native tree and shrub planting. This impact is reduced further through the recently made revised planning application which delivers a more concise junction arrangement, allowing the retention of a greater number of mature trees (see Figure 6G).

Application 09/00708/FUL

8.6.4 The Seven Hills junction scheme works involves the removal of a small number of existing hedgerow trees. The impact of this change is negligible, due to the minor contribution the existing trees make to the wider landscape character, the lack of ‘puncture’ to the field boundary and the appropriateness of the proposed native tree and shrub planting (see Figure 6G).
9. **CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY**

9.1 **Urban design, landscape and Green Belt policy**

9.1.1 There are a wide variety of policies that have a bearing on urban design, landscape and Green Belt within the regional, local and emerging core strategy planning guidance.

9.1.2 A number of these policies have a very specific relevance to the appeal scheme, typically grouped into those that consider

- Green Belt (SP5, GB1)
- Colne Valley (WCBV5, L6); and
- Environmental Concerns/Climate Change (L7, L10, CP8, CP9, CP12, CP13)

9.2 **Urban design audit**

9.2.1 Project *Pinewood* is an exciting and well designed new community that sensitively handles the task of stitching together a wide variety of international streetscenes into one location. This is successful, in my view, due to the generic form of these streetscenes and the way in which they are grouped together to form complementary character areas (for example Amsterdam makes the transition to Venice on a sharp corner ensuring direct comparison cannot be made). This avoids the potential (and very real) risk of creating a theme park of distinct but non complementary streetscenes, with individual buildings competing for attention. The network of streets, spaces and open space is generous, of a high quality and will greatly benefit the new community whilst providing significant amenities for surrounding residents and employees of Pinewood Studios. The retention and incorporation of environmental features in the design, such as ‘the Clump’ and the mature hedgerows, provides an immediate strong setting and sense of place for the scheme, as does the clear axis connection to Pinewood Studios. The site’s commitment to sustainability is evident through the design process and efforts to enhance the site’s connectivity to its surroundings.

9.2.2 The concept and design principles of the appeal scheme are therefore considered to be very successful. It is equally important that this level of quality is applied to the detailed and construction design of the scheme and the construction works itself, matters which the outline planning application could not address (a matter which was identified by CABE in their July 2009 design review). It is for this reason I consider a Design Code to be an essential piece
of information, to be prepared and delivered via a planning condition. The Design Code process is a well established way of providing such detail and will allow the full consideration of and consultation on the emerging details.

9.3 Green Belt

9.3.1 Project Pinewood does have some adverse impacts on the purpose of the Green Belt in the vicinity of the proposed development, however these impacts are focused upon a small number of views, with many representative viewpoints unaffected by the appeal scheme. The table below identifies that viewpoints 2, 8, 9, 11 and 12 have had certain aspects of how the Green Belt purposes are perceptible from these viewpoints harmed by the appeal scheme.

Summary table of detrimental impacts on representative viewpoints / Green Belt purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From this location does the Green Belt...</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 2</strong> 1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 8</strong> 1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 8</strong> 3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 9</strong> 3. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 11</strong> 1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 12</strong> 1. check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas?;</td>
<td>Existing ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3.2 The following representative viewpoints were considered to have no Green Belt purposes to be harmed as a result of the appeal scheme (viewpoints in bold are locations where part of the appeal scheme is visible and therefore verified montages and a detailed assessment has been made):

- Viewpoint 1 – Blanchard’s Farm Public Footpath
- **Viewpoint 3 – Chandlers Hill Public Footpath**
- Viewpoint 4 – Denham Road Public Footpath
- Viewpoint 5 – Pinewood Close
- **Viewpoint 6 – Pinewood Road #1**
- Viewpoint 7 - Black Park Public Footpath
• Viewpoint 10 – Denham
• Viewpoint 13 – The Clump Public Footpath #2
• Viewpoint 14 – Pinewood Road #2

9.3.3 The appeal scheme, therefore, has an adverse impact on the Green Belt, however this is only perceptible from a small number of viewpoints close to or immediately abutting the appeal site. Only one distant representative viewpoint (no. 2) can be identified where the appeal scheme can be viewed in the wider context of the Green Belt, and in this case only the purpose relating to urban sprawl is affected. Overall, therefore, the ‘additional’ harm to the Green Belt (beyond that due to its classification as inappropriate development) is relatively limited for a development of this scale.

9.4 Landscape and townscape character

9.4.1 The detailed assessment of landscape and townscape characters adjacent to the appeal site, identified the following nine character types:

1. Valley Farmlands
2. Woodland Residential
3. Iver Plateau
4. Amenity Woodland
5. Pinewood Studios
6. Motorway Corridor
7. Colne Valley Fringe
8. Iver Heath Residential (North)
9. Iver Heath Residential (South)

9.4.2 Of these character types, the effect of the appeal scheme is considered to be significant to one, of limited significance to three and of no significance to five. Of those character areas with a significant effect or effect of limited significance, the nature of effect was typically adverse, with the exception of Pinewood Studios character area, which was considered to have benefitted from the appeal scheme.

