



Hallam Land Management Ltd

Land at Carr Road, Deepcar, Sheffield

Landscape and Visual Appraisal

November 2017

FPCR Environment and Design Ltd

Registered Office: Lockington Hall, Lockington, Derby DE74 2RH

Company No. 07128076. [T] 01509 672772 [F] 01509 674565 [E] mail@fpcr.co.uk [W] www.fpcr.co.uk

This report is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd. Ordnance Survey material is used with permission of The Controller of HMSO, Crown copyright 100018896.

| Rev | Issue Status | Prepared / Date | Approved/Date |
|-----|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| - | | | FPCR 15.11.2017 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This is a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) prepared by FPCR Environment & Design Ltd, as part of an Outline Planning Application for a residential development of up to 93 dwellings, access, and green infrastructure on land off Carr Road, Deepcar, Stocksbridge. All matters are reserved except for access.
- 1.2 The site location and its context is shown in **Figures 1-2**.
- 1.3 The purpose of the LVA is to review landscape character¹ and visual amenity², and to assess the landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development (i.e. that is presented by this Outline Planning Application) on the receiving landscape receptors³ and visual receptors⁴.
- 1.4 The landscape and visual effects are assessed in relation to the development as described with the Planning Statement and Design & Access Statement, and as identified on the Concept Masterplan.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 The LVA has been prepared using the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition, GLVIA3 (2013)⁵.
- 2.2 The full FPCR methodology that has been used is contained in **Appendix A**. The following provides a summary.
- 2.3 GLVIA3 states:

"Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), is a tool used to identify and assess the significance of, and the effects of, change resulting from development on both landscape as an environmental resource in its own right and on people's views and visual amenity.

LVIA may be carried out either formally as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), or informally, as a contribution to the 'appraisal' of development proposals and planning applications. Both are important and the broad principles and the core of the approach is similar in each case (§ 1.3).

As a standalone 'appraisal' the process is informal and there is more flexibility, but the essence of the approach -specifying the nature of the proposed change or development; describing the existing landscape and the views and the visual amenity in the area that may be affected; predicting the effects, although not their likely significance; and considering how these effects might be mitigated- still applies (§ 3.2)

- 2.4 There are two components of that are described separately within this report:

- *Assessment of landscape effects; assessing effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right; and*

¹ Landscape Character: A distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse [GLVIA3 definition]

² Visual Amenity: The overall pleasantness of the views people enjoy of their surroundings, which provides an attractive visual setting or backdrop for the enjoyment of activities of people living, working, recreating, visiting or travelling through an area [GLVIA3 definition]

³ Landscape receptors: Defined aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal [GLVIA definition]

⁴ Visual receptors: Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal [GLVIA3 definition]

⁵ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition, Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, April 2013

- *Assessment of visual effects; assessing effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people.* (§ 2.11)

- 2.5 The components of this LVA include: baseline studies; a description and details of the Proposed Development; and an identification and description of likely effects arising from the Proposed Development
- 2.6 The judgements that are made in respect of landscape and visual effects are a combination of the sensitivity of the receptors and the magnitude of the effect, alongside professional qualitative judgment which is a very important part of the LVIA process as expressed by GLVIA3.

Assessment of Landscape Effects

- 2.7 GLVIA3 states that:
- "An assessment of landscape effects deals with the effects of change and development on landscape as a resource".* (§ 5.1)
- 2.8 The baseline landscape is described by reference to existing landscape character assessments and by a description of the site and its context. This provides an understanding of the area that may be affected.
- 2.9 Landscape receptors (i.e. landscape resources that have the potential to be affected) are assessed in terms of their sensitivity. This combines judgements on the susceptibility of the receptor to the type of change or development that is specifically proposed, and the value attached to the landscape receptor
- 2.10 A range of landscape effects can arise through development. These can include:
- Change or loss of elements, features, aesthetic or perceptual aspects that contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the landscape;
 - Addition of new elements that influence character and distinctiveness of the landscape; and
 - Combined effects of these changes.
- 2.11 Each effect on landscape receptors is assessed in terms of size or scale, geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration and reversibility. In terms of size or scale, the judgement takes account of the extent of the existing landscape elements that will be lost or changed, and the degree to which the aesthetic or perceptual aspects or key characteristics of the landscape will be altered by removal or by the addition of new elements.

