

DOC REF: 660/SoC/P

APPLICATION NO.: 3/2014/0183

CHIPPING
LANDSCAPE EVIDENCE

STATEMENT OF CASE

By Xanthe Quayle BSc (Hons) DipLA CMLI

For and on behalf of SCPi Bowland Ltd

June 2015

CAMLIN LONSDALE

Beechwood Studio | Manchester Road | Marsden | HD7 6HA | 01484 841000
studio@camlinlonsdale.com | www.camlinlonsdale.com | CL Projects Ltd | Company Reg No: 08288659

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Professional Qualifications and Experience	5
1.2 Camlin Lonsdale Landscape Architects	5
2. BACKGROUND & SCOPE OF EVIDENCE	7
2.1 Background	7
2.2 Brief	7
2.3 Methodology	7
2.4 Objectives and Scope of Evidence	8
3. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL & LVIA Findings	10
3.1 The Application for Planning Permission	10
4. Reasons for refusal and PLANNING CONTEXT	13
4.1 Reasons for Refusal	13
4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	13
4.3 Ribble Valley Borough Council Local Plan Policies	14
4.4 Key Landscape and Visual Issues	17
4.5 Potential effects	18
5. SUMMARY OF THE LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL ASSESSMENT	19
5.1 LVIA Update	19
5.2 Site context and topography	19
5.3 Landscape character	20
5.4 Landscape sensitivity	22
5.5 Magnitude of landscape effect within development sites	23
5.6 Magnitude of landscape effect on key landscape receptors	25
5.7 Importance of landscape effects	28
5.8 Visual Assessment	29

6. ASSESSMENT OF THE KEY LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE REASON FOR REFUSAL OF THE SCHEME	33
6.1 Introduction	33
6.2 Key Landscape Matter 1	33
6.3 Key Landscape Matter 2	34
6.4 Key Landscape Matter 3	34
6.5 Key Landscape Matter 4	35
7. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS	37

APPENDICES (Bound Separately)

APPENDIX A Landscape Figures and viewpoints:

- A/001 – Scheme Location
- A/002 – Wider Landscape and Visual Context
- A/003 – Landscape Receptors
- A/004 – Ground Truthed Zone of Visual Influence- Development Site 1
- A/005 – Ground Truthed Zone of Visual Influence- Development Site 2
- A/006 – Ground Truthed Zone of Visual Influence- Development Site 3
- A/007 – Ground Truthed Zone of Visual Influence- Development Site 4
- A/008 – Ground Truthed Zone of Visual Influence- Development Site 5
- A/009 – Ground Truthed Zone of Visual Influence- Composite
- A/010 – Representative Viewpoints
- A/011 – Visual Receptors
- A/012 – Viewpoint 1 – Jeffery Hill, Longridge Fell
- A/013 – Viewpoint 2 – Parlick Fell
- A/014 – Viewpoint 3 – Beacon Fell
- A/015 – Viewpoint 4 – view south from FPI
- A/016 – Viewpoint 5 – view south from FPI
- A/017 – Viewpoint 6 – view south from FPI
- A/018 – Viewpoint 7 – view east along Church Raike
- A/019 – Viewpoint 8 – view south west along Church Raike
- A/020 – Viewpoint 9 – view south along Church Raike
- A/021 – Viewpoint 10 – view north along Church Raike
- A/022 – Viewpoint 11 – view north west along Church Raike
- A/023 – Viewpoint 12 – view west along Church Raike
- A/024 – Viewpoint 13 – view south west from Leagram estate gatehouse
- A/025 – Viewpoint 14 – view northwest from St Bartholomews churchyard
- A/026 – Viewpoint 15 – view north west along Windy Street
- A/027 – Viewpoint 16 – view west along Green Lane
- A/028 – Viewpoint 17 – view north east from Longridge Road
- A/029 – Viewpoint 18 – view north east from Longridge Road
- A/030 – Viewpoint 19 – view east from Old Hive

A/031 – Viewpoint 20 – view south east from Church Raike
A/032 – Viewpoint 21 – view north east from FP 97
A/033 – Viewpoint 22 – view east from FP 94

APPENDIX B Supplementary Information

B/001 – Summary of Office Comments
B/002 – LVIA Clarifications
B/003 – Ribble Valley Core Strategy Policies
B/004 – LVIA Effects Summary Tables

APPENDIX C Background Information

C/001 – XQ Professional Experience and Qualifications
C/002 – Methodology and definition of terms

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Professional Qualifications and Experience

I.1.1 My name is Xanthe Quayle. I am a Landscape Architect and Managing Director of Camlin Lonsdale Landscape Architects. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree with Honours and a Post Graduate Diploma in Landscape Architecture from the University of Sheffield.

I.1.2 I qualified as a landscape architect in 1995 and was elected as a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute in 1997. I started my career working for the Environmental Consultancy, University of Sheffield before relocating to the South East where I worked within private practice for ten years.

I.1.3 In 2007 I joined Camlin Lonsdale as an Associate and was appointed to a Directorship in 2008. Now as Managing Director of the company I lead the development of the Practice working across both Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Landscape Architecture design services for a broad range of project types and scales in both rural and urban settings. A resume of my experience is provided in Appendix C/001.

I.1.4 Outside the Practice I maintain contact with educational and design excellence establishments, primarily Sheffield University, through external examining and Placesmatters! NEDRES; I am appointed to and regularly sit on both the North East and North West Design Review Panels for Built Environment professionals (RIBA Centres of Excellence).

I.1.5 I have recent and relevant experience with regards to assessing effects of development in a heritage setting through my involvement in the Nicholl's Lane Public Inquiry, Stone in 2014 for clients Seddon Homes Ltd. The Inquiry considered the effects of up to 34 residential properties on the Moddershall Valley Conservation Area, and associated Listed Buildings. My evidence and associated methodology was accepted without challenge and subsequently taken as read by the Inquiry.

I.2 Camlin Lonsdale Landscape Architects

I.2.1 Camlin Lonsdale is an established landscape practice (of over 20 years) with a pedigree in regeneration, masterplanning, strategic land planning and design. The studio, based in Slaithwaite, West Yorkshire, comprises a technical and administrative team totalling 8 in

number. Landscape assessment and landscape planning, design, construction and management of development at all scales have been and continue to be a major feature of the work of the practice.

2. BACKGROUND & SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

2.1 Background

2.1.1 I have been engaged by SCPI Bowland Ltd to provide landscape & visual evidence in support of their application for hotel/spa, kids club, wedding venue, and housing at Chipping in the Forest of Bowland (as set out in the evidence of HOW Planning).

