20/98 Morch 1958

8FC16359C

# COURT FARM AND SUTTON ROAD LITTLEDEAN AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION SURVEY

# **CONTENTS**

		Page
INTRODUCTIO	)N	1
SUMMARY		1
CLIMATE		2
RELIEF		2
GEOLOGY ANI	OSOILS	2
AGRICULTURA	AL LAND CLASSIFICATION AND MAP	3
REFERENCES		4
APPENDIX I	Description of the Grades and Subgrades	5
APPENDIX II	Definition of Soil Wetness Classes	7
APPENDIX III	Survey Data:	8
	Sample Point Location Map	
	Pit Descriptions	
	Boring Profile Data	
	Boring Horizon Data	
	Abbreviations and Terms used	in Survey Data

# COURT FARM AND SUTTON ROAD, LITTLEDEAN

## AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION SURVEY

### INTRODUCTION

- 1. This report presents the findings of a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey of 8.3 ha of land at Court Farm and on Sutton Road, Littledean, Gloucestershire. Field survey was based on 11 auger borings and 1 soil profile pit, and was completed in February 1998. During the survey 1 sample was analysed for particle size distribution (PSD).
- 2. The survey was conducted by the Resource Planning Team of FRCA Western Region on behalf of MAFF in its statutory role in the preparation of the Forest of Dean Local Plan.
- 3. Information on climate, geology and soils, and from previous ALC surveys was considered and is presented in the relevant section. Apart from the published regional ALC map (MAFF, 1977) which shows the sites at a reconnaissance scale as Grade 3 with Grade 4 on the steeper land in the west, the site had not been surveyed previously. However, the current survey uses the Revised Guidelines and Criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land (MAFF, 1988) and therefore supersedes any previous ALC survey. Grade descriptions are summarised in Appendix I.
- 4. Land to the south of Littledean was surveyed in 1997 (FRCA, 1997) and where it was not limited by gradient was shown to be Grade 2 with a minor workability limitation. The soil profiles and geology of the site are similar to the current survey.
- 5. At the time of survey land cover was grass for grazing. Other land which was not surveyed included residential and public gardens.

#### **SUMMARY**

6. The distribution of ALC grades is shown on the accompanying 1:10 000 scale ALC map. The detail of information shown at this scale is appropriate to the intensity of field survey but could be misleading if enlarged or applied to small areas. Areas are summarised in the Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of ALC grades: Court Farm and Sutton Road

Grade	Area (ha)	% Surveyed Area (7.1 ha)				
2	5,6	79				
3b	1.3	18				
4	0.2	3				
Other land	1.2	_				
Total site area	8.3	100				

7. 79% of the site is shown to be best and most versatile being Grade 2 with a minor workability limitation. The rest of the site has moderate and severe limitations due to gradient.

## **CLIMATE**

- 8. Estimates of climatic variables for this site were derived from the published agricultural climate dataset "Climatological Data for Agricultural Land Classification" (Meteorological Office, 1989) using standard interpolation procedures. Data for key points around the site are given in Table 2 below.
- 9. Since the ALC grade of land is determined by the most limiting factor present, overall climate is considered first because it can have an overriding influence by restricting land to a lower grade despite more favourable site and soil conditions. Parameters used for assessing overall climate are accumulated temperature, a measure of relative warmth and average annual rainfall, a measure of overall wetness. The results shown in Table 2 indicate that there is an overall climatic limitation which limits the land to Grade 2 above 150 m.
- 10. Climatic variables also affect ALC grade through interactions with soil conditions. The most important interactive variables are Field Capacity Days (FCD) which are used in assessing soil wetness and potential Moisture Deficits calculated for wheat and potatoes, which are compared with the moisture available in each profile in assessing soil droughtiness limitations. These are described in later section.

Table 2: Climatic Interpolations: Court Farm and Sutton Road

Grid Reference	SO 669 131	SO 668 136		
<del>-</del>	<u></u>			
Altitude (m)	135	160		
Accumulated Temperature (day °C)	1376	1347		
Average Annual Rainfall (mm)	858	873		
Overall Climatic Grade	1	2		
Field Capacity Days	189	191		
Moisture deficit (mm): Wheat	85	81		
Potatoes	70	65		

#### RELIEF

11. Altitude ranges from 131 metres at the southern edge of the site on Sutton Road to 160 metres at the western edge of the site on the A4151. Most of the site has gently and moderately sloping gradients but in the west these become strongly and moderate and steeply sloping and will limit the agricultural use of the land.

#### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

12. The underlying geology of the site is shown on the published geology map (IGS, 1975) as being Lower Old Red Sandstone (Brownstones) and this was confirmed by the current survey.

13. Soils were mapped by the Soil Survey of England and Wales at a reconnaissance scale of 1:250 000 (SSEW, 1983) as belonging to the Eardiston 1 Association which is described as comprising well drained reddish coarse loamy soils over sandstone, which are shallow in places especially on brows. Some reddish fine silty soils are found over shale and siltstone. More detailed soils information is also available in the 1:25 000 scale survey of the Cinderford area (SSEW, 1981). This shows a complex pattern of Castleton, Newent, Ross and Sellack soil series which are all described as being similar to the Eardiston 1 soils. These descriptions were borne out by the findings of the current survey.

### AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION

14. The distribution of ALC grades found by the current survey is shown on the accompanying 1:10 000 scale map and areas are summarised in Table 1. The detail of information shown at this scale is appropriate to the intensity of field survey but could be misleading if enlarged or applied to small areas.

## Grade 2

15. The profiles were found to have medium clay loam topsoils and upper subsoils over lighter textured lower subsoils. These lower subsoils were variable in texture and colour including patches of sandy clay, sandy clay loam, coarse sandy loam and loamy coarse sand. The profiles are well drained and were assessed as Wetness Class I (see Appendix II). With the relatively high field capacity days value of 190 these profiles were mapped as Grade 2 with a minor workability limitation. The soil profile pit described within the mapping unit confirmed the description of the profiles although PSD analysis showed that at this point the topsoil texture was just medium sandy loam and is therefore an isolated patch of Grade 1 land within the wider area of Grade 2.

### Subgrade 3b

16. The small area of Subgrade 3b land is limited by strongly sloping gradients.

## Grade 4

17. The small area of Grade 4 land has a severe limitation due to moderately steep gradients.

H Lloyd Jones Resource Planning Team FRCA Bristol March 1998

### REFERENCES

FRCA RESOURCE PLANNING TEAM, (1997) Agricultural Land Classification Survey of Ruspridge, Cinderford Scale 1:10 000, Reference 85/97 FRCA Bristol.

INSTITUTE OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES (1975) Sheet 234, Gloucester 1:50 000 series Solid and Drift edition. IGS, London.

HODGSON, J M (Ed) (1997) Soil Survey Field Handbook. Soil Survey Technical Monograph No 5. SSLRC, Cranfield University.

MAFF (1977) 1:250 000 series Agricultural Land Classification, South West Region. MAFF Publications, Alnwick.

MAFF (1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales. Revised Guidelines and Criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land. MAFF Publications, Alnwick.

METEOROLOGICAL OFFICE (1989) Climatological Data for Agricultural Land Classification. Meteorological Office, Bracknell.

SOIL SURVEY OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1983) Sheet 5, Soils of South West England, 1:250 000 scale. SSEW, Harpenden.

SOIL SURVEY OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1984) Soils and Their Use in South West England, Bulletin No 12. SSEW, Harpenden.

SOIL SURVEY OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1981) Sheet S061 Cinderford 1:25 000 scale. SSEW, Harpenden

3

#### APPENDIX I

## **DESCRIPTION OF GRADES AND SUBGRADES**

## Grade 1 - excellent quality agricultural land

Land with no or very minor limitations to agricultural use. A very wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can be grown and commonly include top fruit, soft fruit, salad crops and winter harvested vegetables. Yields are high and less variable than on land of lower quality.

## Grade 2 - very good quality agricultural land

Land with minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. A wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can usually be grown but on some land in the grade there may be reduced flexibility due to difficulties with the production of the more demanding crops such as winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops. The level of yield is generally high but may be lower or more variable than Grade 1.

## Grade 3 - good to moderate quality agricultural land

Land with moderate limitations which affect the choice of crops, timing and type of cultivation, harvesting or the level of yield. Where more demanding crops are grown yields are generally lower or more variable than on land in Grades 1 and 2.

