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1. Summary

Conservation area status is awarded to places that are deemed to be of ‘special architectural and historical interest’. The intention is not to prevent change or development in conservation areas but to try and manage change in order to protect and enhance the special character and appearance of the area.

Key Characteristics - Rousham Conservation Area

- Rousham Park is of international significance as a largely unaltered example of the first phase of English Landscape Design in the Picturesque tradition by William Kent, ‘the father of landscape gardening’. Kent was credited with fusing poetry, painting and gardening to make a new landscape art.

- Rousham Conservation Area lies within Cherwell District Council and includes the designed landscape to the north of Rousham House and Park but does not include the principal house nor immediately associated gardens (which lie within West Oxfordshire District boundary).

- Rousham lies within the rural setting of the Cherwell Valley with flood meadows of the Cherwell and surrounding farmland and makes deliberate use of this setting and associated views.

- Rousham Conservation Area contains structures including Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher which were designed by William Kent, but were constructed on land never owned by Rousham Park.

- Rousham Conservation Area also includes the rural villages of Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford; these are the subject of their own conservation area appraisals.

Rousham Conservation Area –management issues

- Rousham Conservation Area covers a portion of the Cherwell Valley within Cherwell District that forms the landscape setting for the gardens at Rousham Park. The land which lies within Cherwell District Council boundary includes Heyford Bridge and land to the north.

- Rousham House was the first landscape to be added to the Register of Parks and Gardens. The boundary for the register lies largely within West Oxfordshire District.

- The Rousham Conservation Area is intended to assist with the management of the wider landscape which does not fall within the Registered Parkland boundary.

- Rousham conservation area is very large and impacts on a number of other conservation areas within the vicinity.

- Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford lie within Rousham Conservation Area, but have their own Conservation Area Appraisals and are only considered within the document for the impact they have on the designed landscape. The Oxford Canal Conservation Area runs through the area, but is the subject of its own separate appraisal.

- The area abuts the Conservation Areas of Steeple Aston and RAF Upper Heyford, which have their own conservation area appraisals.

Summary of issues and opportunities

The future preservation and enhancement of the special character of the conservation area will owe much to the positive management of the area by homeowners, landowners, highways, Environment Agency and Canal and River Trust and service providers. In addition to existing national statutory legislation and local planning control, the following opportunities for enhancement have been identified:
• consider whether the existing boundary is still appropriate.

• consider whether the designed landscape of Rousham is effectively managed and whether there are additional mechanisms for enhancement.

• consider whether the designed views and surrounding settings are being appropriately managed.

• consider whether the monuments and features directly associated with Rousham landscape are being effectively managed.

• encourage the protection of historic detail and the reinstatement of missing architectural details and landscape features.

• ensure that any new development is high quality, sustainable and sympathetic to the conservation area.

• consider how to effectively manage the conservation area whilst also meeting the transport requirements of the road network, canal and railway.

Figure 1. 2009 Aerial photograph including conservation area boundary (highlighted in red).
2. Planning Policy

2. Planning and Policy Context

2.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 69 requires local planning authorities to identify areas of ‘special architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’ through an appraisal process and to designate them as Conservation Areas. Since 1967 some 9600 Conservation Areas have been designated in England, including 60 in Cherwell District.

The purpose of this Conservation Area Appraisal and management plan is:

- to provide a clear definition of an area’s special architectural and historical interests;
- to identify ways in which its unique characteristics can be preserved and enhanced;
- to strengthen justification for designation of the conservation area;
- to create a clear context for future development in accordance with conservation area policies in the Local Plan; and
- to consult with the public and raise awareness of conservation area issues.

2.2 This assessment and management plan aims to promote and support developments that help to preserve and/or enhance the character of the Rousham Conservation Area. It is not an attempt to stifle change. Our responsibility towards the conservation of our built heritage must be balanced with the demands of progress and growth. This document examines the reasons for designation, defining the qualities that make up its special interest, character and appearance. The omission of any reference to a particular building, feature or space should not be taken to imply that it is of no interest.

2.3 The identified significant heritage assets for Rousham are shown in figure 1. These include designated heritage assets, the conservation boundary and tree preservation orders.

2.4 The council is obliged by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to identify ‘heritage assets’ that are locally significant. That is; a structure, object or place that may have historical importance or contribute to the built heritage, character or appearance of the area. Buildings and structures, which make a positive contribution to the conservation area, are identified in Appendix 3 and will be considered for inclusion on the district-wide Register of Local Heritage Assets.


2.6 This appraisal was subject to public consultation, in July and August 2018 (See Appendix 5).

Figure 2. Cherwell Local Plan
Figure 3. Key Heritage Assets
3. Location

3.1 Rousham lies in North Oxfordshire in the Cherwell Valley approximately 11 miles from both Oxford and Banbury. The settlements which are within the area or enclose the area are Rousham, Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford and Steeple Aston. The settlements of Middle Aston, North Aston and Somerton are included within wider views of the designed landscape.

3.2 Administratively Rousham House and associated gardens lie within West Oxfordshire District, but the designed landscape to the north of the site lies within Cherwell District Council.

3.3 The area of land within the historic ownership of the Cottrell Dormer family is approximately 10 hectares (25 acres) with small areas of additional land purchased within the late 20th century. There are picturesque, architectural and landscape features on areas of land never owned by the Dormer family up to 2 kilometres away and William Kent designed the landscape to take advantage of the natural landscape of the area up to 4 kilometres away.

3.4 The Cherwell River, Oxford Canal and West Coast Mainline all run through the area on a north-south alignment. A number of footpaths cross through the landscape along the River Cherwell, Oxford Canal and between settlements.

Figure 4. Current OS map showing location of Rousham Park
4.1 The Rousham Conservation Area lies predominantly within the Cherwell Valley Character Area as identified by the Cobham Landscape Survey.

4.2 The River Cherwell flows through a well defined valley with rolling valley sides of open fields and water meadows and villages sitting on either side of the valley. The size of the Cherwell valley is considerable considering the current size of the river. Much of the area to the west of the river and some areas to the east are classified as Flood Zone 3, which impacts on land use for the area.

4.3 There are pockets of land which lie within the Upper Heyford Plateau Character Area. This is to the east of the Cherwell Valley and is a distinctive landform unit of elevated land with a distinctively denuded character.

4.4 The topography of the area is entirely influenced by the river Cherwell with a well defined valley bottom and steep slopes to either side. The area is green and well-wooded.
4.5 The geology of the area is also influenced by the River Cherwell and is described in the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan. The base of the Cherwell Valley and sides of the Cherwell Valley are formed of different underlying bedrocks to the rest of the neighbourhood area. The base of the valley is part of the Lias Group comprising mudstone, siltstone, limestone and sandstone sedimentary bedrocks formed approximately 172-204 million years ago in the Jurassic and Triassic periods when the area was dominated by shallow seas. The sides of the Cherwell Valley are part of the Interior Oolite Group of limestone, sandstone, siltstone and mudstone formed approximately 165-176 million years ago in the Jurassic Period.

Figure 6. Geological map
5. Archaeology

5.1 Rousham Conservation Area lies in an archaeological rich area. The Historic Environment Record records 36 archaeological monuments within the designated boundary.

5.2 Cuttle Mill, which is also a grade II* listed building, is the only monument directly linked to Rousham Conservation Area. The mill is clearly shown on an estate map of 1606 complete with watermill, but was altered in 1738 by William Kent to form part of the Picturesque landscape of Rousham.

5.3 Major archaeological monuments include an Anglo-Saxon cemetery site at Lower Heyford, Harborough Bank hillfort or henge, a scatter of Neolithic flints, a possible iron age habitation site and several monuments (including possible field systems and enclosures) identified from aerial photography. A scatter of roman-british pottery was also found at the allotments sites on the edge of Steeple Aston.

5.4 There are also medieval manors, a tithe barn and earthwork remains associated with the villages of Upper and Lower Heyford and a substantial number of monuments associated with the routeways running through the area including the Oxford Canal (and associated wharfs, bridges, locks), railway (including former rail station) and roads (the ancient Portway and the turnpike road (with toll houses, mile stones etc).
6. Historical Development

Core significance

6.1 The core significance of Rousham is that it is the earliest and most complete surviving example of William Kent’s work as the ‘father of landscape gardening’. William Kent is intimately associated with the development of the Picturesque in England; he originally trained as an artist and was seen to compose landscape as a painting. His naturalistic style and knowledge of the conventions of painting had a major impact on the development of landscape design at this time, but he had limited horticultural knowledge or technical gardening skill.

6.2 The landscape work at Rousham marked a defined move away from the practice of formal, geometric designed landscapes, which were popular across Europe and further afield. The work represented the birth of the Picturesque Movement described by the artist and author William Gilpin as ‘that peculiar kind of beauty which is agreeable in a picture’.

6.3 Nicholas Pevsner outlined the significance of the works at Rousham: ‘The garden is one of the earliest and least altered embodiments of the idea of the Picturesque, not fully expressed as a respectable theory of aesthetics until the last decade of the 18th century’ and ‘Rousham represents the first phase of England landscape design and remains almost as Kent left it, one of the few gardens of this date to have escaped alteration’.

6.4 Christopher Hussey acknowledged its international significance ‘Rousham alone remains intact. Consequently it is not only an historic and beautiful garden, it is an unique document of garden art; the earliest surviving ancestor of all the landscape gardens and parks in the world, since the conception of informal pictorial garden design was an English idea’

6.5 The landscape at Rousham can be appreciated on a number of different levels relating to the designed landscape; the planting design, the ground breaking geometric outline and the symbolism of the differing elements. It is considered to be one of the most important surviving Picturesque landscapes of all time along with Stowe (Buckinghamshire), Blenheim (Oxfordshire), Chatsworth (Derbyshire) and Stourhead (Wiltshire).

Development of the Picturesque Movement

6.6 The Picturesque tradition of the English Landscape was initiated by a small number of professional architects and designers including John Vanbrugh, Charles Bridgeman, William Kent and James Gibbs. The early pioneers of the movement paved the way for the work of Humphrey Repton and Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown who transformed the English landscape.

6.7 The Picturesque Movement originated in literary and artistic circles where the idea of the romantic, naturalistic landscape had first become fashionable, with an emphasis on nostalgic writing and painting of rural, classical Rome.

6.8 The idea was translated to landscape design due to a rejection of the concept of formal landscapes and a desire to create an English style of garden. Formal gardens had been designed to be considered from a single perspective, usually the principal building with which they had a close relationship. The Picturesque Movement emphasised a series of perspectives or sequences with a close relationship between the gardens and the surrounding landscape.