2.1.2 Prior to accepting the commission I satisfied myself that the site was capable of accommodating the development in landscape and visual terms, with specific regard to potential effects on the Forest of Bowland AONB and the two Conservation Areas at Chipping and Kirk Mill.

2.2 Brief

2.2.1 Camlin Lonsdale were appointed by SCPI (formerly Affinity Asset Management LLP) in June 2013 to work closely with the professional team to:

- Provide landscape design advice for the proposed development
- Undertake the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in parallel to the design work to ensure potential harmful effects were flagged up early in the design stage
- Provide mitigation advice in the context of the evolving scheme with a view to addressing potential effects through primary (wherever achievable) and secondary mitigation strategies.

2.2.2 Since June 2013 the Practice has been an active member of the design team in the iterative process which culminated in the appeal scheme. At a macro level this has included advice on optimum locations for development layouts and, at a micro level adjustments, for the retention of significant landscape features. Landscape and visual impact has therefore been a key design principle at each stage of the evolution of the development.

2.3 Methodology

2.3.1 The assessment of the effects of the proposed development on landscape and visual receptors has been undertaken in accordance with the Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment published in 2013 (GLVIA 2013). Assessing effects requires the exercise of a subjective judgement. However, it is a judgement which can be

expressed against a set of objective criteria (in accordance with a non-prescriptive methodology in the GLVIA 2013 guidance). The purpose of the guidance is to: (i) increase the quality of decision-making; (ii) increase the consistency in decision-making and (iii) ensure transparency in assessment. Ultimately, the methodology allows weight to be attached to the subjective opinion of the assessor. The methodology and definition of terms used as the basis of my evidence are provided in **Appendix C/002**.

2.3.2 The requirement and scope of landscape input for the application was initially undertaken by Indigo Planning in 2012. Further liaison was undertaken in 2014 with both the LPA and the AONB with regards to methodology, receptors, viewpoint locations and photomontage work.

2.3.3 Camlin Lonsdale has provided landscape advice on this application and I have personally undertaken the research and fieldwork, which underpins this evidence.

2.3.4 The evidence which I have prepared and now provide for this appeal in this Statement of Case and its appendices is true, and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

2.4 Objectives and Scope of Evidence

2.4.1 My objectives in this proof of evidence are as follows:

- To explain the pertinent aspects of the scheme relevant to my evidence and the plans and documents submitted with the application along with the findings of the LVIA. This is provided in **Section 3**.
- To review the reasons for refusal and set out the landscape planning context of the site so as to identify the key landscape related issues and policy objectives which this proof of evidence must consider and demonstrate compliance, or otherwise, with. This is addressed in **Section 4**.
- To summarise the key points of the landscape and visual assessment, and, in particular, consider matters of landscape character and visibility of the proposed development in relation to surrounding areas with particular reference to the wider AONB landscape and the setting of the two Conservation Areas. These matters are addressed in **Section 5**.

- To provide a response to the landscape and visual issues relevant to the reasons for refusal. This is provided in **Section 6**.
- 2.4.2 I shall refer to drawings, supplementary and background information bound separately in the Appendices.
- 2.4.3 My evidence is concerned with the potential landscape and visual effects, design and implementation matters relating to the proposed development. My evidence does not consider the broader planning issues, which are dealt with by HOW Planning. Whilst I have had regard to heritage matters (from a landscape and visual perspective), my evidence does not consider the primary heritage issues, which are dealt with by Oxford Archaeology North. Matters of ecology are dealt with within HOW's evidence. This is also the case for Highways matters which will be addressed by Curtins Consulting Engineers.
- 2.4.4 In the context of the LVIA submitted with the appeal scheme, and to address LPA and statutory consultee requests for clarifications (summarised in Appendix B/001) additional assessment information is within **Appendix B/002** (LVIA Clarifications) and Appendix B/004 (LVIA Effects Summary Tables). Within my Statement of Case (SoC) I will rely on written narrative to justify my professional judgments and conclusions, based on the evidence and detail within Appendix B/002. The findings of this review, summarised and tabled for ease of reference at Appendix B/004, will indicate the importance of the potential effects of the proposed development.

3. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL & LVIA FINDINGS

3.1 The Application for Planning Permission

3.1.1 On 23 December 2013, HOW Planning on behalf of the Appellant submitted the hybrid planning application, together with an application for Listed Building Consent, to the Council. A description of the appeal proposals is provided in the draft Statement of Common Ground. A more detailed description can be found in the Design and Access Statement (March 2014). In summary, the development proposal will comprise tourism and leisure facilities, residential and employment uses and a new cricket pitch and pavilion.

(i) Applications for Full Planning Permission

3.1.2 **Kirk Mill** - The application proposals sought full planning permission for the works and change of use to the Grade II listed Kirk Mill to create a hotel (18 bedroom) and restaurant (Use Class A3).

3.1.3 **Main Mills Complex** - Development on the 'main mills complex' development parcel comprises the following elements:

- The Barn: Refurbishment of the existing barn and the erection of a two storey new build element to create 7 holiday cottages (Use Class C1);
- Hotel and Spa: Erection of a hotel (20 bedroom) and spa (Use Class C1) including 7 parking spaces;
- Wedding Venue: Erection of a wedding venue (Use Class D2);
- Kids Club: Erection of a kids club/crèche (Use Class D1);
- Trailhead Centre: Provision of car parking facilities (96 parking spaces) and a Trailhead Centre with café (Use Class A3); and
- Plant Building: Erection of a building to house plant that will service the site.

3.1.4 **New Cricket Pitch Site** - Full planning permission was sought for the provision of a new cricket pitch and the construction of a cricket pavilion and (21 parking spaces) (Use Class Sui Generis).

(ii) Outline Applications

3.1.5 The application proposals sought outline planning permission for up to 60 dwellings. 56 dwellings are proposed on the former cricket pitch and juvenile woodland to the

immediate north of the Kirkland and Kirkfield residential areas (“Church Raike Housing – The Hive”). Four self-build dwellings are proposed in the field access form Malt Kiln Brow (“Malt Kiln Brow Housing”).