9.4.3 Of these adverse impacts, the effect is further reduced by being limited to small geographic areas within each character area, such as:

• Valley Farmlands – the area of adverse effect is limited to a small area of high land to the east of the M25 roundabout (viewpoint no. 2 is within this area).
• Iver Plateaus – the area of adverse effect is limited to the development site itself and an area to the immediate south east of the site.

• Iver Heath Residential (North) – the area of adverse effect is limited to the fringe of residential buildings directly abutting the site boundary.

9.4.4 The net effect of this reduced impact is for the appeal scheme to have a remarkably contained impact on the surrounding character, with harm only resulting to the appeal site itself, the rear of adjacent properties immediately to the south and a small area of high land to the east of the M25 motorway.

9.5 On site landscape and arboricultural matters

9.5.1 The integrity, character and visual amenity of the mature hedgerows within the Project Pinewood site are successfully retained with impacts on biodiversity successfully mitigated. The sensitive design approach, and flexibility in the building footprint parameters, has ensured these high quality trees are a feature of the scheme with minimal tree loss (10% or below of the total number of hedgerow trees) to provide vehicular and pedestrian access, with none of the trees lost being of the highest standard and the majority being either of secondary or tertiary standard.

9.5.2 The tree loss required at Five Points has a detrimental impact on the immediate landscape character insofar as the wooded enclosure of the roundabout junction will be lost. This tree loss will not have an impact on this wider landscape character or purposes of the Green Belt due to its reduced visibility (see Figure 6F). The revised design solution for this roundabout would, in my view, obviate this impact to the localised landscape character due to the retention of an increased amount of the principal tree group, combined with the proposed complementary native tree and shrub planting.

9.5.3 The tree loss at Seven Hills junction will be suitably mitigated through native tree and shrub planting. The proposed tree loss is not prominent and does not play an important role in the local or wider landscape character or have any influence on the purposes of the Green Belt. This impact of the original junction design upon the landscape is broadly the same as when compared with the alternative scheme.
9.6 Reasons for refusal

Application 09/00706/OUT

9.6.1 The appeal scheme by definition is inappropriate development within the Green Belt; however its impact on the purposes of the Green Belt and on the character of the wider area is remarkably contained. The appeal scheme can only be perceived in the wider context of the Green Belt from one representative viewpoint (no. 2). Whilst the impact on character is restricted to the appeal site itself, the rear of adjacent properties immediately to the south of the site and a small area of high land to the east of the M25 motorway.

9.6.2 The masterplan has clearly treated the existing mature vegetation on the site with sensitivity, promoting these natural features as key components of the design. In particular I consider the manner in which the mature hedgerows have been retained as being highly appropriate and a very positive part of the scheme (see 4.2.2 and 7.2).

Application 09/00707/FUL

9.6.3 The proposed junction improvement at Five Points roundabout requires the removal of a number of mature trees within a group Tree Preservation Order. The impact of this tree removal is detrimental but is localised and is mitigated by the retention of a prominent tree group and further native tree and shrub planting. This impact is reduced further through the recently made revised planning application which delivers a more concise junction arrangement, allowing the retention of a greater number of mature trees (see Figure 6G).

Application 09/00708/FUL

9.6.4 The Seven Hills junction scheme works involves the removal of a small number of existing hedgerow trees. The impact of this change is negligible, due to the minor contribution the existing trees make to the wider landscape character, the lack of ‘puncture’ to the field boundary and the appropriateness of the proposed native tree and shrub planting (see Figure 6G).
B.1 The images were created in three stages, stage one was the collection of baseline drawing/photography and survey data, stage two was the creation of the DTM (digital terrain model) and stage three was the camera matching process. Key issues of accuracy in this process include the original drawings and their accuracy, the camera survey process, the photography itself and the camera matching. The process is the same for daytime and night-time images; existing night-time images are surveyed photographs.

Drawings and accuracy:

B.2 The computer model of the proposed development was built on the basis of drawings supplied by ARUP GIS.

B.3 Ordinance Survey state the accuracy of the Superplan Data as follows:

“Absolute accuracy, that is, compared to the National Grid Root-mean-square error: \( \pm 0.5 \) metres. Absolute accuracy is a measure that indicates how closely the coordinates of a point in the map dataset agree with the real coordinates of the same point on the ground in the British National Grid reference system.”

(Taken from [http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/oswebsite/freefun/geofacts/geo1186.html](http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/oswebsite/freefun/geofacts/geo1186.html))

All heights on OS Superplan Data refer to OS Datum.
All heights on architects drawings refer to OS Datum.
All heights of the cameras survey and Camera Control Points refer to OS Datum.