6.9 The precise form of landscape design developed was influenced by intellectual and artistic considerations – concerns about light, shade and tone of landscape, the idea of a garden as a
designed setting and a need to develop a local context for ‘souvenirs’ of the Grand tour. There were also practical considerations in relation to changes to the English countryside including enclosure, changes in agriculture, the need for timber and the requirements of hunting. The ‘natural’ countryside including woodland and pasture was particularly revered following the enclosure movement which was sweeping the country.

6.10 William Kent was commissioned by General James Dormer, who associated with the 18th century literary figures Alexander Pope and Jonathan Swift, to undertake the works to Rousham. His works were greatly admired by Horace Walpole, the art historian, antiquarian, literary figure and Whig politician, who proclaimed that Kent’s genius lay in the fact that the ‘he leaped the fence and saw that all nature was a garden’.

Figure 7. William Kent’s plan for Rousham
Historic development of Rousham

6.11 Rousham House was built for Sir Robert Dormer in 1635. It is placed on the site of an earlier manor house. The house itself is grade I listed and was enlarged by William Kent between 1738 and 1741 for James Dormer and again by William St Aubyn in 1860. William Kent’s work included the addition of an extended garden front with two pavilions (used as a library and kitchen) and the redecoration of a number of principle rooms.

6.12 Rousham House originally had a series of formal gardens with terraced walks, a formal garden to the north and a walled garden with dovecot to the east. A plan of 1725 shows the proposed remodelling of the garden by Charles Bridgeman; works were carried out between 1725 and 1734 although it is unclear whether they exactly followed the 1725 plan.

6.13 William Kent was employed to work on the gardens at Rousham between 1737 and 1741. He carried out the major landscaping works, but the detailed planting was left to the gardener John MacClary and the steward William White.

6.14 The key theme of the work he carried out was utilising existing landscape features, blurring and softening the formal lines of the landscape and adding additional features from the surrounding countryside to provide extensive picturesque views.

6.15 Kent consciously manipulated nature to create a foreground, middle ground and background including a variety of water features, sculptures, pavilions, temples and views out to the distant countryside. The gardens are designed as a series of spaces separated like blocks of painting, the landscape is moulded so that they all look natural.

6.16 There is an unseen geometric unity which provides cohesion to the landscape with a series of perpendicular axis extending from the five glades in the centre of the garden. A number of focal points in the surrounding countryside were created including the north and south roundels, The Temple of the Mill, the Eyecatcher or Triumphal Arch; the majority of these features lay on land which was never within the ownership of the Dormer family. He also made use of existing buildings such as the church towers in the villages of Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford to frame his views.

6.17 The landscaped garden of Rousham has been little altered since William’s Kent time although a few features have been lost from the garden including a bridge across the Cherwell, an oval fishpond and a woodland pond to supply water to the house. The surrounding area largely retains its character although changes in agricultural practice and new transport links (in the form of Oxford Canal and railway) have had an impact. Subsequent changes and their impact will be discussed in the Management Plan of the document.
7. Historic Maps

Figure 8. 1875

Figure 9. 1955
8. Character and Appearance

Landscape character

8.1 William Kent’s garden at Rousham House consists of approximately 10 hectares (or 25 acres) with only land of minimal agricultural value having been originally included in the narrow and irregular garden.

8.2 Rousham Conservation Area (outside of the garden area) lies within the Cherwell Valley, a wide rolling valley landscape and is located to the north and east of Rousham Park. The landscape appears unplanned, natural and informal, but was designed by William Kent in the Picturesque tradition, although the majority of it has never formed part of the Cottrell-Dormer family ownership.

Land Use

8.3 The majority of the area is in agricultural use with wide open fields, in line with modern agricultural practice.

8.4 The River Cherwell cuts through the valley landscape with its water meadows alongside (now designated as flood zones). This formed part of William Kent’s designed outlook.

8.5 The two settlements of Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford lie within the conservation area boundary and Steeple Aston lies immediately adjacent. These were incorporated into William Kent’s designed landscape.

8.6 There are a number of transport routes which cut through the landscape including the Oxford Canal, Chiltern Valley Railway Line, roads and public rights of way.
Settlements

8.7 Upper Heyford retains its historic settlement pattern laid out along a handful of streets running east west following the natural contours of the land. The properties are predominantly two storey cottages of limestone construction with slate roofs. There has been some modern development, but this largely been sensitively incorporated into the existing settlement pattern.

8.8 Lower Heyford retains both its historic form as a linear settlement and its character as a vernacular village with buildings constructed in a combination of the local limestone and marlstone. Development to the north and west has been constricted by the location of the River Cherwell. There has, however, been some limited modern development to the eastern side which has disrupted the traditional settlement form.

8.9 Steeple Aston lies immediately to the west of the Rousham Conservation Area boundary. The settlement retains its historic settlement pattern with a rectangular layout set around an open area of orchards, paddocks and gardens and its vernacular character of houses constructed of limestone and marlstone. There has been some unsympathetic development to the east which impacts on the setting of Rousham.

Communication routes

River Cherwell

8.10 The River Cherwell is a natural route, which creates the essential character of the surrounding area. The river was included as a natural element within William Kent’s designed landscape.

Oxford Canal

8.11 The Oxford Canal was constructed in the late 18th century following William Kent’s construction of the Rousham landscape. It is likely that its construction was a disruptive force at the time, but the canal itself follows the natural contours of the Cherwell Valley and after over 200 years largely blends unobtrusively into the Rousham landscape. The boats along the canal are largely unobtrusive, but there are areas where moored boats which glint in the sunshine detract from views.

Cherwell Valley Railway

8.12 The Cherwell Valley Railway line forms a hard, linear route from north to south of the Rousham Conservation Area. The noise and infrastructure associated with the railway can detract from the picturesque landscape, but tree screening around the line helps to mitigate the impact.
8.13 The B4030 runs across the Rousham Conservation Area from east to west and has done since the medieval period. John MacClary specifically refers to traffic along the road in his letter of 1750 and it became a turnpike road in 1793. The road forms part of the character of the area as a thoroughfare across the historic bridge and causeway. A key issue is the volume of traffic which has now been mitigated by one-way traffic, which provides short gap periods when there is no traffic and returns the valley to its tranquil origins. There is also a small backroad which runs through the area through the settlement of Upper Heyford (between Somerton and Kirtlington / Bletchingdon). This is an historic route which forms part of the character of the area. A number of public rights of way cross the landscape and link the settlements of Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford, Steeple Aston and other surrounding villages. They provide access and different perspectives of the Rousham CA.

Key individual monuments

Heyford Bridge

8.14 The structure is a bridge which was first recorded in 1255, but the current structure dates from the 14th century. The bridge is constructed of limestone with ashlar dressings. It was altered in the 17th century and widened in the 19th century and has been subject to a number of bridge repairs. The bridge is 190 metres long and forms a causeway across the valley. It has been used a main route for traffic across the River Cherwell since the 18th century. It is an important part of William Kent’s designed landscape and features in a number of key views. The bridge is grade II* listed.
The Eyecatcher or ‘The Triumphal Arch’

8.15 The Eyecatcher or ‘Triumphal Arch’ is one of the earliest ‘folly’ or sham ruins in England, having been designed by William Kent as a Picturesque feature. The Eyecatcher is one of the core elements of the extended landscape at Rousham, lying 2km to the north of the park. The surrounding land was never within Cottrell-Dormer ownership, but a single rood of land was purchased for the structure to sit on. The feature is constructed as a single linear wall of marlstone rubble with squared dressing and is 9m high and 21m long with 3 graduated arches. The structure is deliberately tilted slightly to catch the light. The folly is grade II* listed.
Cuttle Mill or ‘Temple of the Mill’

8.16 The building is a 17th century / early 18th century watermill and millers house of coursed, squared marlstone with a stonesfield slate roof. The building was remodelled in 1738 by William Kent in the gothic style (complete with flying buttresses, stepped gables and gothic windows) to form ‘The Temple of the Mill’. It, along with the Eyecatcher is one of the earliest examples of a deliberately constructed ‘folly’.

Church Spires

8.17 The Church Spires of Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford historically formed an important part of the designed landscape. Significant growth of trees around the villages have impacted on these views in recent years.
Trees and green spaces

8.18 The majority of the landscape of Rousham Conservation Area is green space formed by the agricultural fields and meadows surrounding the River Cherwell. There are numerous trees within the area including those lining the main transport routes of River Cherwell, Oxford Canal, Cherwell Valley Railway Line and to a lesser extent the roads in the area.

8.19 A survey undertaken during the 1980s to identify trees probably surviving from the 18th century identified 210 yew, 24 English Oak, 20 beech, 3 horse chestnut as well as 2 Spanish chestnut, 2 European lime, 2 red twigged lime, 1 cedar of Lebanon. Individual trees are generally not replaced until they die this causes the problem of very mature trees being replaced by young specimens.

8.20 Trees generally make a positive contribution to the area and preserve the spirit of Kent’s landscape design. There are however some trees, including self-seeded trees along the bank of the River Cherwell, some planted trees to the frontage of Lower Heyford Church and a belt of trees to the rear of the Eyecatcher which obscure and diminish Kent’s intended views. Kent’s design also had an inherent weakness in that trees were planted for immediate effect and did not take account of the impact of maturing trees and some of his original trees have now grown and reduced the impact of his carefully designed spaces.

8.21 The North and South Roundels were 2 clumps of trees deliberately planted by William Kent on the eastern side of the valley. The original trees have been largely lost, but have been replanted and form a significant part of Kent’s designed landscape.
9. Views

9.1 There are numerous views into, out of and across the conservation area. Views are fundamental to William Kent’s landscape design and to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

9.2 The key views are those created with deliberate, designed intent by William Kent to contribute to the setting of Rousham Park and these have been subject to a Baseline Views Analysis (views 1 to 8). A number of views from some of the key monuments have also been subject to this analysis (views 9-12), where it is considered they make a particular contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

9.3 A number of views have been assessed, but not included and a separate table has been made of these with an explanation about why a full baseline analysis was not carried out.

9.4 There are an extensive number of views across the valley in which Rousham Park and its associated monuments feature. These include views from the settlements of Steeple Aston, Middle Aston, North Aston, the road to Somerton, the road between Upper and Lower Heyford, towpath of Oxford Canal and public footpaths throughout the area. These views have not been assessed as part of the conservation area appraisal, but nevertheless remain significant. It is anticipated that any development in areas which affect views into or out from Rousham Park would be assessed for the impact on the setting of the heritage assets in the usual manner.

View 1 - Rousham House
View 2 - Lion & Horse Statue
View 3 - Praenesta & Dying Gaul
View 4 - Venus Vale
View 5 - Temple of Echo
View 6 - Riverside Walk
View 7 - Pyramid House
View 8 - Cow House & Palladium Gatehouse
View 9 - The Causeway
View 10 - Temple Mill
View 11 - North & South Roundel
View 12 - The Eyecatcher

Figure 10. Key Views
The view from Rousham House is the key fundamental view of the entire landscape, which is of national and international significance. It is the viewpoint from which the whole Picturesque landscape is designed to be seen and lies at the heart of the significance of the Rousham Conservation Area.