Assessment of Visual Effects

- 2.12 The baseline visual study includes an understanding of the area in which the Proposed Development may be visible. It considers the groups of people who may experience views, the viewpoints where they may be affected, and the nature of these views.
- 2.13 The first stage in the assessment is to identify approximate visibility/visibility mapping. This is either done by a computerised Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), which is a desk study exercise and treats the world as 'bare earth' (i.e. it does not take into account factors other than terrain that influence actual visibility, such as buildings, woodland and hedges), or by manual methods using map study and field evaluation to establish a Representative Visual Envelope (RVE).

2.14 The assessment considers both susceptibility to change in views and visual amenity, and the value attached to particular views.

2.15 GLVIA3 states that:

"The visual receptors most susceptible to change are generally likely to include:

- *"residents at home;*
- *people, whether residents or visitors who engaged in outdoor recreation, including use of public rights of way, whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the landscape and on particular views;*
- *visitors to heritage assets or other attractions, where views of surroundings are an important contributor to the experience; and*
- *communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents in the area."* (§ 6.33)

2.16 Travellers on road, rail or other transport routes tend to fall into an intermediate category of susceptibility to change, although where travel involves recognised scenic routes awareness of views is likely to be particularly high. GLVIA3 notes that:

"Visual receptors likely to be less sensitive to change include:

- *People engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not involve or depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape; and*
- *People at their place of work whose attention may be focused on their work or activity, not on their surroundings, and where the setting is not important to the quality of working life..."* (§ 6.34)

2.17 An assessment of visual effects deals with the area in which the development may be visible and effects of change on these views to people and their visual amenity. Each of the visual effects is evaluated in terms of its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration or reversibility. In terms of size or scale, the magnitude of visual effects takes account of:

- *"The scale of the change in the view with respect to the loss or addition of features in the view and changes in its composition, including proportion of the view occupied by the proposed development;*
- *The degree of contrast or integration of any new features or changes in the landscape with the existing or remaining landscape elements and characteristics in terms of form, scale and mass, line height, colour and texture; and*
- *The nature of the view of the proposed development, in terms of the relative amount of time over which it will be experienced and whether views will be full, partial or glimpses.*

The geographical extent of the visual effect in each viewpoint is likely to reflect:

- *The angle of view in relation to the main activity of the receptor;*
- *The distance of the viewpoint from the proposed development; and*
- *The extent of the area over which the changes would be visible" (GLVIA3 § 6.39-6.40)*

Overall Landscape and Visual Effects

- 2.18 Conclusions on the level of effects, and whether these are adverse or beneficial, are drawn from separate judgements on the sensitivity of the receptors and the magnitude of the effects. GLVIA3 observes that the distinction between levels can be helpfully defined by using a word scale such as major, moderate, minor and negligible.
- 2.19 GLVIA3 notes, at paragraphs 5.56 and 6.44, that there are no hard and fast rules with regard to the level of effects. The following descriptive thresholds have been used for this appraisal:
- Major:** A Major landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change;
- Moderate:** A Moderate landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change;
- Minor:** A Minor landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change;
- Negligible:** A Negligible landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change.
- 2.20 Where it is determined that the assessment falls between or encompasses two of the defined thresholds, then the judgement may be described as, for example, Major-Moderate or Moderate-Minor. This indicates that the effect is assessed to lie between the respective definitions or to encompass aspects of both.

3.0 PLANNING CONTEXT

3.1 The following provides a summary in relation to landscape matters at a national and local level. Further information is contained within the application's Planning Statement.

