

Visual and Sensory		
Aspect Area Name	penderyn	<p>Crown Copyright. All rights reserved CCW 100018813 2005</p>
Aspect Area Classification	Upland/Hills, Lower Plateau & Scarp Slopes/Hillside & Scarp Slopes Mosaic (Level 3)	
Aspect Area Code	CynonVS833	
Assessor		
Date Of Survey : 26/01/2004		

**General**

Has the information been verified in the field?	Yes (1:25000)
Does this area have a special or functional link with an adjacent area?	Yes (strong visual link with upland area)

**Description**

Summary Description	Upper valley sides with strong upland feel-both from the strong visual link that exists and the rough grazing with some woodland/conifer elements. slight urban feel on lower slopes but dominant character is that of an upland area. visual detractors include pylons and the sharply defined urban edge. noise and movement from the A465. scattered farmsteads
Physical Form And Elements: Topographic Form?	Hills/Valleys
Physical Form And Elements: Landcover Pattern?	Field Pattern/Mosaic
Physical form and elements: Settlement pattern	Scattered Rural/Farm
Physical form and elements: Boundary type	Mixture
Aesthetic Qualities: Scale?	Large
Aesthetic Qualities: Sense of Enclosure?	Open
Aesthetic Qualities: Diversity?	Simple
Aesthetic Qualities: Texture?	Coarse
Aesthetic Qualities: Lines?	Angular
Aesthetic Qualities: Colour?	Moderate Contrasts
Aesthetic Qualities: Balance?	Balanced
Aesthetic Qualities: Unity?	Neutral
Aesthetic Qualities: Pattern?	Regular
Aesthetic Qualities: Seasonal Interest?	None
Other Factors: Level of Human Access?	Infrequent

Other Factors: Night Time Light Pollution?	Moderate (urban area)
Other Factors: Use of Construction Materials?	Generally Appropriate
What materials? Give Details:	n/a
There are attractive views...	...both in and out (n/a)
There are detractive views...	...out (urban edge)
Perceptual and Other Sensory Qualities	Exposed (n/a)
What is the sense of place/local distinctiveness	Moderate (Upper valley sides with upland feel and tinged by urban edge, slight incongruous mix)
<b>Evaluation</b>	
Value:	Moderate (n/a)
Condition:	Unassessed
Trend:	Unassessed
<b>Recommendations</b>	
Existing management	Unassessed
Existing management remarks:	agriculture, conifer plantation
Principal management recommendation:	prevent overgrazing
Guideline	Immediate (soften urban edge) Medium Term (restrict pylons) Medium Term (reduce impact of A465 eg planting)
Define the key qualities that should be conserved:	n/a
Define the key qualities that should be enhanced:	n/a
Define the key qualities that should be changed:	n/a
Define the key elements that should be conserved:	n/a
Define the key elements that should be enhanced:	n/a
Define the key elements that should be changed:	n/a
<b>Tolerance To Change</b>	
Are there any significant threats to the current integrity and condition of the visual & sensory features of the area?	Not known
<b>Aspect Area Boundary</b>	
To what level was this information site-surveyed?	Level 3
At 1:10,000, how much of the Aspect Area boundary is precise?	Most
What baseline information source was used for Aspect Area boundary mapping?	OS Raster
If OS Data was used, what was the scale?	1:25,000
What is the justification for the Aspect Area boundaries?	landform, contour, urban edge to south
<b>Bibliography</b>	
List the key sources used for this assessment	os data
<b>Evaluation Matrix</b>	
Evaluation Criteria: Scenic quality	Moderate (some attractive view to uplands but visual detractors eg urban edge, pylons)
Evaluation Criteria: Integrity	Moderate (n/a)
Evaluation Criteria: Character	Moderate (moderate sop)
Evaluation Criteria: Rarity	Moderate (n/a)

<b>Evaluation Criteria: Overall Evaluation</b>	Moderate (Valley sides with pattern of field boundaries/woodland, but detractive elements eg urban edge, pylons traffic noise, of local importance)
<b>Justification of overall evaluation</b>	all criteria moderate
<b>Assessment</b>	
<b>Additional Assessments</b>	n/a
<b>Additional Comments</b>	