The view is specifically designed and framed with the bowling green and Lion and Horse statue in the foreground and the Picturesque monuments of the Eyecatcher and Temple of the Mill in different positions in the landscape. The natural features of the River Cherwell and the rolling topography of the Cherwell Valley make a huge contribution to the view. The view is framed by belts of tree planning to either side of the central aspect.

The view is very sensitive to change. The immediate foreground view of bowling green and Lion and Horse statue and some of the meadowland immediately to the north are within the Rousham estate ownership and control, but the majority of the landscape is in a variety of ownership and management regimes.

Extract from John MacClary letter

“When you walk out at the Hall Door, you come into a Large parterre, the middle of which is a Large Bowling Green, with a Gravel Walk all round it, and on each side is a fine large Green Terrace Walk, at the end of which is two open groves, back with two Natural Hillocks planted with Scotch Firs and two Minervas upon Terms stands before them, and in the middle stands a Lion devouring a Horse, upon a very Large pedestal,”

The view from Rousham House
The view from the Lion and Horse statue is one of the key fundamental views of the entire landscape, which is of national and international significance. It is the viewpoint from which the whole Picturesque landscape is designed to be seen and lies at the heart of the significance of the Rousham Conservation Area. The perspective from the Lion and Horse statue is different to that from the main house, although along the same trajectory.

The Picturesque monuments of the Eyecatcher and Temple of the Mill – specifically designed by Kent – can be clearly seen and appreciated in this view. The natural features of the River Cherwell and the rolling topography of the Cherwell Valley make a huge contribution to the view. The view is framed by belts of tree planning to either side of the central aspect.

The view is very sensitive to change, as is evidenced by the impact of the extension to Bridge House. The traffic along the causeway also detracts from the view, but the traffic management system ensures that there are short periods of time without traffic.

Extract from John MacClary letter

’When you walk out at the Hall Door, you ‘when you eye drops upon a very fine Concave Slope, at the Bottom of which runs the Beautiful River Charvell, and at the top stands two pretty Garden Seats, one on each side, backt with the two Hilloks of Scotch Firrs, here you sit down first in the one and then in the other, from whence perhaps at this time you have the prettiest view in the whole World, Tho the most extensive part of it is but short, yet you see from hence five pretty Country Villages, and the Grant Triumphant Arch in Aston Field, together with the natural turnings of the Hills, to let that charming River downe to butify our Gardens, and what stops our Long view is a very pretty Corn Mill, Built in the Gothick manner but nothing sure can please the Eye like our Short View, their is a fine Meadow, cut off from the garden only by the River Charvell whereon is all sorts of Cattle feeding, which looks the same as if they was feeding in the Garden.’
The Praenesta and Dying Gaul are key monuments in William Kent’s designed landscape. Both monuments have views of the Picturesque landscape. The view from the Dying Gaul is of the wider landscape and perspective and the view from the Praeneste is more intimate and focuses on the immediately features of river and North Roundel.

The views out from the Praeneste are partially screened by later tree planting.

The views are of national and international significance and careful consideration would need to be given to any development in the area, specifically to the transport networks of Oxford Canal and railway. Careful consideration needs to be given to any tree planting in the area.

Extract from John MacClary letter

‘Then you turn a way to the right Hand, Through a fine Open Grove of Oaks, Elms, Beachs and Black Cherrys, Thirty feet High, backt with a very fine close Beach Hedge, which brings you to a pleasant opening Faced with a Stone Ballustrade, eighty feet long, on the one end stand Hercules, and the other Pan, upon Terms and in the middle is a Dying Gladiator upon a large pedestal,

From hence you have the same view as you have rom the top of the Great Slope, but nearer and prettier’
The cascades, statues and water features in Venus Vale are of national and international significance as part of the garden features designed by William Kent. There are important views between the different features and very clear views towards the North Roundel from specific vantage points. The views between these features are of national and international significance.

The view could be threatened by inappropriate development, in particular to the transport networks in the area, or extensive tree planting between the two features.

The view is of high significance in the context of William Kent’s designed landscape as the garden features are specifically placed to take advantage of the natural landscape and the North Roundel planted as part of the scheme for the wider landscape.

‘You keep down a Serpentine Gravel Walk which brings you to a large Serpentine Green Walk, bounded on each side with Evergreens and Flowering shrubs entemixt, and all along the middle runs a pretty little Serpentine River, well stockt with fine Trout, (I this day saw no less than twenty five (or fine) trouts sweming in it at one time) about the middle of the Walk and River is a Large Octagon Basson and by it is a little Building, or Cave coll and pleasant,’

Extract from John MacClary letter
9.8 View 5: from The Temple of Echo

The Temple of Echo is one of the key monuments in William Kent’s designed landscape. The Temple has been specifically placed to take advantage of view of St Mary’s Church, Heyford Bridge, Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher.

The views of St Mary’s Church, Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher are now almost completely obscured by later tree planting.

The view of Heyford Bridge is impacted by signage associated with the road and future features and associated infrastructure should be carefully considered to minimise impact on this key view.

The view as originally designed is of national and international significance within the designed landscape, but the view has been compromised by later development.

Extract from John MacClary letter

‘When your at the end of the River, you turn to the Left hand, through a fine Grove of Evergreens to a pavilion, built in the Tuscan order, where you goe in and sett down and hear a very fine Echo, from hence you have a view of the Archi ins Aston Field and the Gothick Corn Mill, and a very near view of Heyford Bridge, and the fine Clear Stream comeing Gliding through the Arches.’

‘From hence you goe down one of the prettiest concave Slopes in England, which brings you to the River Charvill’
Riverside Walk is of medium significance as part of the designed landscape of Rousham. The walk follows the natural contours of the River Cherwell and takes advantage of views of key monuments both within and outside the gardens.

‘Pope’s Seat’ and the Boat House are of high significance as monuments designed by William Kent to take advantage of the views of the River Cherwell and in the case of the Boat House the key monuments of The Temple of the Mill, the Eyecatcher and the North Roundel as well as Venus Vale, the Praeneste and Watery Walk.

When you come to the end of this Grove, you come to two Garden seats, where you set down, but sure no Tongue can express the Beautyfull view that presents itself to your eye; (Extensive description of fountain's in Venus Vale) (no longer operational).

(Description of bridge across the Cherwell – no longer there.) ‘From hence you cross the Bottom on the Grand Slope, which brings you to a Wooden Bridge, that Carrys a privat Bridle Road over the River Charvall, under which there is a very pretty natural Cascade’

‘You keep strait forward by the Riverside, through a open Grove of Oak, Elm, Ash, Beach and plains, forty fee high, which brings you to a large nich, that makes a very handsom Garden Seat, where you set down, and view the River and Garden, from one end to the other’,
The view is of national and international significance within the designed landscape of Rousham. The Pyramid House has been specifically cited to take advantage of views of Kent’s monuments. Views of the Eyecatcher have now been screened by later planting.

Extract from John MacClary letter

‘From here you goe through a Gra’ Serpentine Walk, which brings you to a Egyptian pyramid, here you goe in and set down, and have a very pretty view of the Meddow, the Road and the Bridge, and two parrish Churches, together with the pretty natural turnings and windings of the River, and the delightfull natural Cascade that falls down under the Wooden Bridge,’
The view is of national and international significance within the designed landscape of Rousham. It was designed as the first view of the house and surrounding landscape for visitors to the site. The Palladian Gateway was specifically located to take advantage of the views of Rousham House and Rousham Church. The South Roundel was placed to provide a distance perspective and it is the only view of the South Roundel from within the parkland.

Extract from John MacClary letter

‘From hence you turn along a pleasant green Walk, backt with all sorts of Flowers, and Flowering Shrubs, when you come to the middle, you find a pretty Garden Seat, where you set down and view the House, and a pretty paddock, devided from the Gardens, by Ha Ha ditch, the paddock is stockt at this time with two fine Cows, two Black Sows, a Bore and a Jack Ass,

You keep along the same wak which brings you to a Rustick Door that lets you out into the Road, on each side the Door is a nich, where in stands two Marble Figures, Flora and plenty and before them stand two Vases upon handson carr’d pedestals and by stands a Large Handsom Garddn Seat, where you set down and have a pretty view of the Arch in Aston Field,’
9.11 View 9: from the Causeway

The view of Rousham House from the causeway is of national and international significance and is framed by tree plantation within the park and gardens.

The views of both Rousham House and the Temple of the Mill and Eyecatcher from the causeway are chance views which are situated part way through designed views. The viewpoint allows public appreciation of the views.

Extract from John MacClary letter

‘And through the middle of the meadow runs a great High Road, which goes from several Cities to several Cities, their your see Carriers Wagons, Gentlemen’s Equipages, Women riding, Men walking and sometimes twenty Drovers of Cattle goes by in a Day, then you see Hayford Bridge (which carries the Great Road over the River Charvill) which is a fine Stone Bridge Six Hundred feet Long, and thirty Broad, with a parripet Wall on each side, finely coped, and it is supported by ten Spaceous Arches, here you see the water comes gliding through the Arches and all the pretty natural turnings and windings of the River’
The view from Temple of the Mill towards Rousham House is not a designed view, but is an important view of the principal building. The traffic along the B4030 is the only element which detracts from the view.

There is a view of St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford which is one of the few remaining views of the building from any of Kent’s monuments, despite his design intentions.
The views from the North and South Roundels and the public footpath to the east are of medium significance. They are not designed views, but provide the opportunity to view Kent’s Picturesque landscape from a different perspective with inter-visibility between monuments. The designed views towards Lower Heyford Church can be appreciated from the Roundels where they are screened elsewhere. There are some elements which detract from the views (including large, modern agricultural barns and structures associated with RAF Heyford and the railway) and the view could be significantly impacted by additional development.
The view from the Eyecatcher and the public footpath to the north is not a designed view, but is nevertheless a view of high significance. It is an important view of the principal building. The views along the public footpath allow views of the Eyecatcher and Rousham House in a range of different perspectives.

The direct view remains intact, but modern development to the south east of Steeple Aston detracts from the wider perspective of the view.
10. Management Plan

Policy context

10.1 The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act places a duty on local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its conservation areas. In line with English Heritage guidance (2011) Conservation Area Management Proposals are published as part of the process of area designation or review. The Conservation Area appraisal document is designed to inform planning decisions, and other actions that the Council and/or property owners within the designated area take. The role of the Management Proposals is to identify actions that could contribute to the enhancement of the special character and appearance of the area by the Council, owners and other stakeholders alike.