National Context

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012)⁶

3.2 The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

"The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development." (§ 6)

3.3 The three dimensions to delivering sustainable development are: *economic, social and environmental.*

- *"an environmental role- contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."* (§ 7)

3.4 The core planning principles include the following:

- *"always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings";*
- *take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it"* (§ 17)

3.5 The NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

"The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils" (§ 109)

3.6 It goes on to say:

"Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for a development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape 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 and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks" (§ 113)

"Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads." (§ 115)

⁶ National Planning Policy Framework, Communities & Local Government, March 2012

Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG 2014)⁷

- 3.7 The PPG is an online planning resource which provides guidance on the NPPF and is part of the Government's reforms to make the planning system more accessible. The NPPF continues to be the primary document for decision making. With regard to landscape issues the PPG records within the Natural Environment⁸ chapter that:

"One of the core principles in the National Planning Policy Framework is that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Local plans should include strategic policies for the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment, including landscape. This includes designated landscapes but also the wider countryside" (§001 Reference ID: 8-001-20140306)

Local Context

Sheffield Unitary Development Plan UDP (1998)

- 3.8 The UDP Proposals Map and many of the policies ('saved policies') continue to form part of the Development Plan alongside the more recently adopted Sheffield Core Strategy (2009).
- 3.9 The site and the local landscape is covered by an *Open Space Area*⁹ -one of a number of areas identified by the Proposals Map within Deepcar and Stocksbridge. In relation to the site this *Open Space Area* comprises a broad parcel of agricultural land adjacent to the settlement edge. It is bound by Broomfield Field Lane to the north, Carr Road to the east, Hollin Busk Lane to the south, and Hollin Busk Road to the west. The *Open Space Area* also includes a corridor of accessible woodland and the Local Wildlife Site of Fox Glen (also known as The Glen) that borders the site to the north. With the exception of this woodland, that includes a Public Footpath, the remainder of the *Open Space Area* is not publicly accessible and is not used for any formal recreational activities.

- 3.10 UDP Policy *LR5 Development in Open Space Area* states:

"Development in Open Space Areas will not be permitted where:

- a) it would cause damage to nature conservation sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments or other archaeological sites; or*
- b) it would cause damage to mature or ancient woodland or result in a significant loss of mature trees; or*
- c) it would significantly detract from the green and open space character of the Green Network; or*
- d) it would make an open space ineffective as an environmental buffer; or*
- e) it would harm open space which forms the setting for a Listed Building or other historic buildings, or is needed to maintain an important view or vista; or*
- f) it would damage the character of a Historic Park or Garden; or*

⁷ Planning Practice Guidance, 27th March 2014

⁸ Ibid, Updated 11th February 2016

⁹ When the Sheffield Core Strategy was adopted (4 March 2009) a number of policies from the UDP were replaced by the Core Strategy, to include UDP Policy LR4 Open Space Areas

- g) *it would harm the character or appearance of a Public Space; or*
- h) *it would result in the loss of open space which is such quality that it is of City-wide importance; or*
- i) *it would result in over-development or harm the character of the area; or*
- j) *it would harm the rural character of a wedge of open countryside; or*
- k) *the proposed use would be incompatible with surrounding land uses.*

3.11 With regards to the "Green Network", referred to in bullet (c), a diagrammatic map contained within the Environment Chapter identifies an extensive number of "Green Corridors" and "Green Links". There are a series of broad "Green Links" shown extending through the urban area of Stocksbridge and Deepcar. One of these is interpreted as encompassing -and focussing upon - the small valley corridor of Clough Dike (or Dyke) and the woodland at Fox Glen.

3.12 Policy *GE10 Green Network* states the following:

"A Network of Green Corridors and Green Links will be:

- a) *protected from development which would detract from their mainly green and open character or which would cause serious ecological damage; and*
- b) *enhanced by encouraging development which increase their value for wildlife and recreation; and*
- c) *extended by creating new open space in areas of Desired Green Links"*

3.13 Broader landscape matters are dealt with within Policy *GE 11 Nature Conservation and Development*. This states that:

"The natural environment will be protected and enhanced. The design, siting and landscaping of development should respect and promote nature conservation and measures to reduce any potentially harmful effects of development on natural features of value"

Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009)

3.14 The adopted Core Strategy includes Policy *CS72 Protecting Countryside not in the Green Belt*. This states the following:

"The green, open and rural character of areas on the edge of the built-up areas but not in the Green Belt will be safeguarded through protection as open countryside, including the following locations:

- a. *to the east of Woodhouse*
- b. *to the south-west and north of Mosborough Village (at Mosborough Moor and Moor Valley)*
- c. *at the former Holbrook Colliery*
- d. *south of Stocksbridge (at Hollin Busk)."*

3.15 With regards to the Stocksbridge area (bullet point d), this is not specifically identified on a plan. The explanatory text states that:

"The land at Hollin Busk is a large and integral part of the countryside south of Stocksbridge, prominent in local views and providing an important visual break between the settlements of Stocksbridge and Deepcar. Its rural character is greatly valued locally and there is no need to develop it as new housing can be provided on previously developed land within the urban area. Indeed, protection of the area makes a significant contribution to the character and distinctiveness of Stocksbridge.