## Subgrade 3a - good quality agricultural land

Land capable of consistently producing moderate to high yields of a narrow range of arable crops, especially cereals, or moderate yields of a wide range of crops including cereals, grass, oilseed rape, potatoes, sugar beet and the less demanding horticultural crops.

## Subgrade 3b - moderate quality agricultural land

Land capable of producing moderate yields of a narrow range of crops, principally cereals and grass, or lower yields of a wider range of crops or high yields of grass which can be grazed or harvested over most of the year.

## Grade 4 - poor quality agricultural land

Land with severe limitations which significantly restrict the range of crops and/or level of yields. It is mainly suited to grass with occasional arable crops (e.g. cereals and forage crops) the yields of which are variable. In most climates, yields of grass may be moderate to high but there may be difficulties in utilisation. The grade also includes very droughty arable land.

# Grade 5 - very poor quality agricultural land

Land with very severe limitations which restrict use to permanent pasture or rough grazing, except for occasional pioneer forage crops.

Source: MAFF (1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales Revised Guidelines and Criteria for Grading the Quality of Agricultural Land, MAFF Publications, Alnwick.

#### APPENDIX II

### **DEFINITION OF SOIL WETNESS CLASSES**

Soil wetness is classified according to the depth and duration of waterlogging in the soil profile.

### Wetness Class I

The soil profile is not wet within 70 cm depth for more than 30 days in most years.

### Wetness Class II

The soil profile is wet within 70 cm depth for 31-90 days in most years or, if there is no slowly permeable layer within 80 cm depth, it is wet within 70 cm for more than 90 days, but not wet within 40 cm depth for more than 30 days in most years.

## Wetness Class III

The soil profile is wet within 70 cm depth for 91-180 days in most years or, if there is no slowly permeable layer within 80 cm depth, it is wet within 70 cm for more than 180 days, but only wet within 40 cm depth for between 31 and 90 days in most years.

## Wetness Class IV

The soil profile is wet within 70 cm depth for more than 180 days but not within 40 cm depth for more than 210 days in most years or, if there is no slowly permeable layer within 80 cm depth, it is wet within 40 cm depth for 91-210 days in most years.

### Wetness Class V

The soil profile is wet within 40 cm depth for 211-335 days in most years.

## Wetness Class VI

The soil profile is wet within 40 cm depth for more than 335 days in most years.

**Notes:** The number of days specified is not necessarily a continuous period.

'In most years' is defined as more than 10 out of 20 years.

**Source:** Hodgson, J M (Ed) (1997) Soil Survey Field Handbook. Soil Survey Technical Monograph No 5, SSLRC, Cranfield.

#### APPENDIX III

# ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS USED IN SURVEY DATA

Soil pit and auger boring information collected during ALC survey is held on a computer database and is reproduced in this report. Terms used and abbreviations are set out below. These conform to definitions contained in the Soil Survey Field Handbook (Hodgson, 1997).

## 1. Terms used on computer database, in order of occurrence.

**GRID REF**: National 100 km grid square and 8 figure grid reference.

LAND USE: At the time of survey

WHT:	Wheat	SBT:	Sugar Beet	HTH:	Heathland
BAR:	Barley	BRA:	Brassicas	<b>BOG:</b>	Bog or Marsh
OAT:	Oats	FCD:	Fodder Crops	DCW:	Deciduous Wood
CER:	Cereals	FRT:	Soft and Top Fruit	CFW:	Coniferous Woodland
MZE:	Maize	HRT:	Horticultural Crops	PLO:	Ploughed
OSR:	Oilseed Rape	LEY:	Ley Grass	FLW:	Fallow (inc. Set aside)
POT:	Potatoes	PGR:	Permanent Pasture	SAS:	Set Aside (where known)
LIN:	Linseed	<b>RGR</b> :	Rough Grazing	OTH:	Other
BEN:	Field Beans	SCR:	Scrub		

**GRDNT**: Gradient as estimated or measured by hand-held optical clinometer.

GLEY, SPL: Depth in centimetres to gleying or slowly permeable layer.

**AP (WHEAT/POTS):** Crop-adjusted available water capacity.

MB (WHEAT/POTS): Moisture Balance. (Crop adjusted AP - crop potential

MD)

**DRT:** Best grade according to soil droughtiness.

If any of the following factors are considered significant, 'Y' will be entered in the relevant column.