10.2 The main threat to the character and appearance of Rousham Conservation Area is any substantial alteration to the views of the landscape as designed by William Kent. The principal concern is with long range views, but consideration will also need to be given to small individual changes. It should be noted that unsympathetic permitted development and unauthorised development can cumulatively result in the erosion of the historic character and appearance of the conservation area.

10.3 The aim of management proposals is not to prevent change, but to ensure that any such changes are both sympathetic to and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

10.4 The principal policies covering alterations and development of the historic built environment are given in Appendix 1

Potential future threats to character of conservation area:

- Changes in agricultural practices including the need for technological solutions and the use of large scale structures.
- Widescale tree planting for forestry purposes, which does not respect the Picturesque tradition.
- Removal of hedgerows.
- Large scale residential development at Category A and B settlements and Heyford Park.
- Commercial and tourism development at Heyford Park, particularly in the form of large scale structures.
- Changes to transport infrastructure including significant expansion in profile or capacity, technological change.
- Large scale alternative energy supply in the form of wind or solar farms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Proposals for Preservation and Enhancement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Important Views</strong></td>
<td>Views in to, out from and across the designed landscaped of Rousham are fundamental to the character and appearance of the conservation area. All views of the area are of significance, but the views subject to a Baseline Assessment (as laid out in Appendix 2) are of core significance to the conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upkeep of monuments associated with Rousham Park.</strong></td>
<td>There are a number of monuments designed by William Kent within the landscape. Those within the immediate landholding are well cared for. There are, however, some maintenance problems with the monuments in the wider landscape. Heyford Bridge is subject to frequent accidents with regular repair being required to the stonework. The Temple of the Mill is a cared for dwelling which is fully occupied, but the ‘Gothic’ elements added by William Kent are falling into decay with plant growth, cracks in the stonework and the possible loss of some finials. The Eyecatcher is designed as a gothic ruin, but after over 250 years is beginning to genuinely decay there is evidence of lichen growth and some historic ivy. There have been some patch repairs to the monument some of it in cement mortar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vernacular character of settlements</strong></td>
<td>The settlements of Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford and Steeple Aston, which lie within and immediately adjacent to Rousham Conservation Area largely retain their rural, vernacular character. It is important that this is retained in new development in both form and layout of development as well as traditional materials and techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Development</strong></td>
<td>The settlements have different categorisations in the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031. Steeple Aston is a Category A village, Lower Heyford is Category B and Upper Heyford is Category C. Category A and B villages allow for small scale development as well as infilling. Upper Heyford RAF Base has been identified as a strategic development site for the district. It is fundamental that development in these settlements is sensitively designed and sited to ensure that the international significance of the Rousham landscape is preserved. Development at the settlement edges will be of particular concern. Any proposed development must respect the scale, design, proportions and materials of the surrounding architecture to strengthen the cohesion of the street scene. It is crucial that the scale and diversity of the surrounding architecture is respected and that an imaginative and high quality design is employed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>There are a number of transport routes which cut through the valley landscape associated with Rousham including Oxford Canal, River Cherwell, Cherwell Valley Railway and a number of trunk roads. The existing impact of these has been discussed in other sections. Careful consideration needs to be given to any proposals for alteration including expansion, signage and new technological development (eg electrifying rail line, widening of roads etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of technology infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Large scale technological developments for satellite or telecommunication systems can have a substantial impact on the landscape. Overhead lines in particular can have a detrimental impact on views of the design landscape. Similarly the impact of alternative energy supply such as solar or wind farms in the area could have a detrimental impact on views of the area. Very careful consideration should be given to any large-scale developments of this kind and options to provide cabling or underground systems where the visual impact is minimised should be utilised wherever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>The valley landscape has been altered in 20th and 21st centuries by changes in farming practices and the provision of larger, consolidated land holdings. It is important that any new technological requirements for agriculture are balanced against their impact on the views of the designed landscapes associated with Rousham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees</strong></td>
<td>Trees are of fundamental importance to the designed views of the Picturesque landscape. Any historic trees or those which have been designed to contribute to the landscape should be preserved or replaced. Careful consideration should be given to any substantial areas of new planting to ensure they enhance rather than obscure designed views within the landscape. A programme of tree clearance for later self-seeded trees which detract from key views would significantly enhance the historic designed landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Conservation Area Boundary

11.1 Rousham Conservation Area was originally designated on 22nd July 1991 and the boundary revised on 28th May 1996. The basic structure of the landscape has changed little during this time and therefore it is considered to remain appropriate.

11.2 The boundary is drawn to include the landscape setting of Rousham Park as designed by William Kent and land immediately surrounding which has a bearing on its setting. The boundary follows natural and / or visual boundaries such as hedgerows, roads, copses, streams and the canal.

11.3 Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford lie within the boundary, but have been subject to separate appraisals. The boundary abuts RAF Heyford Conservation Area and Steeple Aston Conservation Area. The Oxford Canal Conservation Area cuts through the Rousham landscape.

12. Effects of Conservation Area Designation

12.1 Conservation areas are designated by the Council under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. There are different planning controls in conservation areas and anyone proposing development should seek advice from Development Control and Major Developments at an early stage. The main effects of designation are as follows:

Development should preserve or enhance the area

12.2 Development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, ‘the special architectural or historic interest of which it is desirable to conserve or enhance.’ This enables the achievement of higher standards of design in new developments and secures the conservation of existing important features and characteristics. Information supporting planning applications must demonstrate the proposal, and its impact on the conservation area, in sufficient detail to enable a thorough assessment.

12.3 Land use planning policies in the Cherwell Local Plan and the emerging Local Development Framework aim to ensure that special attention is given to the preservation or enhancement of designated conservation areas. Proposals for new development will only be acceptable if they assist in the achievement of that objective

Control over demolition of buildings

12.4 Planning permission is required from Cherwell District Council, as the Local Planning Authority, for the demolition or substantial demolition of unlisted buildings in the conservation area. Where a building is of demonstrable architectural or historic interest, consent for demolition will only be given as a last resort.
Control over trees

12.5 The Council must be notified of any intention to carry out works to fell, lop or top any tree over 75mm (3 inches approx.) in diameter not already the subject of a tree preservation order. This provides the Council with an opportunity to consider making a tree preservation order and the provision of an extra degree of control over the many trees that are important to the appearance of the conservation area.

Protection of important open spaces and views

12.6 It is important to protect the open and aesthetic quality of the countryside in the Cherwell Valley as it is fundamental to the character and appearance of the designed landscape of Rousham Conservation Area. The open space and views in, out and across Rousham Park has a specific historic significance.

Control over the demolition of enclosures

12.7 Consent is also required to demolish any means of enclosure over 1 metre in height abutting a ‘highway’ (including a public footpath or bridleway), waterway or open space; or above 2 metres in height in any other case. This means that walls not relating to listed buildings, that add so much to the character and appearance of the street scene, are afforded protection.

Powers to seek repair of unlisted historic buildings

12.8 The Council has powers to seek the repair of unlisted (as well as listed) buildings in a poor state of repair where the building makes a valuable contribution to the street scene or is of local importance as a building type.

Reduced permitted development

There are no permitted development rights for commercial properties.

Within conservation areas there are restrictions on the size of extensions to domestic properties that may be carried out without specific planning permission including:

- A two storey rear extension of any dimension
- A single storey side extension of any dimension
- A building, enclosure, pool or container at the side of a dwelling
- Cladding in any material;
- Any alteration or extension to the roof;
- A satellite dish on any chimney, wall or roof slope that faces onto or is visible from a highway.
- A flue, chimney, soil or vent pipe on a wall or roof slope that fronts a highway or can be seen from a highway and forms the principal or side elevation of the house.

Permitted developments rights before within and outside conservation areas can be subject to change. Further up to date information can be found on the Planning Portal http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/permission or by contacting the Development Management Team of Cherwell District Council planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk or telephone 01295 221006.
13. Repair and Maintenance Guidance

13.1 Regular repair and maintenance is essential if the character and appearance of the Rousham Conservation Area is to be preserved or enhanced. The Picturesque designed landscape of Rousham is of international significance and special consideration needs to be given to the monuments and features within it. The following considerations are particularly important:

- Repair strategy for William Kent’s Monuments
- Heyford Bridge and Causeway

13.2 The bridge is of medieval origin, but has been modified many times and it is likely that much of its fabric has been altered. The bridge is vulnerable to the volume of modern traffic passing over it. The traffic is being managed by traffic lights ensuring that the structure has one-way traffic only. The north west corner of the bridge on the junction with the A4260 is particularly vulnerable to knocks and traffic accidents as vehicles sweep round the bend.

13.3 A number of modifications and patch repairs have been made to the bridge over time. A blue engineering brick cill has been added in some locations no doubt to reduce scrapes to the stonework. The stone coping has been changed in a number of locations, presumably following accidents. Cement pointing also appears to have been used in a number of locations. During the site visit a section of bridge was coned off and proposed works marked out in paint. A full recording of the condition of the bridge would be useful to ascertain an understanding of the impact of previous repair works.

13.4 The bridge will continue to be vulnerable to traffic whilst it maintains its function as a road bridge. A regular maintenance programme is required and skilled craftsmen with knowledge of the history and structural capacity of the bridge will be required to undertake any repair and maintenance work. Any repair work should be carried out in geologically appropriate stone to match the existing and lime mortar. Consideration should be given to measures to protect the historic fabric of the bridge without diminishing its visual amenity.

Temple of the Mill

13.5 The Temple of the Mill was a watermill and mill house prior to Kent’s interventions. The building is now in entirely domestic use and appears to be well maintained.

13.6 The Gothicised additions by Kent are, however, in need of maintenance. There is some plant growth in and around the stonework and overhanging branches from a tree which no doubt drop leaves and debris on to the building during the summer and autumn. It is possible that some of the finials are missing, although this could be part of the design intent as a Gothicised ruin.

13.7 The Gothicised additions are now over 250 years old and care needs to be taken to ensure they do not fall into decay. A regular programme of maintenance needs to be undertaken to ensure that the structure does not begin to erode. Simple measures such as removing planting growth and overhanging branches should ensure this so the structure maintains its appearance as a ‘ruin’ without actually becoming one.
Eyecatcher

13.8 The Eyecatcher was designed as a ‘folly’ or ‘gothic ruin’. The structure is a single linear wall in the centre of a field and is open to all the elements and therefore vulnerable to weathering. The structure is now over 250 years old.

13.9 The structure is in the form of a wall with three arches and six buttresses. The bottom part of the structure is rubble stone, laid to courses and pointed. The upper part is laid in the manner of a dry-stone wall with no pointing. The structure is topped by finials made from rubble stone laid on top of each other.

13.10 The structure is in reasonable condition and does look as if it has had some maintenance in recent years. There has been some patch re-pointing, but unfortunately some of it looks as if it may be cement pointing. There is evidence of some cracking. The structure is also subject to weathering and natural plant growth with evidence of lichen growth and the remains of some ivy.