Protection of these areas will be achieved through designation as open countryside in the City Sites document and on the SDF Proposals Map, and the consideration of any applications for permission to develop" (§ 12.8-12.9)

3.16 Policy CS47 Safeguarding of Open Space states the following:

"Development of open space will not be permitted where:

- a. it would result in a quantitative shortage of either informal or formal open space in the local area; or*
- b. it would result in the loss of open space that is of high quality or of heritage, landscape or ecological value; or*
- c. people in the local area would be denied easy or safe access to a local park or to smaller informal open space that is valued or well used by people living or working in the local area; or*
- d. it would cause or increase a break in the city's Green Network.*

Development that would still result in the loss of open space will only be permitted where:

- e. as soon as practicable, equivalent or better replacement open space would be provided in the local area; or*
- f. the site is identified as surplus for its current open space function and:

 - i. a proposed replacement would, as soon as practicable, remedy a deficiency in another type of open space in the same local area; or*
 - ii. it could not fulfil other unsatisfied open space needs; or**
- g. the development would be ancillary to the open space and have a minimal impact on the use or character of the open space.*

Open space or sports and recreational facilities of importance beyond the city will be safeguarded and development or redevelopment will be permitted only where it would improve the quality of facilities provided in the city."

Pre-Submission Draft: City Policies and Sites Document (2013)

3.17 Within the City Policies and Sites Document (2013), the site and the surrounding area is identified on the Proposals Map as a "*Countryside Area (Non-Green Belt)*"

3.18 Policy G6A *Development in Countryside Areas including the Green Belt* states:

"The openness, distinctive character and quality of the countryside around the city will be protected and where possible enhanced. In Countryside Areas:

- a. development will only be permitted for uses that are appropriate in rural areas and which would not harm the rural character of the area or lead to unsustainable patterns of development;*
- b. extensions or alterations to existing buildings will be permitted provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; and*
- c. the re-use of buildings for other uses will only be permitted where:

 - i the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction and it does not require significant structural re-building; and*
 - ii it would not require disproportionate additions to the original building**
- d. infilling of single house plots will be permitted in:

 - i the villages of Bolsterstone, Brightholmlee, Dungworth, Ewden Village, Midhopestones, Ringinglow and Whitley; or*
 - ii substantially developed road frontages at Green Lane/Cockshutt [sic] Lane/Owler Gate/Hilltop Drive at Wharncliffe Side; Chapeltown Road; Whiteley Wood Road; Long Line;**
- e. exceptionally, development of small sites for housing will be permitted within, or at the edge of the villages listed in part (d)(i) where it would be used for affordable housing in perpetuity to meet local needs...."*

3.19 The site and the wider landscape is located within the South Yorkshire Forest. Policy *G3 Trees, Woodland and the South Yorkshire Forest* states:

"All new developments should include tree planting, unless not practicable, with priority being given to sites next to roads, footpaths, open spaces and the Green Belt.

Developments should also retain and integrate healthy, mature trees and hedgerows and replace any trees that need to be removed. Development will not be permitted that would directly or indirectly damage existing mature or ancient woodland, veteran trees or ancient or species-rich hedgerows.

All new tree planting should use indigenous species and not conflict with other important habitats, natural features or archaeological remains and provision should be made for its future management.