(iii) Development Sites

3.1.6 The application proposals are therefore divided into five distinctive development sites, as set out in the Design and Access Statement, comprising approximately 5.67 hectares in total. The development sites, as indicated on Figure 1, comprise:

- 1 – Kirk Mill
- 2 – Main Mills Complex (modern factory buildings)
- 3 – Malt Kiln House Field
- 4 – Former Cricket Ground
- 5 – New Cricket Pitch Site

(iv) Information submitted with the application

3.1.7 The following drawings and reports were submitted by Camlin Lonsdale in support of the appeal application:

- 660/100 Rev. D - Illustrative Masterplan
- 660/201-202 Rev. D - Detailed Areas
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, December 2013
- Six Photomontages, February 2014

Findings of the LVIA

3.1.8 This evidence should be read together with the evidence of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) submitted with the applications. The executive summary assessed the effects of the application as follows:

‘ The assessment has determined that the landscape character of the study area is generally of moderate to high sensitivity and to be predominantly moderate value. The overall importance of landscape effects arising from the proposed development at Day 1 is expected to be minor adverse in most parts of the development area whilst in the Kirk Mill and modern factory site it is expected to be Major Beneficial effect. The

overall effect on the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is expected to be negligible.

The long term visual effect, once the new planting has established, is considered to be generally of Minor Beneficial to Major Beneficial importance with the development associated with Kirk Mill and the modern factory site redevelopment. The development will sympathetically incorporate new uses within the listed Kirk Mill and replace the large scale industrial sheds with buildings of more appropriate scale and form which will enhance the setting of Kirk Mill and its associated conservation area. The provision of areas of high quality public realm will improve the setting of Chipping Brook and allow public access to the riverside.

Areas of residential development on higher ground to the north of the village are more visually exposed at the outset of the development but will soften over time with the establishment of the associated landscape planting, aiding its integration within the wider rural landscape. The development provides the opportunity to introduce additional tree and shrub planting, aiding the integration of the developments within the locally well wooded landscape and enhancing the visual quality of the popular, much visited local landscape.'

Officer Comments

3.1.9 A summary of officer comments regarding landscape and visual matters received during determination of the application is provided within Appendix B/001. In supporting the favourable officer recommendation made in the Committee Report of December 2014, the following additional information and clarifications were provided:

- A submission of 6 photomontages from viewpoints agreed with officers was made in February 2014;
- A detailed response to officer comments (primarily those of Elliot Lorimer, Principal AONB Officer made on 25th April 2014 and Steve Breteton of 18th June 2014) was issued on 16 July 2014.

3.1.10 The submitted LVIA was reviewed for the purpose of this SoC and the necessary clarifications required to address officer comments are provided (again) with fuller explanation within B/002, B/004 and C/002.

4. REASONS FOR REFUSAL AND PLANNING CONTEXT

4.1 Reasons for Refusal

4.1.1 The stated reasons for refusal relevant to my evidence as provided in the Decision Letter of December 2014 were:

Reason for Refusal 2

4.1.2 The proposal is harmful to the character and appearance, significance, setting and views into and out of Kirk Mill and Chipping Conservation Areas. This is because of the intrusion upon and coalescence of the conservation areas from poorly designed and inappropriate development.

Reason for Refusal 4

4.1.3 Given the location, size, intensity, nature and design of the proposed Kirk Mill redevelopment works and associated housing proposals they would be an incongruous feature that would result in the loss of landscape fabric. The proposal would not contribute to, or be in keeping with, the landscape character of the AONB and would cause visual harm, thereby failing to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the area. No exceptional circumstances have been provided to justify this 'major development' within the AONB and thus the proposal is considered contrary to policies G1 and ENVI of the Ribble Valley Local Plan, Key statement EN2 and policies DME4, DMG1, DMB2 and DMB3 in the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and the environmental role of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that development proposals contribute to, protect and enhance the environment.

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) sets out the governments planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. With respect to landscape the following NPPF paragraphs are relevant: Para 7: There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.

4.2.2 Para 17 seeks to "recognize" the intrinsic beauty of the countryside. However, not all of the countryside is protected.

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

4.2.3 109: The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local

environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

- 4.2.4 I13: LPAs should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting...landscaped areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance.
- 4.2.5 I15: Great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty in....Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
- 4.2.6 I16: Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities ,and the extent to which that could be moderated.
- 4.2.7 The NPPF does not have a specific policy which addresses how to determine developments which seek to develop large, vacant and derelict sites in the AONB. It is essential that a balanced approach to the determination is undertaken, which applies NPPF as a whole.

4.3 Ribble Valley Borough Council Local Plan Policies (CDI.1)

- 4.3.1 I set out at Appendix B/003 and summarise below the list of policies from the adopted plan (December 2014) referred to by Ribble Valley Borough Council as pertinent to their reasons for refusal:

Key statement DS2: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

- 4.3.2 When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key statement EN2: Landscape

- 4.3.3 The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland AONB will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area.

4.3.4 As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.

DMG1: General Considerations

4.3.5 In determining planning applications, all development must:

- 3. Design: Consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.

DME4: Protecting heritage assets

4.3.6 In considering development proposals the council will make a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.

- 1. Conservation Areas: Proposals within, or affecting views into and out of, or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area will be required to conserve and where appropriate enhance its character and appearance and those elements which contribute towards its significance.
- Scale, size, design and materials and existing buildings, structures, trees and open spaces will be supported.
- In the Conservation Areas there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of elements that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

DMG2: Strategic considerations

4.3.7 Within the open countryside, development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build.

4.3.8 In protecting the designated AONB the council will have regard to the economic and social well being of the area. However the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. Where possible new development should be accommodated

through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. Development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. The AONB management plan should be considered and will be used by the council in determining planning applications.

DMH3: Dwellings in the open countryside and AONB

- 4.3.9 The protection of the open countryside and designated landscape areas from sporadic or visually harmful development is seen as a high priority by the Council and is necessary to deliver both sustainable patterns of development and the overarching core strategy vision.

DMB3: Recreation and tourism development

- 4.3.10 Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the borough. This is subject to the following criteria being met:

- 3. The development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design;
- In the Forest of Bowland AONB the following criteria will apply:
 1. The proposal should display a high standard of design appropriate to the area.
 2. The site should not introduce built development into an area largely devoid of structures (other than those directly related to agriculture or forestry uses).

- 4.3.11 Accordingly, it is quite clear that the Core Strategy supports new built development in the AONB where it extends the range and visitor facilities in the borough. In the AONB, it is important that development is not of a large scale. In the AONB and immediately adjacent areas, proposals should contribute to the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape. Within the open countryside, proposals will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect the local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials.

- 4.3.12 Recreation and tourism development are often well suited to rural areas and there is a need to have in place effective measures to ensure that facilities and infrastructure can be enhanced in a sustainable way.