13.11 A regular monitoring and maintenance programme is required in order to assess the condition of the monument. The monument may be considered to be a building at risk purely due to its exposed condition.

North and South Roundels

13.12 The North and South Roundels are clumps of trees designed by William Kent to be seen from Rousham House. An appraisal of the area in 1996 identified that the South Roundel was largely denuded, but tree planting since that date has restored the feature. The Roundels are currently in good condition and need to be managed by a routine programme of tree maintenance.

Tree planting and hedge maintenance

13.13 Careful consideration needs to be given to tree planting and hedge maintenance in the area surrounding Rousham. There are a number of instances where later tree growth has screened or blocked views of designed features within the landscape. Hedges need to be maintained and not allowed to grow out as well as careful consideration being given to the location of any tree planting. Works to trees within the conservation area need to be notified to the local planning authority.

Works to transport networks

13.14 New development to any of the existing transport networks in the area is perhaps the greatest threat to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Careful consideration needs to be given to the impact of any new infrastructure associated with these transport including signage and potentially lighting. Any overhead lines or tall structures which impact on views should be resisted.

In relation to the roads, the rural lanes make a particular contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and special care should be taken to retain their informal character. Any attempt to urbanise the area with formal pavements and additional road markings should be resisted.
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Appendix 1: Planning Policy

There are a number of policy documents which contain policies pertaining to the historic built environment. The main policies are summarised in this section. Other policies of a more general nature are also of some relevance. These are not listed here but can be found elsewhere in the specific documents mentioned below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Legislation</th>
<th>National Policy Guidance</th>
<th>Local Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

National Planning Policy Framework


Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment; paragraphs 184-202

Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 (Submission Document)

At the time of publication of the Rousham Conservation Area Appraisal the document had completed Regulation 16 Submission and is awaiting Independent Examination.

Individual policies (both wording and numbers) could be subject to change and therefore cross reference to the document is necessary.

Cherwell Local Plan 1996

H19: Proposed conversions will need to retain existing appearance and not cause harm to historic assets or wider countryside.

H20: The Council will normally resist proposals to convert rural buildings to provide two or more dwellings within a farmstead situated beyond the built up limits of a settlement unless the buildings are unsuitable for conversion to an employment generating use.

H21: Residential conversion favoured unless it would harm the character or interest of a building of historic interest.

C18 Works to a listed building should preserve the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest. Alterations or extensions to a listed building should be minor and sympathetic.

C23 Presumption in favour of retaining positive features within a Conservation Area.
C28 The layout, design and materials proposed within a new development should respect the existing local character.

C30 The design of the proposed scheme should show compatibility with the existing street scene and vicinity.

C33 Undeveloped gaps of land which have historic value, preserve the character of a loose-knit settlement or the setting of a listed building should be retained.

C38 Satellite dishes within a conservation area or on a listed building will not normally be permitted when they would be visible from a public highway.


ESD1: Mitigating and adapting to climate change.

ESD5: Renewable energy.

ESD10: Protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment.

ESD13: Local landscape protection and enhancement.

ESD15: The character of the built environment.

Policy Villages 1: village categorisation: the village will be Category C and therefore development will be restricted to conversions only.

Policy Villages 2: distributing growth across the rural areas

Policy Villages 3: rural exception sites: rural exception sites will only be considered where there is an identified and demonstrable need which has the support of the local community.
A selection of listed Buildings associated with William Kent’s designed landscape (referred to in the appraisal) - Cherwell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed Building / Structure</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heyford Bridge (that part in the parish of Lower Heyford)</td>
<td>Heyford Bridge, Cherwell, Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyecatcher at SP4828 2603</td>
<td>Eyecatcher, Steeple Aston, Cherwell, Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttle Mill</td>
<td>Cuttle Mill, Steeple Aston, Cherwell, Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttle Mill Stable aprox 20 metres to SW</td>
<td>Cuttle Mill stable, Steeple Aston, Cherwell, Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A selection of listed Buildings associated with William Kent’s designed landscape (referred to in the appraisal) - West Oxfordshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed Building / Structure</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rousham House</td>
<td>Rousham House, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousham (registered Park and Garden</td>
<td>Rousham, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow House approx. 410 metres south of Rousham Park</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha-ha running between Rousham House and Lodge adjoining Palladian Gateway</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue of Lion and Horse approx. 85 metres north of Rousham Park and at north end of Bowling Green</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden seat next to River Cherwell and garden walls, doorways and gateway to east of Rousham Park</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue of Dying Gaul approx. 5 metres SW of balustrade of Praeneste</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladian Gateway</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat House</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Cascade including statues of Venus and Swans in Venus Vale</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Echo</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue of Apollo at end of Long Walk an approx. 12 metres SE of the Temple of Echo</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pyramid House</td>
<td>The Pyramid House, Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining walls to the Cold Bath, Octagon Pool and Watery Walk</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeneste,</td>
<td>Rousham Park Gardens, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyford Bridge (that part in the parish of Rousham)</td>
<td>Rousham, West Oxfordshire</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Views

In addition to the views specifically listed the views of Rousham House and its associated landscape from the settlements of Steeple Aston, Middle Aston, North Aston, the road to Somerton, the road between Upper and Lower Heyford, towpath of Oxford Canal and public footpaths throughout the area have not been subject to an assessment or a Baseline Analysis. If development were to occur in an area that would impact on the views of Rousham designed landscape they should be subject to an analysis of the impact on setting in the usual way.

Views not subject to baseline assessment

The views outlined below have not been subject to a baseline assessment and the reason behind this has been justified on an individual basis. The views are still of significance and any development in these areas would impact on the setting of heritage assets and should be subject to the usual assessment of significance, harm and public benefit. They are, however, not part of the core significance of the Rousham Conservation Area which preserves and enhances William Kent’s designed landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views that have not been subject to full baseline analysis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views from Charles Bridgman’s amphitheatre</td>
<td>The amphitheatre was laid out by Charles Bridgeman and not William Kent. The views are of the natural landscape and not of any of the designed features by Kent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watery Walk</td>
<td>The Walk is one of the key features designed by William Kent, but there are no substantial views out as the walk is through a wooded area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousham Church</td>
<td>There are key views in to Rousham Church from North and South Roundels, but there are no corresponding views from ground level back to these designed features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The view from Rousham House is the key fundamental view of the entire landscape, which is of national and international significance. It is the viewpoint from which the whole Picturesque landscape is designed to be seen and lies at the heart of the significance of the Rousham Conservation Area.

The view is specifically designed and framed with the bowling green and Lion and Horse statue in the foreground and the Picturesque monuments of the Eyecatcher and Temple of the Mill in different positions in the landscape.

The natural features of the River Cherwell and the rolling topography of the Cherwell Valley make a huge contribution to the view. The view is framed by belts of tree planning to either side of the central aspect.

The view is very sensitive to change. The immediate foreground view of bowling green and Lion and Horse statue and some of the meadowland immediately to the north are within the Rousham estate ownership and control, but the majority of the landscape is in a variety of ownership and management regimes including Canal and River Trust (Oxford Canal), Environment Agency (River Cherwell) and Highways Agency (B4030). Any proposed development in this area including new buildings, structures, upgrades to transport networks should be scrutinised for its impact on this central view.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Importance of view</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for selection</strong></td>
<td>The principle view of the Picturesque landscape is from the house itself. It is the position from which the majority of William Kent’s design intentions can be seen in the widest context. The central viewpoint has the Lion and Horse statue aligned with the Eyecatcher with the Temple of the Mill set slightly to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of viewing place</strong></td>
<td>The view is described from the central point of the exterior frontage of Rousham House. The area is gravel path on flat ground between the house and the bowling green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of view from viewing place</strong></td>
<td>Rousham House was built in 1635 and therefore pre-dates the designed landscape. The gardens were originally laid out to a formal arrangement by Charles Bridgeman in the 1720s. Between 1737-1741 William Kent was employed to extend the house and redesign the surrounding landscape. The link between the house and landscape is therefore of fundamental significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements which detract from the view</strong></td>
<td>The central view remains largely intact from the central viewpoint. Bridge House is a dominant feature in the middle foreground of the landscape which features in kinetic views from the frontage. The original cottage was in existence during Kent’s time, but has had a large extension to the frontage which detracts from the Picturesque monuments. The non-original woodland behind the Eyecatcher deadens and detracts from the silhouette of this feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats to the view</strong></td>
<td>Threats include any potential development which impinges on this central view. Could include large scale housing development, rail infrastructure, wind turbines or construction of agricultural barns. Any substantial alteration to the B4030 including changes to traffic management systems could be a threat to the view. Bridge House extension detracts, but the colour of the windows is muted and blend in with the remainder of the building. A change in window type and colour or the addition of structures in the garden of the property could cause additional harm to the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall heritage significance within the view</strong></td>
<td>The view is of national and international significance and forms the core significance of the conservation area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of asset
Bowling Green; Lion and the Horse statue; Eyecatcher; Temple of the Mill; Heyford Bridge – medieval causeway; River Cherwell in foreground; Rolling topography; Open farmland

### History of asset
- The Bowling Green pre-dated William Kent's time and was laid out in approximately 1720.
- The Lion and Horse Statue was designed by Scheemakers in 1743 for William Kent's remodelling of the landscape.
- The Eyecatcher, the first sham ruin, was specifically designed and built by William Kent to contribute to the overall Picturesque view.
- The Temple of the Mill was modified by William Kent to the appearance of a Gothic ruin to contribute to the overall Picturesque view.
- The River Cherwell follows its natural course in this area, but its winding nature has been used to good effect to contribute to the overall Picturesque view.
- The rolling topography is part of the natural landscape, but has been used to good effect to contribute to the overall Picturesque view.

### Kinetic changes
- It is anticipated that the view changes from different rooms in the house and at different levels / heights.
- Bridge House can be viewed in some locations along the frontage, but the central view is masked by tree planting.
- Traffic moving along the bridge, in the form of vehicles, pedestrians and horses, enliven the view.
- The foreground view of the bowling green and footpaths can be enlivened by activity – contributing to the view of the Picturesque landscape as a ‘living painting’.

### Seasonal / night time changes
- It is anticipated that there would be little in the way of light pollution from the viewpoint. Headlights from the cars along the causeway may be visible from a distance.
- The view was captured during winter with trees predominantly bare. The views in summer would be green and there would be a range of colours in the autumn. This contributes to the idea of the Picturesque landscape being a ‘living painting’.

### Significance of assets in the view
- The Lion and Horse statue, The Eyecatcher and Temple of the Mill are fundamental to the core significance of the view. All structures are grade II* listed.
- Heyford Bridge is not really visible from this perspective.
- The river and the rolling topography make a contribution to the Picturesque view and form part of Kent's design intention.
View 2: Lion and Horse Statue

Summary

The view from the Lion and Horse statue is one of the key fundamental views of the entire landscape, which is of national and international significance. It is the viewpoint from which the whole Picturesque landscape is designed to be seen and lies at the heart of the significance of the Rousham Conservation Area. The perspective from the Lion and Horse statue is different to that from the main house, although along the same trajectory.