Development within the South Yorkshire Forest area should:

- a. incorporate appropriate new tree planting that reflects the character of that area, including new woodland where opportunities arise;*
- b. introduce tree planting to enhance the environment where a development is located within a predominantly built-up area;*
- c. include substantial woodland planting on schemes involving the reclamation of derelict land or waste disposal sites;*
- d. respect and protect existing wooded settings and plant additional woodland where compatible with other open space needs where development is in less built-up areas."*

3.20 Landscape Character is addressed by Policy G6B which states that:

“Development within, or conspicuous from, Countryside Areas, will only be permitted where it would safeguard the identified character and features of the following landscape character areas¹⁰:

Upland Character Areas

- a. Moorland Ridge*
- b. Pastoral Hills and Ridges*
- c. Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West*
- d. Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the East*
- e. Upland Wooded Ridges and Slope*

Valley Character Areas

- a. Upland River Valleys and Reservoirs*
- b. Wooded Upland River Valleys*
- c. Pastoral Upland River Valleys*
- d. Upland Valley Sides Above Urban and Industrial Areas*
- e. Encapsulated River Valleys to the West*

Lowland Character Areas

- a. Encapsulated River Valleys to the East*
- b. Lowland Rolling Slopes and Valleys*
- c. Lowland Broad River Valleys*
- d. Lowland Wooded Valley Sides Above Urban or Suburban Areas*
- e. Encapsulated Farmland*

Highly Maintained Landscape Areas

- a. Highly Maintained Landscapes*

Where development takes place in Despoiled Land/Fragmented Landscape Areas it should improve the character of the area.

Development on land which is conspicuous from the Peak District National Park should protect and enhance the Park’s landscape and scenic beauty and not conflict with its purposes or harm its valued characteristics.”

Sheffield Plan (2013)

- 3.21 Rather than submitting the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map to Central Government, Sheffield City Council have decided to commence work on a new Sheffield Plan that will guide the future of the city by setting out how, and where, development will take place up to 2034.
- 3.22 The Sheffield Plan will ultimately replace the Sheffield UDP (1998) and the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009) and will incorporate some of the work already prepared as part of the Pre-submission Draft

¹⁰ These Character Areas are described within the Sheffield Preliminary Landscape Assessment (2011)

City Policies and Sites Document and Proposals Map (2013). According to the Sheffield City Council website it is expected that the Sheffield Plan will be adopted 2020.

3.23 The website states that:

"Until the new Sheffield Plan is adopted, Development Management decisions will be based on the following:

- *Core Strategy (adopted March 2009)*
- *Unitary Development Plan saved policies and Proposals Map (adopted March 1998)*
- *Pre-Submission Draft City Policies and Sites and Proposals Map (April 2013)"*

3.24 The application provides further information on the planning context and the overall planning issues with regards to the Development Plan and other material considerations.

4.0 LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

Designations (Figure 3)

- 4.1 The site and the local landscape is not covered by any landscape quality designation at either a national or local level.
- 4.2 To the south west of the built up area of Deepcar and Stocksbridge is the nationally designated landscape of the Peak District National Park. Within the context of Deepcar, the boundary of the Peak District is defined by Heads Lane near the village of Bolsterstone around 0.7km to the south of the site at its closest point. Covering parts of Derbyshire, Yorkshire, Staffordshire and Cheshire, the Peak District extends over some 1,438 km² of the landscape.
- 4.3 At a local level, the Sheffield UDP has landscape designations that are defined as: *"Areas of High Landscape Value"*¹¹. These are recorded by the UDP as being: *"areas of the countryside which are very attractive and which have a special character"*. The site does not fall within one of these designations.
- 4.4 A Grade II Registered Park & Garden: Wortley Hall, lies around 3.5km from the site beyond the built-up area of Deepcar and the rising wooded landscape at Warncliffe Crag.
- 4.5 Grade II Listed Buildings lie immediately to the east of the site on Carr Road (Royd Farmhouse, and nearby barn and Buildings). Another Grade II Listed Building (a Cruck Barn) lies c. 200 m to the south-east of the site within the residential area. A number of Listed Buildings are also situated Bolsterstone.
- 4.6 Fox Glen Wood, which borders the site's northern boundary, is a Local Wildlife Site (LWS).
- 4.7 The wider landscape to the south of site and Hollin Busk Lane forms part of the extensive Sheffield Green Belt designation. This is discussed in more detail within the Planning Statement.