DME2: Landscape and Townscape Protection

4.3.13 Development proposals will be refused which significantly harm important landscape or landscape features including:

- 4. Woodlands.
- 5. Copses.
- 6. Hedgerows and individual trees (other than in exceptional circumstances where satisfactory works of mitigation or enhancement would be achieved, including rebuilding, replanting and landscape management).
- 7. Townscape elements such as the scale, form, and materials that contribute to the characteristic townscapes of the area.

4.3.14 The Council will seek, wherever possible, to enhance the local landscape in line with its key statements and development strategy. In applying this policy reference will be made to a variety of guidance including the Lancashire County Council Landscape Character Assessment, the AONB Landscape Character Assessment 2009 and the AONB Management Plan. Also the Council will take into account the potential cumulative impacts of development in areas where development has already taken place. By proactively considering these important features through the development management process the Council will deliver the Core Strategy vision and support the delivery of sustainable development.

4.4 Key Landscape and Visual Issues

4.4.1 In considering the reasons for refusal and pertinent planning policy, the following landscape and visual issues have been particularised for the purpose of consideration through this evidence:

With regard to Reason for Refusal 2:

4.4.2 Key Landscape and Visual Issue 1: Will the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development cause harm to the character and appearance, setting and views into/out of both Kirk Mill and Chipping Conservation Areas?

With regard to Reason for Refusal 4:

4.4.3 Key Landscape and Visual Issue 2: Is the development an incongruous feature and would it result in the loss of landscape fabric?

4.4.4 Key Landscape and Visual Issue 3: Does the proposal contribute to, or is in keeping

with, the landscape character of the AONB?

4.4.5 Key Landscape and Visual Issue 4: Would the proposal cause visual harm, thereby failing to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB?

4.5 Potential effects

4.5.1 The key elements of the proposed development which may result in potential landscape and visual effects are identified below:

- Removal of existing built form (primarily industrial outbuildings) within the landscape fabric of the Kirk Mill Conservation Area and the industrial units to the south;
- Loss of existing vegetation;
- Changes to existing landform;
- Introduction of new elements, including built form;
- The effect this loss of elements and addition of elements may have on views from properties and publicly accessible land within the study area;
- The effect this loss and addition of elements may have on the landscape character and setting of valued landscape receptors.

5. SUMMARY OF THE LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL ASSESSMENT

5.1 LVIA Update

- 5.1.1 As noted in Section 3 the LVIA was reviewed for the purpose of the SoC and relevant clarifications are provided in B/002. Updated summary tables of both the landscape and visual assessments are provided in B/004.
- 5.1.2 This section focuses on the landscape and visual effects of the proposals on the key landscape receptors raised through the reasons for refusal, namely the AONB and the conservation areas of Kirk Mill and Chipping.
- 5.1.3 Firstly, the landscape baseline is summarised with particular reference to context, topography and landscape character. A summary of the landscape and visual effects are then provided in regard to the key receptors.
- 5.1.4 This section should be read in conjunction with Appendix B/002, B/004 and the original LVIA dated December 2013.
- 5.1.5 The study area represents the locality for the proposed development and the wider landscape within which the proposed development may have an influence upon landscape character and within which potentially important visual effects may be experienced.
- 5.1.6 The Zones of Visual Influence (ZVIs) for individual development sites were also determined to assist with the consideration of effects between sites and as well as with regards to an overall assessment. These are provided as Figures A/004 – A/009.

5.2 Site context and topography

- 5.2.1 The village of Chipping sits at approximate 115-130m AOB within the gently undulating lowland farmland found within the southern area of the AONB. The village is set within a landscape of small to medium sized fields enclosed by hedgerows and stone walls with farmsteads and small hamlets, such as Old Hive, evenly distributed across the well settled and wooded landscape. This historic village straddles the Chipping Brook river corridor which is commonly strongly wooded. It is enclosed to the north east, forming an incised clough at the northern extent of the village before opening out into the lowland plain to the south east.
- 5.2.2 The development sites are located contiguous with the existing settlement .

5.2.3 The topography of the wider study area is predominantly rolling land, bisected by steep sided stream valleys. Land varies from around 100m AOD in the wide valley floor, rising to over 200m AOD as it rises towards Parlick and Fair Snape Fell 4km to the north of the village of Chipping.

5.3 Landscape character

AONB:

5.3.1 The development sites are situated within the Forest of Bowland AONB. The key characteristics of the AONB landscape as defined within the Forest of Bowland AONB Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) 2009 (CDI.6) are included in Appendix B/002. The key characteristics of the AONB landscape include: the grandeur and isolation of the upland core; the open expanses of moorland; the cultural landscape of upland farming; the historic landscape management as royal hunting forest; a rural landscape of dry stone-wall enclosed pastures, stone built farms and villages; wooded pastoral scenery and parkland; and steep scarps, deeply incised cloughs and wooded valleys. The Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan 2014 – 2019 provides positive and proactive management, highlighting the special qualities of the designated area, the importance of the relevant landscape features and identifying those features which are vulnerable to change. a strategic context within which the pressures on the landscape are addressed and guided to safeguard the national importance of the landscape. This document also references the Forest of Bowland AONB Landscape Character Assessment and an outcome of the Management Plan is that the AONB Landscape Character Assessment is used as a planning tool and to monitor change within the AONB.

5.3.2 The study area is considered to be consistent with this description in so far as is relevant to the locality i.e. the rural landscape of dry stone wall enclosed pastures, stone built farms and villages are central to the study area's distinctiveness alongside steep scarps, deeply incised cloughs and wooded valleys which dissect the lowland scene.

5.3.3 As the Forest of Bowland AONB is clearly not homogenous in terms of landscape character, the LCA defines sub-areas. The application sites are located within the 'Undulating lowland farmland with Parkland' G2 (Little Bowland) LCA. The key features of this landscape include: evidence of old deer park features at Leagram, with Leagram Hall being a key landscape feature; mixed hedgerows with hedgerow trees area

features; the gently undulating landscape is crossed by a series of narrow road corridors which are lined with hedgerows; the small nucleated village of Chipping; dramatic, open views northwards towards the central Bowland Fells, which provide a distant sense of enclosure; mixed ancient semi-natural woodland and in-field trees. The 'Moorland Fringe' D15 (Wolf-burnslack) LCA is located within the study area, to the north west of Chipping, and the 'Undulating lowland farmland' E1 (Whitechapel) LCA to the west.