MREL: Microrelief limitation FLOOD: Flood risk EROSN: Soil erosion risk EXP: Exposure limitation FROST: Frost prone DIST: Disturbed land

**CHEM:** Chemical limitation

**LIMIT:** The main limitation to land quality: The following abbreviations are used.

OC: Overall Climate Aspect Exposure AE: EX: Frost Risk Gradient Microrelief FR: GR: MR: Topsoil Texture Soil Depth Flood Risk TX: DP: FL:

CH: Chemical WE: Wetness WK: Workability

DR: Drought ER: Erosion Risk WD: Soil Wetness/Droughtiness

**ST:** Topsoil Stoniness

**TEXTURE:** Soil texture classes are denoted by the following abbreviations:-

S: SL: Sand LS: Loamy Sand Sandy Loam SZL: Sandy Silt Loam CL: Clay Loam ZCL Silty Clay Loam ZL: Silt Loam SCL: Sandy Clay Loam C: Clav SC: Sandy clay ZC: Silty clay OL: Organic Loam P: Peat Sandy Peat LP: Loamy Peat SP: PI: Peaty Sand Marine Light Silts Peaty Loam PS: MZ:

For the sand, loamy sand, sandy loam and sandy silt loam classes, the predominant size of sand fraction will be indicated by the use of the following prefixes:-

F: Fine (more than 66% of the sand less than 0.2mm)

M: Medium (less than 66% fine sand and less than 33% coarse sand)

C: Coarse (more than 33% of the sand larger than 0.6mm)

The clay loam and silty clay loam classes will be sub-divided according to the clay content: M: Medium (< 27% clay) H: heavy (27 - 35% clay)

**MOTTLE COL:** Mottle colour using Munsell notation.

**MOTTLE ABUN:** Mottle abundance, expressed as a percentage of the matrix or surface described.

F: few <2% C: common 2 - 20% M: many 20 - 40% VM: very many 40%+

**MOTTLE CONT:** Mottle contrast

F: faint - indistinct mottles, evident only on close inspection

**D:** distinct - mottles are readily seen

**P:** Prominent - mottling is conspicuous and one of the outstanding features of the horizon.

**PED. COL:** Ped face colour using Munsell notation.

GLEY: If the soil horizon is gleyed a 'Y' will appear in this column. If slightly

gleyed, an 'S' will appear.

**STONE LITH:** Stone Lithology - One of the following is used.

HR: All hard rocks and stones SLST: Soft oolitic or dolimitic limestone

CH: Chalk FSST: Soft, fine grained sandstone

**ZR:** Soft, argillaceous, or silty rocks **GH:** Gravel with non-porous (hard) stones

MSST: Soft, medium grained sandstone GS: Gravel with porous (soft) stones

SI: Soft weathered igneous or metamorphic rock

Stone contents are given in % by volume for sizes >2cm, >6cm and total stone >2mm.

STRUCT: The degree of development, size and shape of soil peds are described using the following notation

Degree of development WA: Weakly developed WK: Weakly developed

Adherent

MD: Moderately ST: Strongly developed

developed

Ped size F: Fine M: Medium

C: Coarse VC: Very coarse

Ped Shape S: Single grain M: Massive

GR: Granular AB: Angular blocky

SAB: Sub-angular blocky PR: Prismatic

**PL:** Platy

**CONSIST:** Soil consistence is described using the following notation:

L: Loose VF: Very Friable FR: Friable FM: Firm

VM: Very firm EM: Extremely firm EH: Extremely Hard

SUBS STR: Subsoil structural condition recorded for the purpose of calculating

profile droughtiness: G: Good M: Moderate P: Poor

POR: Soil porosity. If a soil horizon has poor porosity with less than 0.5% biopores

>0.5mm, a 'Y' will appear in this column.

IMP: If the profile is impenetrable to rooting a 'Y' will appear in this column at the

appropriate horizon.

SPL: Slowly permeable layer. If the soil horizon is slowly permeable a 'Y' will

appear in this column.

CALC: If the soil horizon is calcareous with naturally occurring calcium

carbonate exceeding 1% a 'Y' will appear this column.