¹¹ UDP Policy GE8

NATIONAL CONTEXT

National Character Area NCA Profile

NCA Yorkshire Southern Pennine Ridge

4.8 Landscape character is assessed at a national level by Natural England through the use of National Character Area (NCA) profiles. The assessment provides an understanding and the general characteristics of these substantial landscapes areas.

4.9 The site, and much of the surrounding landscape that includes the settlements of Deepcar and Stocksbridge, lies within the extensive *NCA 37 Yorkshire Southern Pennine Ridge*¹². This covers some 58,510 ha of the landscape. **(Figure 4)**

4.10 As recorded within the summary section, the NCA is noted as being:

"...a transitional landscape from the upland areas of the Southern Pennines NCA in the west through to the low-lying land of the Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Yorkshire Coalfield NCA to the east."

4.11 The key characteristics of the NCA are:

- *"A transitional landscape dissected by steep-sided valleys, dropping from the high gritstone hills in the west to lower land in the east, and thus creating an important backdrop to the many industrial towns and villages within and beyond the NCA.*
- *Sandstones and gritstone beds of Millstone Grit (Namurian) age underlying smooth hills and plateaux in the west. These are overlain in the east by beds of sandstone, siltstone and mudstone of Coal Measures age.*
- *Rivers creating a deeply dissected landscape, with high plateaux cut by steep-sided valleys, and fanning out in 'fingers' across valleys of the NCA.*
- *Treeless hill tops with tracts of rough grazing and extensive areas of enclosed pasture to the west, but with broadleaved woodland on steeper valley sides, giving the impression of a well-wooded landscape, especially to the north and west of Sheffield.*
- *Predominantly pastoral farming, especially in western areas, with a shift to more arable land in the drier eastern areas.*
- *Boundary features that change from distinctive patterns of drystone walls on the upland hills, to hedgerows becoming the predominant field boundary in the east.*
- *Close conjunction between rural landscapes and the rich industrial heritage of the urban areas, including settlements associated with the textile industry, with large mills and tall chimneys, and large factories and forges associated with the iron, steel and manufacturing industries.*
- *Urban development constrained within valley floors and up side slopes, with location and layout strongly influenced by the landform.*
- *Industrial wealth revealed in magnificent civil architecture in town centres, notably Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield and Sheffield, and several stately homes with designed parklands.*
- *Evidence of bronze-age and Roman habitation still present on uplands, and old pack-horse routes that once joined settlements across the Pennines still in place, or now forming modern major road routes.*

¹² NCA 37: Yorkshire Southern Pennine Ridge, 16 October 2013, Natural England

- *Extensive and dramatic views from higher land out over lower-lying land to the east, even from within urban areas.*
- *Several reservoirs contained within narrow valleys contributing a distinct character as well as providing popular places to visit.*
- *Small patches of fragmented priority habitats providing important refuges locally for wildlife. Grassland mosaics are particularly important in supporting waders and the twite that breeds on adjacent moorland areas; lowland woodland is also an important feature.*
- *In places a dense network of roads and urban development, with many road, rail and canal routes crossing the NCA, and a high density of footpaths throughout"*

4.12 The NCA includes four "statements of environmental opportunity". These being:

"SEO 1: Protect and manage the rich industrial heritage – including historical settlement patterns and local vernacular styles, as well as the industrial and municipal buildings that were built with wealth when the industry thrived, such as the World Heritage Site at Saltaire – which links the history of the area to the landscape features, to enhance sense of place and history and inspire local communities through increased access and recreation opportunities.

SEO 2: Manage flood plains and wetland habitats to regulate water flow and availability, and to enhance water quality and biodiversity. Increase the river and riparian habitat networks, for example along the Calder, the Don and the Colne in the north and along the Sheaf, the Rivelin and the Loxley in the south, and ensure good linkages with the networks of woodland and semi-natural habitats for the species they support and to improve the resilience of these habitats to climate change.

SEO 3: Protect the distinctive landscape character with its contrasts between open pastures on hill tops, woodland on valley sides and the settlements nestled in the valley bottoms. Manage the arable and pastoral farmland and the areas of woodland to improve their contribution to biodiversity, food provision and landscape character, to improve soil and water quality, and reduce soil erosion.