- 5.3.4 The key characteristics of each character area are provided within B/002. In summary the defined special qualities for the Little Bowland LCA are: the gently undulating landscape which is crossed by a series of narrow road corridors lined with a combination of stone walls, hedgerows and white railings; evidence of old deer park features at Leagram; mixed, ancient semi-natural woodland, following watercourses which run northwest to southeast across the landscape; in-field trees, including oak, alder and ash and landscape features; dramatic, open views northwards towards the central Bowland Fells which provide a distant sense of enclosure; and the small, nucleated village of Chipping encompassing a combination of traditional gritstone cottages and terraced houses.

Conservation Areas

- 5.3.5 The significance of the Conservation areas has been assessed by Ian Miller. Kirk Mill Conservation Area, a reactive designation made in 2010 on closure of the factory buildings, and expanded in 2011, is intended to preserve the setting of the grade 2 listed mill building, its associated buildings and mill pond. The designation includes the field (in part) to the rear of Malt Kiln House/The Grove and extends northwards to woodland associated with Chipping works and agricultural fields above Austin House, Mill Pond House and Grove Square/House. The Kirk Mill buildings occupy a condensed area of land, and due to the industrial activity that occurred within its curtilage, does not have any prominent trees within its immediate vicinity. The stone barn included in the main mill complex (development site 2) is included in the designation but the remaining area of the site is not.
- 5.3.6 Whilst the 2010 designation plan is not supported by an appraisal, it is considered that the key landscape features and attributes central to the maintenance of its

distinctiveness must be derived from the Little Bowland LCA description that encompasses it. The key landscape attributes within the conservation area would therefore be the undulating rural landscape which forms the setting for the mill complex on its west side and grassed escarpments on its east with associated in-field trees and hedgerows; the woodland which follows the Chipping watercourse; the narrow road corridor of Malt Kiln Brow; and the traditional gritstone historic built fabric of the mill complex.

- 5.3.7 The mill complex and listed buildings are currently vacant, derelict and in serious need of investment to secure its long term future. The long term future of these elements is of central importance to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the proposed tourism related use is potentially of significant benefit to the AONB, which is strongly supported by the Core Strategy (CD 1.1) and NPPF.
- 5.3.8 The Chipping Conservation Area Appraisal 2006 (CD 1.3) identifies the key features for its designation, which include its listed buildings, its churches and churchyards and its historical associations. It also identifies a number of important views (two of which have been assessed for effects within the visual appraisal) significant open spaces, important trees and tree groups.

5.4 Landscape sensitivity

- 5.4.1 The wider AONB landscape, the AONB Landscape Character Areas E1, G2 and D15 which make up the local landscape within the study area, Kirk Mill Conservation Area, Chipping Conservation Area, Leagram Hall and the character and elements of the development sites themselves were identified as landscape receptors. Their value, susceptibility and sensitivity were assessed and the narrative for these judgments for key landscape receptors are provided in Appendix B/002. The updated findings for all landscape receptors are summarised in Appendix B/004.
- 5.4.2 The assessment considers that the undulating landform, the relatively wooded landcover and the pastoral landscape in this area of the AONB combined with the form of development proposed results in a susceptibility of medium. This, combined with their high value, results in an overall landscape sensitivity of medium. This accords with the Forest of Bowland AONB LCA 2009 also defines the sensitivity of LCAs G2 and E1 as moderate.

5.5 Magnitude of landscape effect within development sites

Assessing magnitude of landscape effect

5.5.1 The magnitude of landscape effects arising from the proposed development was then judged taking into account the following factors:

- The extent / proportion of landscape elements lost;
- The contribution of lost / new elements to landscape character and the degree to which aesthetic / perceptual aspects are altered;
- Whether the effect is likely to change the key characteristics of the landscape, which are critical to its distinctive character.

Magnitude of landscape effect

5.5.2 The nature and magnitude of landscape effects arising from the proposals for each development site are detailed within Table 3.1 of the LVIA. They are summarised below with particular regard to the potential effects on key features, characteristics and attributes on landscape character as identified in Section 5.3 above.

5.5.3 **Development Site 1:** Kirk Mill

- Loss of valued landscape features is limited to the self seeded treecover associated with mill pond stabilization works.
- Loss of incongruous landscape features include the removal of inappropriate security fencing;
- Enhanced landscape features include new public realm and tree planting;
- The interventions result in appropriate improvements to the appearance of the area and assist to enhance the relationship between historic buildings of the Mill area and the Chipping river corridor;
- This gives rise to the findings of a low beneficial effect with regards to magnitude of change for this development site and its immediate locality.

5.5.4 **Development Site 2:** Main Mills Complex

- The removal of large incongruous components in the landscape (the modern mill complex) and their replacement with more sympathetic development of a scale, style and form;

- Further loss of incongruous landscape features include the removal of the concrete bridges and overhead gantry;
- Loss of valued landscape features is limited to a small number of moderate quality trees (to achieve proposed access and river channel works) with associated regrading;
- Enhanced landscape features include substantial new public realm and native hedge and tree planting associated with riverside works;
- The interventions result in appropriate and substantial improvements to the character and appearance of the area (including Malt Kiln Brow) and assist to enhance the relationship between historic buildings of the Mill area and the Chipping river corridor;
- This gives rise to the findings of a medium beneficial effect with regards to magnitude of change for this development site and its immediate locality.

5.5.5 **Development Site 3:** Malt Kiln Brow Housing

- Loss of valued landscape features on this site relate to the loss of part of the field to the rear of Malt Kiln House where undulating agricultural field will be replaced with four self build properties with associated access and regrading works;
- Enhanced landscape features, as part of the proposed interventions, include the retention of all existing trees and strengthening of boundaries with additional native hedge and woodland planting including substantial areas of woodland within the conservation areas between the proposed plots and the mill area;
- Appropriate and sensitively sited, small scale residential development, whilst new components to the site, are not considered to be incongruous elements within the landscape of the locality per se;
- On balance the magnitude and nature of interventions is considered to give rise to the findings of a medium adverse effect with regards to magnitude of change for this development site and its immediate locality.