The Picturesque monuments of the Eyecatcher and Temple of the Mill – specifically designed by Kent – can be clearly seen and appreciated in this view. The natural features of the River Cherwell and the rolling topography of the Cherwell Valley make a huge contribution to the view. The view is framed by belts of tree planning to either side of the central aspect.

The view is very sensitive to change, as is evidenced by the impact of the extension to Bridge House (the cottage was in existence during Kent’s time, but the extension to the northern aspect detracts from the other more significant monuments which are located further afield). The traffic along the causeway also detracts from the view, but the traffic management system ensures that there are short periods of time without traffic. Any proposed development in this area including new buildings, structures, upgrades to transport networks should be scrutinised for its impact on this central view.
### Importance of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for selection</th>
<th>The Lion and Horse statue is one of the key monuments in Kent’s landscape. It was designed by Scheemakers in 1743. It marks the transition between the end of the formal garden and the picturesque landscape beyond. The statue is in a central position to Rousham House frontage, but provides a different viewing perspective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of viewing place</td>
<td>The viewing place is central to the frontage of the house. It is as at the northern extent of the bowling green lawn just before the land steps down in a concave curve. The view is channelled with tree planting to either side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of view from viewing place</td>
<td>The view is the key, central viewing point as designed by William Kent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements which detract from the view</td>
<td>Impact of traffic along causeway. Mainly visual, but can hear sirens etc. Bridge House extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the view</td>
<td>Threats include any potential development which impinges on this central view. Could include large scale housing development or construction of agricultural barns. Substantial development at RAF Heyford could impact on the view. Any substantial alteration to the B4030 including changes to traffic management systems could be a threat to the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall heritage significance within the view</td>
<td>The view is of national and international significance and is part of the core significance of the conservation area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view

| Description of asset | Eyecatcher  
| | Temple of the Mill  
| | River Cherwell in foreground  
| | Rolling topography  
| | Open farmland outside the formal landscape  
| | Concave slope down to River Cherwell |

| History of asset | The Eyecatcher was specifically designed and built by William Kent to contribute to the overall Picturesque view.  
| | The Temple of the Mill was modified by William Kent to the appearance of a Gothic ruin to contribute to the overall Picturesque view.  
| | The River Cherwell follows its natural course in this area, but its winding nature has been used to good effect to contribute to the overall Picturesque view.  
| | The rolling topography is part of the natural landscape, but has been used to good effect to contribute to the overall Picturesque view as has the open farmland.  
| | Rousham House was built prior to the design of the landscape by William Kent. It forms the backdrop to the landscape and views are designed to be seen from the house. |

| Kinetic changes | The view gradually opens up as you move between Rousham House and the statue. Different aspects of the view are seen as you walk along the southern aspect of the bowling green lawn. |

| Seasonal / night time changes | It is anticipated that there would be little in the way of light pollution from the viewpoint, but headlights from the cars along the causeway would be highly visible.  
| | The view was captured during winter with trees predominantly bare. The views in summer would be green and there would be a range of colours in the autumn. This contributes to the idea of the Picturesque landscape being a ‘living painting’. |

| Significance of assets in the view | The Eyecatcher and Temple of the Mill are fundamental to the core significance of the view. The structures are grade II* listed.  
| | The river, open farmland and the rolling topography make a contribution to the Picturesque view and form part of Kent’s design intention. |
View 3: The Praenesta and Dying Gaul

Summary

The Praenesta and Dying Gaul are key monuments in William Kent’s designed landscape. Both monuments have views of the Picturesque landscape. The view from the Dying Gaul is of the wider landscape and perspective and the view from the Praeneste is more intimate and focuses on the immediately features of river and North Roundel.

The views out from the Praeneste are partially screened by later tree planting.

The views are of national and international significance and careful consideration would need to be given to any development in the area, specifically to the transport networks of Oxford Canal and railway. Careful consideration needs to be given to any tree planting in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of viewing place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of view from viewing place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements which detract from the view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats to the view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall heritage significance within the view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of asset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of asset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kinetic changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonal / night time changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of assets in the view</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The cascades, statues and water features in Venus Vale are of national and international significance as part of the garden features designed by William Kent. There are important views between the different features and very clear views towards the North Roundel from specific vantage points. The views between these features are of national and international significance.

The view could be threatened by inappropriate development, in particular to the transport networks in the area, or extensive tree planting between the two features.

The view is of high significance in the context of William Kent’s designed landscape as the garden features are specifically placed to take advantage of the natural landscape and the North Roundel planted as part of the scheme for the wider landscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of viewing place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of view from viewing place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements which detract from the view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats to the view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall heritage significance within the view</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of asset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of asset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kinetic changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonal / night time changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of assets in the view</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
View 5: Temple of Echo

Summary

The Temple of Echo is one of the key monuments in William Kent’s designed landscape. The Temple has been specifically placed to take advantage of view of St Mary's Church, Heyford Bridge, Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher.

The views of St Mary’s Church, Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher are now almost completely obscured by later tree planting.

The view of Heyford Bridge is impacted by signage associated with the road and future features and associated infrastructure should be carefully considered to minimise impact on this key view.

The view as originally designed is of national and international significance within the designed landscape, but the view has been compromised by later development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Importance of view</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reason for selection** | The Temple of Echo / Statue of Apollo are grade II* listed buildings which forms part of William Kent’s designed landscape.  
The Temple of Echo is a garden temple designed by William Kent and built by William Townsend. The Statue of Apollo was designed by William Kent and erected in 1739.  
The Temple of Echo and Statue of Apollo are specifically placed in different locations on high ground to take advantage of the views to the north from a different perspective to the frontage of the house. |
| **Description of viewing place** | The two features are set on raised ground on a grassy slope. They have been specifically angled to take advantage of the view.  
The two monuments are surrounded by trees to the rear and open aspect views to the front. There is a footpath leading between the two monuments. |
| **History of view from viewing place** | The Temple of Echo and Statue of Apollo are part of the re-design of the landscape by William Kent.  
The Temple of Echo is in a direct line with the tower of Lower Heyford church.  
The location is designed for views of Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher, but neither are currently visible due to tree planting in the area. |
| **Elements which detract from the view** | Later tree planting has obscured views of Lower Heyford Church, Temple of the Mill and Eyecatcher. |
| **Threats to the view** | xx |
| **Overall heritage significance within the view** | The view is of national and international significance, but has been compromised by later tree planting.  
The Temple of Echo and Statue of Apollo are key parts of the landscape as designed by William Kent. |
### Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view

| Description of asset | Heyford Bridge – grade II* listed.  
|                      | St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford – grade II* listed.  
|                      | Temple of the Mill – grade II* listed  
|                      | Eyecatcher – grade II* listed |

| History of asset | Heyford Bridge is of 12th century origin with alterations in the 17th and 19th centuries.  
|                  | The bridge forms an important part of the designed landscape of William Kent with monuments within landscape placed to take advantage of the views of the structure.  
|                  | St Mary's Church originated in the 13th century with later work in 14th and 15th centuries and was restored in the 19th century. William Kent had no input to the design of the church, but based the location of Temple of Echo on maximising views to the building.  
|                  | Temple of the Mill and Eyecatcher – history described elsewhere. |

| Kinetic changes | The view from both monuments is kinetic and changes as you walk along the terrace to the frontage of the Praenesta and along the footpath in front of the Dying Gaul statue.  
|                 | There are two different perspectives of the same view. Views from the Dying Gaul provide a wide viewpoint of the valley whilst views from the Praeneste are more intimate with greater focus on the immediate environment.  
|                 | The North Roundel cannot be seen from the Dying Gaul due to the change in perspective. |

| Seasonal / night time changes | There are no night time views of the bridge. Car headlights are no doubt glimpsed as they traverse over the bridge. It is anticipated that the bridge would still be visible during the summer months.  
|                             | There are no views of St Mary's Church even in winter. It is possible that the building would be perceived through tree planting if the building were to be illuminated at night. |

| Significance of assets in the view | Heyford Bridge is of high significance within the view as Temple of Echo and Statue of Apollo were deliberately cited to take advantage of the view.  
|                                  | The views of Church of St Mary, Eyecatcher and Temple of the Mill have now been lost. |
Summary

Riverside Walk is of medium significance as part of the designed landscape of Rousham. The walk follows the natural contours of the River Cherwell and takes advantage of views of key monuments both within and outside the gardens.

‘Pope’s Seat’ and the Boat House are of high significance as monuments designed by William Kent to take advantage of the views of the River Cherwell and in the case of the Boat House the key monuments of The Temple of the Mill, the Eyecatcher and the North Roundel as well as Venus Vale, the Praeneste and Watery Walk.
## Importance of View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for selection</th>
<th>Riverside walk forms a part of William Kent’s designed landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Description of viewing place
The walk is a flat path which follows the contours of the River Cherwell within Rousham Park landscape.

### History of view from viewing place
The walk follows the natural course of the river. The walk is not specifically shown on Kent’s plan, but is utilised as a key part of an appreciation of the landscape.

A number of features within Rousham Park (including Rousham Hall itself, the Praeneste and other monuments and statues can all be clearly viewed from the walk.

The Boat House lies at a key central point along the walk. It provides a viewing point for Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher to the north, the North Roundel to the east and Venus Vale and the Praeneste to the south.

The garden seat next to River Cherwell by William Kent is grade II* listed (along with garden walls, doorways and gate). It is specifically designed for appreciating the view. It is known locally as ‘Pope’s seat’ as Alexander Pope is understood to have regularly sat there when he visited the property.

### Elements which detract from the view
Tree planting blocks views of some intended features including Lower Heyford Church and the North Roundel.

### Threats to the view
Additional tree planting.
Development to transport networks including railway, canal and B4030.

### Overall heritage significance within the view
The overall significance is medium.

The significance from the Boat House is high as it is such a pivotal location for the appreciation of views of many of Kent’s monuments both within and outside the gardens.

