Summary Landscape Assessment – Rush Green

The Rush Green site lies adjacent to the B656 within the Langley Valley (LCA214). Currently most of the site is being used as a scrap yard and is well screened from the road by mature vegetation along the boundary.

Generally, settlement is sparse within Langley Valley, consisting of small nucleated villages with historic cores, estates and scattered farmsteads. This would be sensitive to unsympathetic development not in scale with the villages (LCA214)

Overall Langley Valley is considered to be of moderate sensitivity.

In visual terms, Langley Valley is considered to be of **moderate to high sensitivity**. Panoramic views from vantage points and views along the valleys are important features within the character area. These would be sensitive to the introduction of built features.

Overall Langley Valley is considered to be of **moderate low landscape value**. Openness is a particular aspect of value but lack of remoteness and general human influence on the landscape detract from this.

The site itself is assessed as low sensitivity due to its current land use (scrap yard) and screening but is surrounded by areas of higher sensitivity.

Date Aug 07	Area name – S 53 – Rushgreen Farm
Surveyors PS	OS grid ref
LCA & PLANNING POLICIES	
LCA No: 214 – Langley Valley Condition: Poor Robustness: Weak LCA Evaluation: Reconstruct	Key Characteristics & Distinctive features. Rolling chalk landform Dominant large scale arable farming Smaller areas on steeper slopes to the north of Hitchin. Woodland plantations concentrated in the north. Relatively woodland cover elsewhere.
LP2A policies: LC1 – Landscape conservation area.	Photographs
LANDSCAPE CHARACTER SENSITIVITY	
Landform: Low lying / flatish Landcover: Grass Tree cover: Rushgreen wood on southeastern corner. Settlement form and pattern: Sparse	Land Use: Cattle grazing Enclosure & pattern: Next to tree screened scrap yard but still part of open field pattern.
Edge of settlement: No Completeness of edge: Yes	Sense of enclosure: Partial
VISUAL SENSITIVITY	
Prominence of site from surrounding area Short views in: From fields and higher ground to the north. Short views out: To the above Long views out: Not really Long views in: Not really	Presence & size of populations: Low Mitigation potential of visual impacts: Moderate
VALUE	
National designations: No	Local designations: Flood plain

Survey Matrix Sheet Landscape Sensitivity & Capacity

Visual sensitivity

Visibility sensitivity matrix

	Sloping	2 Moderate	3 High	4 V High
Landform	Rolling/undulating	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 High
	Lowlying	0 Very Low	1 Low	2 Moderate

Large woods Small woods Unwooded

Tree cover

People visibility matrix

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Views in	/iews in Low		2 High				
	Few people		Many people				

Viewed by number of people

Overall visual sensitivity = visibility sensitivity + people visibility

Ecological Sensitivity

	Other	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low	0 Very Low
Woodland	Wooded	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
	Trees and woods	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
		Marginal pasture	Good pasture	Marginal arable	Good arable
		Landuse			

Continuity matrix	(High = Ancient, Moderate = Historic, Low/Very Low = Planned)				
	Large	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
Landscape Scale	Medium	3 High	2 Moderate	Low 1 Moderate	1 Low
	Small	3 High	3 High	2 Moderate	2 Moderate

Unsettled Ancient Pastoral Arable

Landscape Pattern

Consistency matrix

(0 = Unified, 1 = Coherent, 2 = Variable)

 Land use
 1
 2
 2

 U/V
 1
 1
 2

 Uniform
 0
 1
 1

 Uniform
 U/V
 Varied

Tree Cover

Continuity Vs Consistency matrix

	Planned	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
Continuity	Historic	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
	Ancient	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate
		Unified	Coherent	Variable

Consistency

Visual sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ecological sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	х	x
Cultural sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	Х	х

Total 5 (Flood plain centre)

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment Rating

1-4	5-6	7-8	9-12
Low Sensitivity	Moderate Sensitivity	High Sensitivity	No development

Landscape Value Assessment Rating

	,	
Α	В	Landscape value
Score 1 point for each	Score 1 point for each	A + B
Tranquillity or	Conservation Interests	0 points = Low
Scenic beauty or		1 point = Moderate
Contribution to Settlement.		2 points = High
Flood plain		

Landscape capacity assessment rating

	High	Moderate	Low	Low
Landscape Sensitivity	Moderate	Moderate to High	Moderate	Low
	Low	High	Moderate to High	Moderate