5.5.6 **Development Site 4:** Church Raike Housing

- Loss of valued landscape features on this site relate to the loss of the former cricket field (currently open grassland) to the north of the existing housing estate

of Kirkfield. Development also entails the loss of a length of hedgerow along Church Raike and associated regrading to enable access;

- An area of juvenile tree planting will be lost to at the east end of the site but due to its immaturity is not considered to be a valued landscape feature;
- Enhanced landscape features, as part of the proposed interventions, include the retention of all other existing trees and strengthening of boundaries with additional native hedge planting to create a new positive boundary to the settlement. It is envisaged that further appropriate tree planting is to be included within streetscenes associated with the development;
- New incongruous landscape features include infrastructure elements such as lighting and streetscene features;
- The scale rather than the nature of the residential proposal is expected to result in negative effects on landscape character in the immediate locality;
- The proposal enables a new, softer settlement edge to provide an interface with the immediate locality;
- On balance the magnitude and nature of interventions is considered give rise to the findings of a medium adverse effect with regards to magnitude of change for this development site and its immediate locality.

5.5.7 Development Site 5: New cricket pitch

- No valued landscape features will be lost;
- A small area of lowland grassland is improved and therefore lost to facilitate its new use however it is not considered to be a valued landscape feature;
- Enhanced landscape features include existing boundary hedge and tree planting;
- The pavilion is a potentially incongruous new element within an open agricultural landscape;
- On balance the magnitude and nature of interventions is considered to give rise to the findings of a negligible adverse effect with regards to magnitude of change for this development site and its immediate locality

5.6 Magnitude of landscape effect on key landscape receptors

Forest of Bowland AONB

- 5.6.1 The development sites are situated within the AONB so direct effects as a result of the scheme would be experienced. The area of the development sites (0.57km²) is tiny in proportion to the overall area of the AONB (800km²) and the area of change within these sites is even smaller.
- 5.6.2 In terms of overall size/scale of landscape effect, direct effects are of a negligible magnitude.
- 5.6.3 The magnitude of landscape effects can be considered with reference to Viewpoints 1, 2, 3 (wider study area) and 4, 13, 16 and 22 (immediate vicinity) where the nature and change is described and assessed.
- 5.6.4 The assessment at B/002 determines that the proposals would result in a negligible adverse magnitude of effect on the AONB on Day 1 and neutral - none in Year 15. This arises from the fact that the effects of the proposals, summarised in Section 5.5, are not considered to be of a scale or nature which would affect the key landscape character attributes of the AONB, detailed at Section 5.3, and the baseline condition is expected to be maintained.

LCA G2

- 5.6.5 All development sites are situated within LCA G2 so direct effects as a result of the scheme would be experienced. The area of the development sites is very small in proportion to the overall area of the LCA and the area of change within the sites is even smaller. In terms of overall size/scale of landscape effect, direct effects are both positive and negative and of a negligible magnitude.
- 5.6.6 The magnitude of landscape effects can be considered with reference to Viewpoints 4,6,7,13,16,17, 18 and 19 where the nature and scale of change is described and assessed.
- 5.6.7 The assessment at B/002 determines that the proposals for sites 1 and 2 would have beneficial effects on the LCA whilst effects on the character of the LCA as a result of development in sites 3 would be adverse.
- 5.6.8 On balance, it is expected that the proposals will have an overall negligible adverse magnitude of effect on the LCA on Day 1 and negligible adverse magnitude of effect in Year 15. This arises from the fact that some elements of the proposals are both adverse and beneficial in landscape terms, as summarised in Section 5.5, but effects as a

whole are not considered to be of a scale or nature that would effect the key landscape character attributes of the LCA G2, detailed in Section 5.3, and the baseline condition is expected to be maintained.

Kirk Mill Conservation Area:

- 5.6.9 Development Site 1 and the northern section of development site 2 are situated within the Kirk Mill Conservation Area so direct effects as a result of the scheme may be experienced. Indirect effects may arise from development proposals related to sites 3, 4 and 5.
- 5.6.10 The magnitude of landscape effects can be considered with reference to Viewpoints 7, 8, 9 and 10 where the change is described and assessed.
- 5.6.11 The assessment at B/002 determines that direct and indirect effects on the conservation area would be experienced. Indirect effects may arise from development proposals related to the proposed housing on site 3 and 4. Development in site 5 would have no effect on the character of the Kirk Mill Conservation Area.
- 5.6.12 On balance it is expected that the proposals will have a low beneficial magnitude of effect on Kirk Mill conservation area on Day 1 and medium beneficial magnitude of effect in Year 15. This arises from the fact that elements of the proposals are adverse whilst others beneficial in landscape terms, as summarised in Section 5.5, taken in their entirety they are considered to be of a scale and nature that would positively effect the character of the conservation area, that is the key landscape character attributes detailed in Section 5.3, and the baseline condition is expected to be enhanced.

Chipping Conservation Area:

- 5.6.13 As none of the development sites are situated in the Chipping Conservation Area there will be no direct effects as a result of the scheme however indirect effects may arise from development proposals in site 2.
- 5.6.14 The magnitude of landscape effects can be considered with reference to Viewpoints 14 and 15 where the nature and scale of change is described and assessed.
- 5.6.15 The assessment at B/002 determines that indirect effects on the conservation area would be experienced as a result of the proposed development associated with site 2.
- 5.6.16 The proposals would have a negligible beneficial magnitude of effect on Chipping

Conservation Area on Day 1 and negligible - low beneficial magnitude of effect in Year 15. This arises from the fact that proposals from site 2 include the removal of existing large scale modern industrial buildings and replacement with appropriate built development and associated landscape structure. This would be particularly beneficial to the setting of the church of St Bartholomew and rear aspects to properties along the northern side of Talbot Street in the centre of the village, and would improve an important view from St Bartholomew's churchyard looking north over development site 2 identified within the Conservation Area appraisal.

5.7 Importance of landscape effects

5.7.1 The sensitivity of the receptors and the magnitude of change are combined to establish an overall importance of landscape effects. The assessment of landscape effects are considered in detail for the Construction phase, Day1 and Year 15 within Appendix B/002. This allows for the consideration of the establishment of the landscape structure planting associated with the development.

The wider AONB Landscape

5.7.2 High Sensitivity combined with a negligible adverse magnitude of effect is considered to result in overall terms as of negligible adverse importance of effect on Day 1. The proposals are therefore expected to result in a barely perceptible deterioration in the baseline condition.

5.7.3 In Year 15 this effect is reduced to no noticeable effect as the landscape structure associated with the proposed scheme establishes and matures to aid its integration into the wider landscape.

LCA G2

5.7.4 Medium sensitivity for this LCA combined with a negligible magnitude of landscape effect is considered to result in an overall negligible adverse importance of effect. That is the proposals would result in a barely perceptible deterioration in the baseline condition.

5.7.5 In Year 15 this effect is reduced to no noticeable effect arising from the effects of establishing landscape structure associated with the proposed scheme.