The significance from ‘Pope’s Seat’ is high as the seat was specifically placed to take advantage of the views.
### Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view

| Description of asset | Heyford Bridge and Causeway  
|                      | North Roundel  
|                      | St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford |
| History of asset     | Heyford Bridge and causeway and St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford of medieval origin. Pre-date William Kent’s Picturesque landscape.  
|                      | North Roundel planted by William Kent as part of designed landscape. |
| Kinetic changes      | The view along Riverside Walk is kinetic with different aspects of the view opening up as you walk around. This is part of the philosophy of the Picturesque approach to landscape design. |
| Seasonal / night time changes | The seasonal changes relate to the change of leaf cover and colour of trees and adds to the experience of the views.  
|                      | The only views at night time are likely to be the car headlights and potentially any lights from passing trains. |
| Significance of assets in the view | North Roundel of high significance in views along Riverside Walk as it was specifically placed to be appreciated from this perspective.  
|                      | Heyford Bridge / causeway – medium significance. The bridge can be viewed in different perspectives along the walk, but the walk was not specifically designed to take advantage of views of the bridge.  
|                      | Lower Heyford Church – limited significance. The walk was not specifically designed to take advantage of the views of the church (unlike some of the monuments). The church can no longer be seen from this aspect.  
|                      | Temple of the Mill and the Eyecatcher – high significance. The monuments are located in a clear line from the boat house. |
View 7: The Pyramid House

Summary

The view is of national and international significance within the designed landscape of Rousham. The Pyramid House has been specifically cited to take advantage of views of Kent’s monuments. Views of the Eyecatcher have now been screened by later planting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of viewing place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of view from viewing place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements which detract from the view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats to the view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall heritage significance within the view</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of asset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of asset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kinetic changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonal / night time changes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of assets in the view</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The view is of national and international significance within the designed landscape of Rousham. It was designed as the first view of the house and surrounding landscape for visitors to the site. The Palladian Gateway was specifically located to take advantage of the views of Rousham House and Rousham Church. The South Roundel was placed to provide a distance perspective and it is the only view of the South Roundel from within the parkland.
### Importance of view

| Reason for selection | The view is the first public view of the Rousham estate for members of the public entering through the Palladian Gate. There are clear views from both the Palladian Gate and the Cow House of Rousham Park, Rousham Church and the South Roundel. |
| Description of viewing place | The view is from a grass and stone pathway just before the ha-ha. The Cow House is located just to the south of the gateway. |
| History of view from viewing place | The Cow House and Palladian Gate were both designed by William Kent as part of the re-modelling of the landscape. |
| Elements which detract from the view | There is some later tree planting which partially obscures the view of the Roundel, but Rousham Church and House are clearly visible. |
| Threats to the view | Additional tree planting could further obscure the view of the South Roundel. |
| Overall heritage significance within the view | National and international significance. The view was intended as the first perspective of the Rousham estate for visitors. It is the only view of the South Roundel and provides good views of the relationship between Rousham House and Church. |

### Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view

| Description of asset | Rousham House  
| History of asset | Rousham House and Church clearly pre-date the Palladian Gateway and Church, but the feature designed by Kent have been placed here to take advantage of the view of these buildings. The South Roundel was designed by William Kent as part of the landscape. |
| Kinetic changes | There is little kinetic change as the view is of a specific vantage point. There are slight changes of orientation between the Cow House and the Palladian Gateway. |
| Seasonal / night time changes | The view would change with the seasons – with change in leaf coverage and colour on trees. The only night time view would be of lights from the house. |
| Significance of assets in the view | The significance of Rousham House and Church is of very high significance and it is clear that the Palladian gateway has been placed in this location to take advantage of the view. The South Roundel would appear to have been placed specifically to provide a form of perspective from this viewpoint. It is the only place it is visible from within the Rousham estate. |
View 9: The Causeway

Summary

The view of Rousham House from the causeway is of national and international significance and is framed by tree plantation within the park and gardens.

The views of both Rousham House and the Temple of the Mill and Eyecatcher from the causeway are chance views which are situated part way through designed views. The viewpoint allows public appreciation of the views.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of viewing place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of view from viewing place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements which detract from the view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to the view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall heritage significance within the view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinetic changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal / night time changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of assets in the view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
View 10: Temple of the Mill

Summary

The view from Temple of the Mill towards Rousham House is not a designed view, but is an important view of the principal building. The traffic along the B4030 is the only element which detracts from the view.

There is a view of St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford which is one of the few remaining views of the building from any of Kent’s monuments, despite his design intentions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of view</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for selection</strong></td>
<td>Temple of the Mill is one of William Kent’s modified features designed to complement the Picturesque landscape. The structure is designed to be clearly seen from Rousham House and there are return views up to the principal building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of viewing place</strong></td>
<td>The Temple of the Mill is now a dwelling house situated in garden land adjacent to the River Cherwell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of view from viewing place</strong></td>
<td>The building was a watermill and mill house dating to the late 17th / early 18th century prior to William Kent’s intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements which detract from the view</strong></td>
<td>The traffic along the B4030 is the only issue which detracts from the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats to the view</strong></td>
<td>Any alteration to the B4030 would have a significant impact on the view between Temple of the Mill and Rousham House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall heritage significance within the view</strong></td>
<td>High. The view is not necessarily a designed view but provides a key view back to Rousham House.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of asset</strong></td>
<td>Rousham House – grade I listed building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History of asset</strong></td>
<td>The current building dates to 1635 with later changes. The alignment of the mill building with the house pre-dates William Kent’s designed landscape, but it was Kent who took advantage of the view and modified the building accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford is a medieval church. Kent utilised views of the church within his designed landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kinetic changes</strong></td>
<td>The view is a largely static rather than kinetic view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonal / night time changes</strong></td>
<td>The views of Rousham House are compromised at certain times of day in the winter months due to the low lying sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is anticipated that there may be lights from within Rousham House, as well as car headlights along the causeway in the evenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The seasonal changes would include leaf cover and colour on the trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of assets in the view</strong></td>
<td>Rousham House – high / medium. It is not a designed view towards the house, but an important one. Demonstrates the links between Kent’s monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary’s Church, Lower Heyford – high. It is the only remaining view of the church from one of Kent’s monuments. The remainder have been screened by tree planting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
View 11: North and south Roundels

Figure 20.

Summary

The views from the North and South Roundels and the public footpath to the east are of medium significance. They are not designed views, but provide the opportunity to view Kent’s Picturesque landscape from a different perspective with inter-visibility between monuments. The designed views towards Lower Heyford Church can be appreciated from the Roundels where they are screened elsewhere. There are some elements which detract from the views (including large, modern agricultural barns and structures associated with RAF Heyford and the railway) and the view could be significantly impacted by additional development.
The North and South Roundels are key parts of the designed landscape by William Kent. The view from the footpath to the east affords views of the Roundels within the context of the wider parkland including Rousham House itself.

The North and South Roundels are clumps of trees set within agricultural fields.

The public footpath is a track along the hedge line of an agricultural field.

The Roundels were designed by Kent to provide focal points in the landscape in views from Rousham House.

There was no design intent for views from the Roundels, but never-the-less they form important links between monuments in the Rousham landscape.

The viewpoint offers a different perspective of the Rousham landscape.

The view has changed with the introduction of the Oxford Canal and the railway line.

Modern agricultural barns; RAF Heyford buildings; Structures associated with railway.

Further development of transport networks, RAF Heyford or modern agricultural practice.

Medium

North Roundel – Rousham House, Rousham village, Praeneste, Lower Heyford Church, and village, Steeple Aston church and village.

South Roundel – Rousham church, village; oblique views of Rousham House, Steeple Aston church.

The majority of heritage assets visible in these views were in existence prior to Kent’s design of the landscape. The monuments have been utilised within the design.

The views of the landscape change between the North and South Roundels and the footpath to the rear. Different aspects of the view are opened out as you walk through the landscape.

It is anticipated that there is some light pollution from railway and possibly development at Upper Heyford.

Medium. The views are not designed, but provide the opportunity to appreciate Kent’s Picturesque landscape from different perspectives with inter-visibility between monuments.
Summary

The view from the Eyecatcher and the public footpath to the north is not a designed view, but is nevertheless a view of high significance. It is an important view of the principal building. The views along the public footpath allow views of the Eyecatcher and Rousham House in a range of different perspectives.

The direct view remains intact, but modern development to the south east of Steeple Aston detracts from the wider perspective of the view.
Importance of view

Reason for selection

The Eyecatcher is one of Williams Kent’s architectural features designed specifically for the Picturesque landscape. The structure is designed to be seen from Rousham House and there are return views to the principal building. The view from the public footpath to the north affords views of both the Eyecatcher and Rousham House, showing the clear alignment between them.

Description of viewing place

The Eyecatcher is located in the centre of an agricultural field. There is an area of grassland to the frontage / south face of the feature. The public footpath to the north runs along the hedge line at the field edge.

History of view from viewing place

The Eyecatcher was designed by Kent to provide a focal point in the landscape from Rousham House. The direct view is little altered, with the exception of additional tree cover.

Elements which detract from the view

Modern development to the south east of Steeple Aston detracts from the indirect view.

Threats to the view

Further modern development. Additional tree cover / planting. Potential for any large transport / infrastructure project.

Overall heritage significance within the view

High. The view is not a designed view, but provides a key view back to Rousham House. Views from the public footpath show the alignment of both features.

Understanding of significance of heritage assets in the view

Description of asset

Rousham House – grade I listed building.

History of asset

Rousham House predates the Eyecatcher. The current building dates from 1685 with later changes.

Kinetic changes

The view from the Eyecatcher itself is static. The view along the public footpath is kinetic and the Eyecatcher and Rousham House are shown on different alignments and different perspectives as you walk through the landscape.

Seasonal / night time changes

There would be the usual change in colour and leaf cover of the trees in the landscape through the seasons. It is anticipated that the only lights in the direct view would be from Rousham House, but the lighting from the modern development to the south east of Steeple Aston would detract from this at night.

Significance of assets in the view

High.
Appendix 4: Letter from John MacClary 1750

The letter, written in 1750 to his employers describes the principal circuit of the gardens, entering at the Palladian doorway in the garden wall and walking north-east.

‘Madam I’Afraid my Master and all of you have forgot what sort of Place Rousham is, so I have sent you a description of it that it may not quite creep out of your Memorys.

When you walk out at the Hall Door, you come into a Large parterre, the middle of which is a Large Bowlingreen, with a Gravel Walk all round it, and on each side is a fine large Green Tarrice Walk, at the end of which is two open groves, backt with two Natural Hillocks planted with Scotch Firs and two Minervas upon Terms stands before them, and in the middle stands a Lion devouring a Horse, upon a very Large pedestal, you walk forward to view the Lion nearer, when you eye drops upon a very fine Concave Slope, at the Bottom of which runs the Beautiful River Charvell, and at the top stands two pretty Garden Seats, one on each side, backt with the two Hillocks of Scotch Firs, here you sit down first in the one and then in the other, from whence perhaps at this time you have the prettiest view in the whole World, Tho the most extensive part of it is but short, yet you see from hence five Country Villages, and the Grant Triumphant Arch in Aston Field, together with the natural turnings of the Hills, to let that charming River downe to butify our Gardens, and what stops our Long view is a very pretty Corn Mill, Built in the Gothick manner but nothing sure can please the Eye like our Short View, their is a fine Meadow, cut off from the garden only by the River Charvell whereon is all sorts of Cattle feeding, which looks the same as if they was feeding in the Garden.