Low Moderate High

Date Aug 07	Area name – S 55 – Rush Green Farm Scrap Yard.
Surveyors PS	OS grid ref
LCA & PLANNING POLICIES	
LCA No: 214 – Langley Valley Condition: Poor Robustness: Weak LCA Evaluation: Reconstruct	Key Characteristics & Distinctive features. Rolling chalk landform Dominant large scale arable farming Smaller areas on steeper slopes to the north of Hitchin. Woodland plantations concentrated in the north. Relatively woodland cover elsewhere.
LP2A policies: LC1 – Landscape conservation area Policy 12 Green Belt – Policy 2	Photographs
LANDSCAPE CHARACTER SENSITIVITY	
Landform: Low lying / flat Landcover: Mostly non vegetative Tree cover: 15% (from 2005 flyover) Settlement form and pattern: Sparse.	Land Use: Scrap yard. Enclosure & pattern: Fairly well screened and enclosed.
Edge of settlement: No Completeness of edge: Yes	Sense of enclosure: yes
VISUAL SENSITIVITY	
Prominence of site from surrounding area Short views in: Not really Short views out: Not really Long views out: Not really Long views in: Not really Need to check views in from high ground to the south.	Presence & size of populations: Low Mitigation potential of visual impacts: Good
VALUE	
National designations: No	Local designations: No

Survey Matrix Sheet Landscape Sensitivity & Capacity

Visual sensitivity

Visibility sensitivity matrix

	Sloping	2 Moderate	3 High	4 V High
Landform	Rolling/undulating	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 High
	Lowlying	0 Very Low	1 Low	2 Moderate

Large woods Small woods Unwooded

Tree cover

People visibility matrix

1 copie vielbinty matrix						
Views in	0 Low	1 Moderate	2 High			
	Few people	Moderate number of people	Many people			

Viewed by number of people

Overall visual sensitivity = visibility sensitivity + people visibility

Ecological Sensitivity

	Other	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low	0 Very Low
Woodland	Wooded	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
	Trees and woods	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
		Marginal pasture	Good pasture	Marginal arable	Good arable
		Landuse			

Continuity matrix (High = Ancient, Moderate = Historic, Low/Very Low = Planned)

	Large	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
Landscape Scale	Medium	3 High	2 Moderate	Low 1 Moderate	1 Low
	Small	3 High	3 High	2 Moderate	2 Moderate

Unsettled Ancient Pastoral Arable

Landscape Pattern

Consistency matrix

(0 = Unified, 1 = Coherent, 2 = Variable)

1 2 2 Varied Land use U/V1 1 2 0 1 1 Uniform Uniform U/VVaried

Tree Cover

Continuity Vs Consistency matrix

	Planned	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
Continuity	Historic	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
	Ancient	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate
		Unified	Coherent	Variable

Consistency

Visual sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ecological sensitivity	0	1	2	ω	4	х	х
Cultural sensitivity	0	1	2	З	4	х	х

Total 1 (but in flood plain)

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment Rating

		9		
	1-4	5-6	7-8	9-12
Low S	Sensitivity	Moderate Sensitivity	High Sensitivity	No development

Landscape Value Assessment Rating

Editacoupe value Accessiment nating		
Α	В	Landscape value
Score 1 point for each	Score 1 point for each	A + B
Tranquillity or	Conservation Interests	0 points = Low
Scenic beauty or		1 point = Moderate
Contribution to Settlement.		2 points = High
Flood Plain		

Landscape capacity assessment rating

Moderate Low

Landscape Sensitivity	High	Moderate	Low	Low
	Moderate	Moderate to High	Moderate	Low
	Low	High	Moderate to High	Moderate

Low Moderate High

Date Aug 07	Area name – S 56 – Field northeast of Rush Green Farm Scrap Yard.
Surveyors PS	OS grid ref
LCA & PLANNING POLICIES	
LCA No: 214 – Langley Valley Condition: Poor Robustness: Weak LCA Evaluation: Reconstruct	Key Characteristics & Distinctive features. Rolling chalk landform Dominant large scale arable farming Smaller areas on steeper slopes to the north of Hitchin. Woodland plantations concentrated in the north. Relatively woodland cover elsewhere.
LP2A policies: LC1 – Landscape conservation area Policy 12 Green Belt – Policy 2	Photographs
LANDSCAPE CHARACTER SENSITIVITY	
Landform: rising to the north east Landcover: grass Tree cover: Tree screen to scrap yard Settlement form and pattern: Sparse.	Land Use: Pasture Enclosure & pattern: Open in character
Edge of settlement: No Completeness of edge: Yes	Sense of enclosure: no
VISUAL SENSITIVITY	
Prominence of site from surrounding area Short views in: From adjacent fields and PROW s Short views out: To adjacent fields Long views out: High ground to the south and views to the east and west Long views in: From high ground to the south.	Presence & size of populations: Low Mitigation potential of visual impacts: poor
VALUE	
National designations: No	Local designations: No
ı	ı