Kirk Mill Conservation Area

5.7.6 High sensitivity for this conservation area combined with a low beneficial magnitude of landscape effect would result in an overall minor - moderate beneficial importance of

effect. That is the proposals are expected to result in beneficial change to elements such that the landscape character is minor - moderately affected and there is a small - clear improvement in the baseline condition.

- 5.7.7 In Year 15 this effect is strengthened arising from the effects of establishing landscape structure associated with the proposed scheme and a clear improvement to the baseline condition will be experienced.

Chipping Conservation Area

- 5.7.8 High sensitivity for this conservation area combined with a negligible beneficial magnitude of landscape effect is considered to result in an overall minor beneficial importance of effect. That is the proposals would result in beneficial change to elements such that the landscape character is slightly affected and there is a small improvement in the baseline condition.

5.8 Visual Assessment

Visual Receptors

- 5.8.1 These were identified with reference to the verified ZTVs and include residents, users of public rights of way, users of the local highway network, users of the playing fields, users of St Bartholomew's church and visitors to the Conservation Areas. These are shown in Figure A/011.

Sensitivity of receptors

- 5.8.2 Value, susceptibility and sensitivity were assessed for all visual receptors. Further supporting narrative is provided in this regard in Appendix B/002 and B/004.

Magnitude of effects

- 5.8.3 The magnitude of visual effects on the identified individual visual receptors is summarised in Appendix B/004 based on the preceding assessment of receptor value, sensitivity and magnitude of change.

Importance of effects

- 5.8.4 The importance of visual effects on the identified individual visual receptors is summarised in Appendix B/004 based on the preceding assessment of receptor sensitivity and magnitude of change.

- 5.8.5 The importance of visual effects are considered on a development site by development

site basis within B/002.

- 5.8.6 To aid a greater understanding of the existing visual baseline environment and visual effects experienced as a result of the proposals, a number of representative viewpoints within the wider and local study areas were identified. Assessment of the existing situation with a description of the anticipated change to the view of the visual receptors as a result of the proposed development are included in Figures A/012 – A/033.
- 5.8.7 Due to topography and surrounding vegetation, the re-development of the Mill will have a limited visual influence; viewpoints A/016 – A/022 and A/030 – A/033 show that views of the Mill building are limited.

AONB

- 5.8.8 This considers potential effects on the visual setting and scenic quality of the Forest of Bowland AONB landscape as experienced by visitors to the AONB.
- 5.8.9 The value of the AONB landscape is assessed to be high as the AONB is a nationally important designated landscape. Susceptibility of visitors is assessed to be high as views are considered a key factor of their experience of the AONB, so overall sensitivity for visitors to the AONB is considered to be high.
- 5.8.10 This is assessed from three points within the AONB landscape (Viewpoints 1 – 3) – a panoramic viewpoint at Jeffery Hill (3.6km to the south of Chipping), a view from the summit of Parlick Fell (3km north west of Chipping) and Beacon Fell a 360 degree panoramic viewpoint 5km to the west of Chipping.
- 5.8.11 The proposed development would theoretically be visible from these three viewpoints, but it would generally be imperceptible due to a combination of distance (3km+) and the assimilation of the built form of Chipping into the wider wooded landscape when viewed at this scale. It is considered that the magnitude of change would be negligible adverse.
- 5.8.12 As magnitude of change is negligible, it is considered that (even with the high sensitivity of users) overall effects on the scenic quality of the AONB landscape are considered negligible at Day one. As the landscape structure proposed as part of the scheme

establishes and matures overall residual effects fall to “not noticeable” at Year 15.

Kirk Mill Conservation Area

- 5.8.13 This considers potential effects on the visual setting and scenic quality of the Kirk Mill Conservation Area as experienced by residents, visitors and road users.
- 5.8.14 The value of views into / out of the Conservation Area is considered to be high. Susceptibility of visitors is assessed to be medium as views are considered to be important but not a key factor of their experience of the conservation area; however, overall sensitivity for visitors is still considered to be high.
- 5.8.15 Viewpoints 4 – 11 and 19 - 22 illustrate effects on views into and from the Kirk Mill Conservation Area. Magnitude of change is generally expected to be minor - moderate beneficial as the existing out of context industrial buildings are removed and replaced with more appropriate vernacular built form and open space. The listed mill building (whose current condition is degrading) will be renovated. Adverse visual effects include the removal of the self-seeded trees along the dam wall, however this tree loss will be offset by a new landscape scheme. In some areas there would be filtered views from within the Conservation Area to the residential development at Malt Kiln Brow (as shown in Appendix A, Figure A/016 – A/022 and A/030 – A/033), but the visual effects of this element of the scheme on the Conservation Area are limited as the built form, landform and vegetation cover in and around the Conservation Area limits views to the proposed housing areas from within the Conservation Area.
- 5.8.16 Overall ‘day one’ importance of visual effect on the setting of the Kirk Mill Conservation Area are moderate beneficial; ‘year 15’ residual visual effects are also considered to be moderate beneficial.

Chipping Conservation Area

- 5.8.17 This considers potential effects on the visual setting and scenic quality of the Chipping Conservation Area as experienced by residents, visitors and road users.
- 5.8.18 The value of views into / out of the conservation area is considered to be high. Susceptibility of visitors is assessed to be medium as views are considered to be important but not a key factor of their experience of the conservation area; however, overall sensitivity for visitors is still considered to be high.

- 5.8.19 Viewpoints 14 and 15 illustrate effects on views into and out from the Chipping Conservation Area, and are identified as 'important views' in the Chipping Conservation Area Appraisal (CD 1.3). There will be no effect on views from viewpoint 15 and the view towards development site 2 from viewpoint 14 would be considered to have a low beneficial magnitude of change as the existing incongruous industrial buildings would be removed.
- 5.8.20 Overall 'day one' importance of visual effect on the setting of the Chipping Conservation Area are negligible beneficial; 'year 15' residual visual effects are also considered to be negligible beneficial.

6. ASSESSMENT OF THE KEY LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE REASON FOR REFUSAL OF THE SCHEME

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 Having undertaken the preceding review, the reasons for refusal can now be addressed:

6.2 Key Landscape Matter I

Will the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development cause harm to the character and appearance, setting and views into / out of both Kirk Mill and Chipping Conservation Areas?

Kirk Mill Conservation Area

6.2.1 The key elements of character, setting and views with regards Kirk Mill Conservation Area is interrogated at Section 5.3. The extent and nature of change is provided in Section 5.5. The importance of the effect, both at Day 1 and Year 15 are considered at 5.7.