And through the middle of the meadow runs a great High Road, which goes from several Cities to several Cities, their your see Carriers Wagons, Gentlemen’s Equipages, Women riding, Men walking and sometimes twenty Drovers of Cattle goes by in a Day, then you see Hayford Bridge (which carriyes the Great Road over the River Charvill) which is a fine Stone Bridge Six Hundred feet Long, and thirty Broad, with a parripet Wall on each side, finely coped, and it is supported by ten Spaceous Arches, here you see the water comes gliding through the Arches and all the pretty natural turnings and windings of the River, for half a mile and one yard, which is the length of the Gardens by the River, and Turn a bout you see a good old House uninhabited on each side of which is a Wing newly built and on each wing is two niches, wherein stand four fine figures. A Dancing Fawn a Bacchanal, a Venus and An Apolo.

Then you turn a way to the right Hand, Through a fine Open Grove of Oaks, Elms, Beachs and Black Cherrys, Thirty feet High, backt with a very fine close Beach Hedge, which brings you to a pleasant opening Faced with a Stone Ballustrade, eighty feet long, on the one end stand Hercules, and the other Pan, upon Terms and in the middle is a Dying Gladiator upon a large pedestal,

From hence you have the same view as you have rom the top of the Great Slope, but nearer and prettier,

From hence you turn along a pleasant green Walk, backt with all sorts of Flowers, and Flowering Shrubs, when you come to the middle, you find a pretty Garden Seat, where you set down and view the House, and a pretty paddock, devided from the Gardens, by Ha Ha ditch, the paddock is stockt at this time with two fine Cows, two Black Sows, a Bore and a Jack Ass,
You keep along the same wak which brings you to a Rustick Door that lets you out into the Road, on each side the Door is a nich, where in stands two Marble Figures, Flora and plenty and before them stand two Vases upon handson carr’d pedestals and by stands a Large Handsom Garddn Seat, where you set down and have a pretty view of the Arch in Aston Field,

Flowering shrubs entermixt, and all along the middle runs a pretty little Serpentine River, well stockt with fine Trout, (I this day saw no less than twenty five (or fine) trouts sweming in it at one time) about the middle of the Walk and River is a Large Octagon Basson and by it is a little Building, or Cave coll and pleasant,

When your at the end of the River, you turn to the Left hand, through a fine Grove of Evergreens to a pavilion, built in the Tuscan order, where you goe in and sett down and hear a very fine Echo, from hence you have a view of the Archi ins Aston Field and the Gotham Corn Mill , and a very near view of Heyford Bridge, and the fine Clear Stream coming Gliding through the Arches.

Turn about you view the inside (where you set down) which you finde to be a Square Roome with the Angles cut of, in it are two niches, in the one stands the Head of Apolo, in the other is Socoratas, in the four Cants is a Bacchus drunk Lead between two Satturs, Demosthenes setting upon the Alter before he is put to Death, a Bacchanal, and Juipter setting on his Trhone, all in Bass Relife,

From hence you goe down one of the prettiest concave Slopes in England, which brings you to the River Charvill,

Look to the left hand, youl see a Door that letts you out upon Heyford Bridge, which is the end of the Gardens,

You moves on to the righ, Through a fine open Grove of Oaks, Elms, Beach, Alder, plains and Horsechestnuts, all in Flower now, and Sixty feet high, this Grove is a Hundred feet Broad, and five Hundred feet Long, on one side runs the River, the other is Backt with all sorts of Evergreens and Flowering shrubs entermixt,

When you come to the end of this Grove, you comes to two Garden seats, where you set down, but sure no Tongue can express the Beautyfull view that presents itself to your eye,
You see a Fountain four Inches Diameter, playing up fifty feet High, in the middle of a Clump of Old Oaks, and backt with a Cascade where the Water comes tumbling down from under three Arches, through Ruff Stones,

From hence you carry your Eye on, you see on each side natural Hilloks planted with Large trees of different sorts and In the middle stands Faun, on the Left stands Pan, upon pedestals,

You carry your eye still on you see a Fountain playing thirty fee High, that is five inches Diameter, behind which stand a Figur Venus, on each side of her stands a Cupid riding upon swans Backs, all three upon handsom pedestals and al this Backt with a very fine tall Evergreens of Deferent Sorts.

From hence you goe up a Serpentine Gravel walk, which brings to A Aracde, a hundred feet long, in which are Seven Arches and against each Archi is a large nich, wherein stand a very pretty carv’d seat and between them is six small inches and in them stands the Bust of a young Celopatora, Shakspeare, a Baccahnal, Alexander, the roman Sistener and Niaba, before it is a large Gravel Walk, faced with a Stone Ballustrade, with a large Vase at each end.

You turn down a Serpentine Gavel walk, which brings you to A Aracde, a hundred feet long, in which are Seven Arches and against each Archi is a large nich, wherein stand a very pretty carv’d seat and between them is six small inches and in them stands the Bust of a young Celopatora, Shakspeare, a Baccahnal, Alexander, the roman Sistener and Niaba, before it is a large Gravel Walk, faced with a Stone Ballustrade, with a large Vase at each end.

You keep strait forward by the Riverside, through a open Grove of Oak, Elm, Ash, Beach and plains, forty fee high, which brings you to a large nich, that makes a very handsom Garden Seat, where you set down, and view the River and Garden, from one end to the other,

From hence you trun up a Serpentine Gravel Walk, by a little Cave (wherein stands a fine sprirtn that serves the House with Drinking Watter) which brings you to alittle pond,

From here you goe through a Gra’ Serpentine Walk, which brings you to a Egyptian pyrimade, here you goe in and set down, and have a very pretty view of the Meddow, the Road and the Bridge, and two parrish Churches, together with the pretty natural turnings and windings of the River, and the delightfull natural Cascade that falls down under the Wooden Bridge,

Look round and you find your sehlf in a large square Handsom Room, iht the Back wil fo which is a nich, with a Roman (?) in it, and on one side si the head of Julius Ceasar, on the other is Calpurnia in Bass Relife, on each side is a nich, in which stands the Bust ofs Marcus Arielus, and Socratus,

From henc you goe a long a Sepentine Gravel walk, which brings you to the Kitchen Garden Door, which when you ent in, it makes you forget all they Beautys you hae seen befor, it look more like paradice than a Ketchen Gardn

There is three Kitchen Gardens Joining to eah other, in which are four Fishponds, and the Water is carred from one pond, to the Other, in little Riverlats, which makes them both usefull, and pretty; their wall’d round with Brick wllas twelve feet high, well planted with choise Fruit trees and there is a lare Gravil walk with Box edgings on ehach side, goes quite Round and twice through the Middle, by the side of the Gravil walk is
A very handsom Espalier, painted Green and planted with the bst sorts of Apples and pears, in England,

Here you pass by a very large handsom Hotthouse, well stockt with very fine pine Apples,

Before I leave the Kitchen Garden, I must let you know how it is stockt; First we have a pretty maney peaches and nectons, Great plent of Apricots, Figgs, Grapes, and Mulberrys, few plumbs, pears, Apples, Cherries, Currants and Goos berries, and as Great plenty of all sorts of things for the Kitchen as a Oxfordshire garden can produce;

From hence you goe into a pretty Little Flower Garden, well planted with al sorts of pretty Flowers.

Here is a Rustick Door, through which there is a privat road to the Church,

From hence you goe into the Darey Yard, in the middle of which is a large Square pond, well stock stih fine Fish, and all the yard was handsomely Layd with Gravil,

Faceing you stands a very large Building which is the Darey and Darey House, and there is tow Wings one of weach side which is a Coach House and Hen houses,

Look to the left and you see as pretty a set of pigg Stighs as aney is in England,

Look to the right you see the Gate, which letts you into a large Gravil Walk which Leads to the House, but before I leave the Darey Yard I must let know how it is stockt,

Here you see one Hen Turkey nursing eighteen fine young ones fit, for the Spitt, and the other three Hen Turkeys are setting again, and the Hen that is the nurse Layes again,

And here you see a nother fine sight, a old Hen looking after Twentyfour fine Chickens fitt for the Spitt, and several more old Hens nursing Large Broods of Chickens under their wings, n all to the number of Sixty Six,

And here yo see the old Ducks sweming a bout the pond with no less than forty young ones of Deferenat sizes seeming after them,

Here you see several old Hens setting, and two of them upon Guinea Fowls Eggs,

From hence, you goe through the Gate and up the Gravil walk to the House, you go by a very pretty lader walk to the Gravil, with never a bit of nettles in it.

There is one thing I had like to a forgot, which is a thing I believe none of you knows aney thing of, which is a most noble view we have form one place in our Gardens we look into four Countys and see no less then ten parish Churches at one time.

Now Madam if al thig wont induce you, once more to set your Faces towards Rousham, I beg you’ll be so good and to intercede with my master, to give us his Estate, as well as his House and Gardens, theirs one good thing If you don’t come soon, my Master will have but small Butchers Bills to pay for wee shall be forst to live one Day upon Turnkey, another Day upon Ducks , another upon Chickens.’
Appendix 5: Public Consultation

Cherwell District Council considers public consultation an important part of conservation area designation and review.

As part of the designation/review process the historic settlement in question and the environs are assessed and an appraisal document produced setting out what is significant about the place.

A similar process is undertaken for individual buildings, either for putting a structure forward for statutory designation as a heritage asset (formerly known as ‘listing’), or for those buildings, structures or archaeological features that are locally significant for inclusion in the district-wide Register of Local Heritage Assets.

An exhibition and public meeting were held on Thursday 28th June 2018 to enable local residents to inspect the draft document and talk to the Design and Conservation team and planning colleagues.

The draft document was available to be viewed on-line from Cherwell District Council’s website (www.cherwell.gov.uk/conservation) and hard copies were available at Bicester library.

Comments on the draft document and suggestions for inclusion or exclusion of areas and/or buildings within the conservation area were considered by the Design and Conservation Team. Where appropriate amendments were made and incorporated into the final document. The document was assessed and signed off by the Lead Member for Planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document title</th>
<th>Executive date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rousham Conservation Area Appraisal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Recommendation of the Executive**
  - Delegate authority to Lead Member for Planning

- **Further recommended changes to the document**
  - No changes undertaken

- **Amended document approved by**
  - **Lead Member for Planning**
  - Date approved: 20 September 2018
How to contact us

Design & Conservation Team
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 4AA

Tel: 01295 227006
e-mail: design.conservation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
www.cherwell.gov.uk

Call 01295 227006
or visit www.cherwell.gov.uk

The information in this document can be made available in other languages, large print braille, audio tape or electronic format on request. Please contact 01295 227001