Survey Matrix Sheet Landscape Sensitivity & Capacity

Visual sensitivity

Visibility sensitivity matrix

	Sloping	2 Moderate	3 High	4 V High
Landform	Rolling/undulating	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 High
	Lowlying	0 Very Low	1 Low	2 Moderate

Large woods Small woods Unwooded

Tree cover

People visibility matrix

1 copie violenty matrix						
Views in	0 Low	1 Moderate	2 High			
	Few people	Moderate number of people	Many people			

Viewed by number of people

Overall visual sensitivity = visibility sensitivity + people visibility

Ecological Sensitivity

	Other	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low	0 Very Low
Woodland	Wooded	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
	Trees and woods	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
		Marginal pasture	Good pasture	Marginal arable	Good arable
		Landuse			

Continuity matrix (High = Ancient, Moderate = Historic, Low/Very Low = Planned) 2 0 3 Large High Moderate Very Low Low Landscape Scale 3 2 Low Medium High Moderate ----1----Low Moderate 3 3 2 2 Small High High Moderate Moderate Unsettled Ancient Arable Pastoral

Consistency matrix

(0 = Unified, 1 = Coherent, 2 = Variable)

Landscape Pattern

Land use

Varied	1	2	2
U/V	1	1	2
Uniform	0	1	1

Uniform

U / V Varied

Tree Cover

Consistency

Continuity Vs Consistency matrix

	Planned	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
Continuity	Historic	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
	Ancient	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate
		Unified	Coherent	Variable

Visual sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ecological sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	х	x
Cultural sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	Х	х

Total 7

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment Rating

1-	4	5-6	7-8	9-12
Low Ser	nsitivity	Moderate Sensitivity	High Sensitivity	No development

Landscape Value Assessment Rating

Α	В	Landscape value
Score 1 point for each	Score 1 point for each	A + B
Tranquillity or	Conservation Interests	0 points = Low
Scenic beauty or		1 point = Moderate
Contribution to Settlement.		2 points = High

Landscape capacity assessment rating

Landscape capacity assessment rating						
	High	Moderate	Low	Low		
Landscape Sensitivity	Moderate	Moderate to High	Moderate	Low		
	Low	High	Moderate to High	Moderate		

Low Moderate High

Date	Area name – S 60 Rush Green aerodrome
Surveyors PS	OS grid ref
LCA & PLANNING POLICIES	
LCA No: 214 – Langley Valley Condition: Poor Robustness: Weak LCA Evaluation: Reconstruct	Key Characteristics & Distinctive features. Rolling chalk landform Dominant large scale arable farming Smaller areas on steeper slopes to the north of Hitchin. Woodland plantations concentrated in the north. Relatively woodland cover elsewhere.
LP2A policies: LC1 – Landscape conservation area Policy 12 Green Belt – Policy 2	Photographs
LANDSCAPE CHARACTER SENSITIVITY	
Landform: Low lying / flatish Landcover: Grass Tree cover: Along southern boundary to the road and Settlement form and pattern: Sparse	Land Use: Aerodrome Enclosure & pattern: Partially enclosed
Edge of settlement: No Completeness of edge: Yes	Sense of enclosure: Not really
VISUAL SENSITIVITY	
Prominence of site from surrounding area Short views in: Not really Short views out: To fields to the northwest Long views out: Not really – due east! Long views in: Not really	Presence & size of populations: Low Mitigation potential of visual impacts: Moderate
VALUE	
National designations: No	Local designations: No

Survey Matrix Sheet Landscape Sensitivity & Capacity

Visual sensitivity

Visibility sensitivity matrix

	Sloping	2 Moderate	3 High	4 V High
Landform	Rolling/undulating	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 High
	Lowlying	0 Very Low	1 Low	2 Moderate

Large woods Small woods Unwooded

Tree cover

People visibility matrix

Tooler House, Herein						
Views in	0 Low	1 Moderate	2 High			
	Few people	Moderate number of people	Many people			

Viewed by number of people

Overall visual sensitivity = visibility sensitivity + people visibility

Ecological Sensitivity

	Other	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low	0 Very Low
Woodland	Wooded	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
	Trees and woods	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
		Marginal pasture	Good pasture	Marginal arable	Good arable
		Landuse			

Continuity matrix (High = Ancient, Moderate = Historic, Low/Very Low = Planned)

	Large	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
Landscape Scale	Medium	3 High	2 Moderate	Low 1 Moderate	1 Low
	Small	3 High	3 High	2 Moderate	2 Moderate

Unsettled Ancient Pastoral Arable

Landscape Pattern

Consistency matrix

(0 = Unified, 1 = Coherent, 2 = Variable)

1 2 2 Varied Land use U/V1 1 2 0 1 1 Uniform Uniform U/VVaried

Tree Cover

Continuity Vs Consistency matrix

	Planned	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
Continuity	Historic	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
	Ancient	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate
		Unified	Coherent	Variable