2. Additional terms and abbreviations used mainly in soil pit descriptions.

STONE ASSESSMENT:

VIS: Visual S: Sieve D: Displacement

## MOTTLE SIZE:

EF: Extremely fine <1mm M: Medium 5-15mm VF: Very fine 1-2mm> C: Coarse >15mm

F: Fine 2-5mm

MOTTLE COLOUR: May be described by Munsell notation or as ochreous

(OM) or grey (GM).

ROOT CHANNELS: In topsoil the presence of 'rusty root channels' should

also be noted.

MANGANESE CONCRETIONS: Assessed by volume

 N:
 None
 M:
 Many
 20-40%

 F:
 Few
 <2%</th>
 VM:
 Very Many
 >40%

**C:** Common 2-20%

**POROSITY:** 

P: Poor - less than 0.5% biopores at least 0.5mm in diameter

G: Good - more than 0.5% biopores at least 0.5mm in diameter

**ROOT ABUNDANCE:** 

The number of roots per 100cm<sup>2</sup>: Very Fine and Fine Medium and Coarse F: 1-10 1 or 2

**C:** Common 10.25 2 - 5 **M:** Many 25-200 >5

A: Abundant >200

**ROOT SIZE** 

VF: Very fine <1mm M: Medium 2 - 5mm F: Fine 1-2mm C: Coarse >5mm

**HORIZON BOUNDARY DISTINCTNESS:** 

**Sharp:** <0.5cm **Gradual:** 6 - 13cm **Abrupt:** 0.5 - 2.5cm **Diffuse:** >13cm

**Clear:** 2.5 - 6cm

HORIZON BOUNDARY FORM: Smooth, wavy, irregular or broken.\*

\* See Soil Survey Field Handbook (Hodgson, 1997) for details.

SITE NA	ME	PR	OFILE NO.	SLOPE AND ASPECT		LAND USE Av Rainfall:		858 mm		PARENT MATERIAL							
Court Far Sutton Ro Littledear	ad	Pit	1 (ASP 6)	4° We	st		Per	manant Gras	s	ΑΊ	ГО:	1376 day	°C	Lower Old Red Sandstone (Brownstones)			
JOB NO.	<u> </u>	DA	TE	GRID I	REFERENC	Ė	DE	SCRIBED B	Y	FC	C Days:	190	:	PSD SAMPLE	PSD SAMPLES TAKEN		
20/98		18.	2.98	SO 669	9 1328		HL	J		1	imatic Grade:	1		T/S 0-25 MSL	C/S 0-25 MSL* SCL S60: Z23:C17		
Horizon No.	Lowest Av. Depth (cm)	Texture	Matrix (Ped Face) Colours	Stonine Size,Ty Field M	pe, and	Mottling Abundanc Contrast, Size and Colour	e,	Mangan Concs	Structure: 1 Developme Size and Shape	Ped	Consistence	Structural Condition	Pores (Fissures)	Roots: Abundance and Size	Calcium Carbonate Content	Horizon Boundary: Distinctness and form	
1	28	MSL	75YR31	1% HR (	vis)			None	-		-	-	Good	MF+VF	-	Clear Smooth	
2	52	MCL	05YR32	0% (vis)	None			None MDCS		В	Friable	Moderate	Good	CF+VF	-	Clear Smooth	
3	68	SCL	05YR43	0% (vis)	s) None		None		MDCSA	В	Friable	Moderate	Good	FF+VF	-	Clear Smooth	
4	110+	CSL*1	05YR43,54 25YR44	0% (vis)	None			None WKCA		*2	Very Friable	Good	Good*3	FVF	-	-	
Profile G	leyed Fror	n: Not	gleyed		Available	Water W	Vheat	: 1	81 mm			Final ALC	Grade:	1			
Slowly Permeable Horizon From: No spl  Wetness Class: I				Potatoes: 117 mm  Moisture Deficit Wheat: 84 mm						Main Limiting Factor(s):							
Wetness	Grade:	ī				Pe	otato	es:	68 mm								
welless Glade.		•			Moisture I		Vheat		97 mm			Remarks:	*1 va	riable inc. SCL,	LCS		
					Droughtine	Po ess Grade: 1	otato		49 mm ulated to 120	) cm	n)		*3 wo grade	riable inc. SCL, eavier material is orm channels at 9 e 2 map unit	Prismatic & 95 cm	Friable	