6.2.2 This review concludes that the effects of the proposed development will be minor – moderate beneficial in Year 1 and Moderate beneficial in Year 15. Development is beneficial to the setting as it results in the removal of existing incongruous features, the addition of beneficial features in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area and the potential adverse effects of the proposed additional elements (e.g. car parking) are limited.

6.2.3 As such there is no evidence to support the view that the proposed development will cause harm to Kirk Mill conservation area.

Chipping Conservation Area

6.2.4 The key elements of character, setting and views with regards Kirk Mill Conservation Area is interrogated at Section 5.3. The extent and nature of change is provided in Section 5.5. The importance of the effect, both at Day 1 and Year 15 are considered at 5.7.

6.2.5 Development is beneficial to the setting as it results in the removal of existing incongruous features, the addition of beneficial features in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area and the potential adverse effects of the proposed additional elements (e.g. car parking) are limited.

6.2.6 As such there is no evidence to support the view that the proposed development will cause landscape and/or visual harm to the Chipping Conservation Area.

6.3 Key Landscape Matter 2

Is the development an incongruous feature and would it result in the loss of landscape fabric?

6.3.1 The key landscape characteristics for the AONB landscape and the landscape which contains the development sites are defined in Section 5.3. A consideration of nature and extent of change in the context of defined landscape character is provided at 5.5. The review has demonstrated that the application includes the addition of beneficial features in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area, the removal of incongruous elements and the mitigation of potential adverse effects of the proposed additional elements (e.g. car parking). The proposed residential built form will be an additional adverse feature into the landscape, but the existing landscape features on the development sites are largely to be retained and the proposed landscape structure associated with the development will help to accommodate these elements into the landscape.

6.3.2 As such there is no evidence to support the view that key landscape features or attributes will be lost as a result of the proposed development.

6.4 Key Landscape Matter 3

Does the proposal contribute to the landscape character of the AONB?

6.4.1 The key elements of character within the AONB are interrogated at Section 5.3. The extent and nature of change is provided in Section 5.5. The importance of the effect, both at Day 1 and Year 15 are considered at 5.7.

6.4.2 The proposed residential development on sites 3 and 4 will not adversely affect the key landscape characteristics (as defined in 5.3 above) of either the AONB or its constituent LCAs.

6.4.3 This review concludes that the effects of the proposed development on the AONB landscape will be negligible adverse in Day 1 and “no noticeable effect” in Year 15 (negligible adverse effects of the housing development balanced with the negligible beneficial effects from the development on the Mill sites).

6.4.4 Not only is the extent of change extremely limited in the context of the whole AONB

but also proposals enhance character with particular reference to heritage context. As such the evidence provided demonstrates that the special qualities of the AONB will remain unharmed.

6.5 Key Landscape Matter 4

Would the proposal cause visual harm, thereby failing to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB?

6.5.1 The effects on key visual receptors relating to the AONB, the extent and nature of change and the importance of the effect, both at Day 1 and Year 15 are considered at 5.8.

6.5.2 This review concludes that the effects of the proposed development will be negligible adverse in Day 1 and not noticeable in Year 15.

6.6 Compliance with Policy

NPPF

6.6.1 Weight has been given to the AONB as a nationally valued landscape within the landscape and visual assessment; the demonstration of the public interest of the scheme is addressed in the evidence of the planning consultants, whilst the evidence within the landscape and visual impact assessment determines that the detrimental effects on the AONB is very limited.

Core Strategy (CD 1.1)

Core strategy EN2: Landscape

6.6.2 The assessment determines that elements of the scheme will enhance the natural beauty of the AONB (primarily related in development sites 1 and 2) whilst other elements of the scheme (the housing on sites 3 and 4) would result in negligible landscape effects.

Core strategy DMG1 (3): General considerations

6.6.3 The assessment demonstrates that the proposed schemes effect on landscape character is very limited.

Core strategy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets

Kirk Mill Conservation Area

6.6.4 The assessment considers that the proposed development would have limited effects on views into and out of the Kirk Mill Conservation Area. The scheme would generally result in enhancements to the Conservation Area locality through the removal of incongruous elements, with limited adverse effects from the proposed housing on sites 3 and 4.

Chipping Conservation Area

6.6.5 The assessment considers that there will be no adverse effects on either the setting or views in/out of the Chipping Conservation Area; an 'important view' would be enhanced as part of the scheme.

Core Strategy DMH3: Dwellings in the open countryside and AONB

6.6.6 The assessment considers that the proposed development has overall limited visual effects from views within the AONB.

Core Strategy DMB3: Recreation and Tourist development

6.6.7 The assessment considers that the proposed development does not undermine the character, quality or visual amenity of the area and will extend the range of visitor facilities.

Core Strategy DME 2: Landscape and Townscape Protection

6.6.8 The development would not result in the loss of woodlands, copses, hedges or individual trees (other than the removal of a small area of juvenile woodland and the limited removal of trees to facilitate construction) and would result in the enhancement of townscape character.

7. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1.1 I have interrogated the potential for the proposed development to impact on the landscape and visual character of the development sites and associated locality with particular reference to potential effects on the AONB and Kirk Mill and Chipping Conservation Areas, as raised through the reasons for refusal of the scheme. I have also considered the requisite statutory tests in terms of the NPPF and associated local plan policy.
- 7.1.2 My assessment determines that potential importance of landscape and visual effects on the AONB and its constituent LCAs are negligible adverse in Year 1 and no noticeable effect in Year 15.
- 7.1.3 My assessment determines that potential importance of landscape and visual effects on the Kirk Mill Conservation Area is minor beneficial in Year 1 and moderate beneficial in Year 15. With regards to Chipping Conservation Area potential importance of landscape and visual effect is minor beneficial, both in Year 1 and Year 15.
- 7.1.4 In the light of these assessments I have therefore found no significant landscape or visual effects the scheme.
- 7.1.5 The scheme complies with NPPF Policies 109, 113, 115 and demonstrates limited detrimental effects in terms of paragraph 116. The assessment determines that negligible detrimental effects would be caused with a number of beneficial effects with respect to Core Strategy EN2, negligible effects as a result of the development would be experienced under DME4, the scheme would demonstrate beneficial effects on the Conservation Areas under DME4, would not result in visually harmful development under DMH3, would extend tourism / visitor facilities without undermining character, quality or visual amenity under DMB3 and enhance townscape under DME2.
- 7.1.6 I therefore recommend that the Appeal be allowed.