Consistency

Visual sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ecological sensitivity	0	1	2	З	4	х	x
Cultural sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	х	x

Total 3 But in flood plain

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment Rating

		9		
	1-4	5-6	7-8	9-12
Low S	Sensitivity	Moderate Sensitivity	High Sensitivity	No development

Landscape Value Assessment Rating

Editacoupe value Accessinont nating		
A	В	Landscape value
Score 1 point for each	Score 1 point for each	A + B
Tranquillity or	Conservation Interests	0 points = Low
Scenic beauty or	4	1 point = Moderate
Contribution to Settlement.		2 points = High
	WS, GCN, ECO, BATS	

Landscape capacity assessment rating

Landscape capacity assessment rating						
High	Moderate	Low	Low			
Moderate	Moderate to High	Moderate	Low			
Low	High	Moderate to High	Moderate			
	High Moderate	Moderate High Moderate to High High	High Moderate Moderate Moderate to High Moderate High Moderate			

Moderate Low High

Date	Area name – S 64 – Langley Valley flood plain
Surveyors PS	OS grid ref
LCA & PLANNING POLICIES	
LCA No: 214 – Langley Valley Condition: Poor Robustness: Weak LCA Evaluation: Reconstruct	Key Characteristics & Distinctive features. Rolling chalk landform Dominant large scale arable farming Smaller areas on steeper slopes to the north of Hitchin. Woodland plantations concentrated in the north. Relatively woodland cover elsewhere.
LP2A policies: LC1 – Landscape conservation area Policy 12 Green Belt – Policy 2	Photographs
LANDSCAPE CHARACTER SENSITIVITY	
Landform: Lowlying flat Landcover: Grass and trees Tree cover: Fair Settlement form and pattern: Sparse	Land Use: Flood zone Enclosure & pattern: Linear site not farmed.
Edge of settlement Completeness of edge	Sense of enclosure: No
VISUAL SENSITIVITY	
Prominence of site from surrounding area Short views in: From adjacent fields Short views out: To adjacent fields Long views out: The higher land both north and south Long views in: From the higher land both north and south	Presence & size of populations: Low Mitigation potential of visual impacts: Low
VALUE	
National designations: No	Local designations: No

Survey Matrix Sheet Landscape Sensitivity & Capacity

Visual sensitivity

Visibility sensitivity matrix

	Sloping	2 Moderate	3 High	4 V High
Landform	Rolling/undulating	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 High
Lowlying		0 Very Low	1 Low	2 Moderate

Large woods Small woods Unwooded

Tree cover

People visibility matrix

1 copic vicibility matrix							
Views in	0 Low	1 Moderate	2 High				
	Few people	Moderate number of people	Many people				

Viewed by number of people

Overall visual sensitivity = visibility sensitivity + people visibility

Ecological Sensitivity

	Other	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low	0 Very Low
Woodland	Wooded	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low	0 Very Low
	Trees and woods	4 Very High	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
		Marginal pasture	Good pasture	Marginal arable	Good arable
		Landuse			

Continuity matrix (High = Ancient, Moderate = Historic, Low/Very Low = Planned) 2 0 3 Large High Moderate Very Low Low Landscape Scale 3 2 Low Medium High Moderate ----1----Low Moderate 3 3 2 2 Small High High Moderate Moderate Unsettled Ancient Arable Pastoral

Consistency matrix

(0 = Unified, 1 = Coherent, 2 = Variable)

Land use

Varied	1	2	2
U/V	1	1	2
Uniform	0	1	1

Uniform

U / V Varied

Landscape Pattern

Tree Cover

Continuity Vs Consistency matrix

	Planned
Continuity	Historic
	Ancient

2	1	0
Moderate	Low	Very Low
3	2	1
High	Moderate	Low
4	3	2
Very High	High	Moderate

Unified Coherent

Variable

Consistency

Visual sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ecological sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	х	x
Cultural sensitivity	0	1	2	3	4	х	x

Total 7 Flood plain

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment Rating

Editabapa Constituty Acceptancia Hatting				
	1-4	5-6	7-8	9-12
	Low Sensitivity	Moderate Sensitivity	High Sensitivity	No development

Landscape Value Assessment Rating

Α	В	Landscape value
Score 1 point for each	Score 1 point for each	A + B
Tranquillity or	Conservation Interests	0 points = Low
Scenic beauty or		1 point = Moderate
Contribution to Settlement.		2 points = High
Flood Plain	GCNZ, RIG, ECO	

Landscape capacity assessment rating

Lanuscape capacity assessment rating								
	High	Moderate	Low	Low				
Landscape Sensitivity	Moderate	Moderate to High	Moderate	Low				
	Low	High	Moderate to High	Moderate				

Low Moderate High