Camera Survey

B.4 The Camera Surveyors are:
Sterling Surveys Ltd.
Grove House
Headley Road
Grayshott, Hindhead
Surrey
GU26 6LE

Survey brief:

B.5 To conduct a survey of the Camera Position at each prescribed viewpoint and of Camera Control Points at each location.

Surveyor’s statement:

B.6 “The accuracy of each camera position and it’s associated control points are \( \pm 1 \) cm. The overall accuracy of any point in OS coordinates is \( \pm 3 \) cm.”
**Camera Position:**

B.7 The survey is of a point at the back of the camera, in alignment with the axis of the camera lens, or the point on the ground directly below the camera. This point is clearly marked with paint on the ground below the centre of the tripod. The surveyor is provided with photographs of the tripod and a marked up OS plan of its location. These points are supplied in OS coordinates.

**Camera Control Points:**

B.8 Survey of easily recognizable locations spread over the foreground and background of each photograph. These Camera Control Points are supplied in OS coordinates. These points are used to verify the location and orientation of the virtual camera.

**Photography**

**Equipment used**

B.9 Images are captured on a 21mp digital SLR with a sensor size of 36x24mm which is dimensionally equal to a 35mm film image frame. Using lenses in the 24-50mm range (74-40deg horizontal FOV) on suitably sized printed output the system is capable of equaling the detail in a scene observable by a person with average vision if they were standing at the camera position. Choice of a lens for a particular viewpoint is outside the scope of this specific methodology section and must be established in advance. Lenses in this range are ‘shift’ designs which allow vertical framing adjustment without moving the lens axis off its horizontal orientation and thus maintain 2 point perspective and parallel vertical lines in the image.

**Image capture procedure**

B.10 The camera is mounted on a tripod at eye level which is around 1.6m. The coordinate on the camera system which coincides with the coordinate of the virtual render camera is positioned in relation to a standard survey nail to a tolerance of 2mm XYZ. The orientation of the camera is set by a spirit level so that the target point of the optical axis and the horizontal axis of the sensor is aligned with the astronomical horizon to an accuracy of 3mm per 100m. Where long distance views are taken the affects of the earth curvature and atmospheric refraction mean that the target point derived from such an orientation does not coincide with an object at the same height AOD as the camera and this must be taken into account by the end user and a correction factor applied according to standard survey formulas. The mount is designed to rotate the camera in a horizontal plane around a vertical axis from the survey point which ensures that each image in the sequence has an identical camera position coordinate. This eliminates parallax errors in overlapping imagery for panoramic cylindrical images or misaligned joints on 40deg adjacent rectilinear section imagery.
B.11 Images are captured using the native camera RAW format to ensure maximum tonal and colour information is retained for use in the image processing stage. Choices for aperture and focus distance are designed to render all parts of the scene 'in focus' which avoids 'leading the eye' to a selected distance from the camera position. Supplementary photographs are taken to record the survey nail and the camera position in the location.

Post production

B.12 The camera files are imported into a proprietary image processing application which converts the RAW camera data into lossless RGB format files suitable for use in 2d image editing and 3D modelling applications. At this stage there are also tonal and colour adjustments which aim to replicate the scene as honestly as possible as it was perceived by the photographer at the time of capture.

B.13 Lens correction software remaps the image to remove any non perspectival optical distortions in order to enable perfect alignment of rendered survey points with their corresponding targets on the photograph in all parts of the frame. Where cylindrical panoramic imagery is required an overlapping sequence which covers the required FOV is imported into proprietary software which creates a seamless and accurate cylindrical projection having a single camera coordinate identical to that of the individual frames in the sequence. The image is then placed in a pre prepared template where the center of the optical axis is aligned with the image center to account for any offset used in vertical farming adjustments. Camera, lens and image technical parameters necessary for alignment with the virtual camera are included in a text layer in accordance to specific end user requirements and always contain the following core parameters which will are sufficient to enable another party to replicate the process;

- Camera coordinate height above survey nail
- Lens focal length
- Sensor size
- Time and date of photograph

Camera matching

B.14 The camera in the 3D modelling program with adjustable values to simulate a real camera. Camera Matching is achieved by positioning a Virtual Camera to reference points of each Camera Position and moving the camera’s target (rotation of the camera) until the Camera Control Points come to rest over their respective positions in the photograph.

B.15 To verify that the virtual camera is correctly aligned, markers at the positions of the Camera Reference Points are rendered at full image resolution. The rendering is then overlaid onto the photograph, where their position can be seen to match the location of the Camera Control Points.
Nightime Views

B.16 A black and white map was created to represent the average lit elevation of the Project Pinewood development. This map was applied as a light map in 3ds max based on a 50% occupancy. The level of luminance of the light map was set by comparing singular similar lights within the existing photograph. Photoshop was utilized to adjust the variance of colour levels and to mask the foreground vegetation.