SEO 4: Plan to optimise opportunities for access to the natural environment for the large urban populations in the area, making the most of key landscape features to redefine sense of place in the changing landscape and encouraging implementation of well-designed and managed green infrastructure, sustainable urban drainage systems and good use of planting to screen urban edges.

4.13 To the south west of Deepcar and Stocksbridge is the extensive *NCA 51 Dark Peak*. This is described within the summary of the NCA profile as:

"...a landscape of large-scale sweeping moorlands, in-by pastures enclosed by drystone walls, and gritstone settlements, within the Pennine chain. It falls almost entirely within, and forms a large part of, the Peak District National Park"

4.14 To the north east is *NCA 38 Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Yorkshire Coalfield*. This is noted as:

"...an area that has seen great change over the past few centuries. The impact of widespread industrialisation and development on the landscape and settlement pattern within the National Character Area (NCA) is clear, influencing the visual and ecological landscape."

LOCAL CONTEXT

Sheffield Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment (2011)

- 4.15 Landscape characterisation has been undertaken at a district level by the Sheffield Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment¹³. The report explains that this is not a completed final report, but merely the first stage in landscape characterisation. It states that:

"It is anticipated that this document will be viewed as a first stage in the production of a more structured and complete Landscape Character Assessment. This would provide more detail relating to the context nationally and regionally and would ideally involve specialist contributions for areas such as geology, ecology, soils and cultural heritage.

The complete Landscape Character Assessment should also include a landscape strategy for both management and enhancement including planting and management guidelines for the individual character types. At this point the document would be the tool by which to assess the inherent sensitivity of the Landscape Character Areas further informing decisions as to the capacity to accommodate change"¹⁴

- 4.16 The report identifies four Landscape Character Areas. These being: *Upland Character Areas, Valley Character Areas, Lowland Character Areas* and *Highly Maintained Landscapes*¹⁵. Within each of these are additional sub- character areas.

Upland Character Area

- 4.17 The site and the landscape south of Deepcar and Stocksbridge lies within the *Upland Character Area*, and the sub area of *UP3-Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West*. (**Figure 5**)

Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West

- 4.18 In summary, the *Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West* is described as being:

"Located to the south-west, west and north of Sheffield, these Pennine foothills have an undulating and, in places, steeply sloping topography with an interlocking pattern of fields, including blocks of woodland. There are patches of semi-improved and acid grasslands on steeper slopes with permanent pasture in small fields enclosed by dry stone walls.

- 4.19 Its key characteristics are defined as:

- *"Rolling slopes dominate, valleys tend to be incised and narrow*
- *Often steeply sloping*
- *Sometimes located immediately below and adjacent to moorland*
- *Upland settled rural character*
- *Sometimes views of moorland and/or industry in valley bottoms*
- *Often distant views of the city and/or middle distance views of suburban areas*
- *Pastoral farmland with some arable areas*
- *Usually includes areas of woodland*

¹³ Sheffield Green Belt & Countryside Areas Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment, Sheffield City Council (2011)

¹⁴ Ibid, page 13

¹⁵ Later in the report these are referred to as 'landscape types' as opposed to landscape 'character areas'. At page 19-20 they are defined as *Upland Character Type, Valley Character Type, Lowland Type* and *Highly Maintained Landscape Type*.

- *Stone boundary walls*
- *Includes traditional farm buildings, hamlets and churches."*

4.20 As explained by the report it does not include an assessment of landscape condition or sensitivity, nor any landscape management guidelines for these character areas. The report states that these elements are likely to form the second and final stages of the report. As stated on the Sheffield City Council website, *"Currently, no timetable has been set for completing the Full Assessment as this will depend on the availability of resources and competing priorities"*.

Peak District Landscape Character Assessment (2008)

4.21 A further layer of landscape characterisation has also been undertaken within the Peak District National Park. The report explores the landscape character of the Peak District and the immediate landscape outside of the designation, which includes the landscape around Deepcar.

Dark Peak Yorkshire Fringe Landscape Character Area

Enclosed Gritstone Upland Landscape Character Type

4.22 The site lies within the extensive *Dark Peak Yorkshire Fringe* Landscape Character Area. In broad terms this encompasses the landscape between Penistone and Sheffield on the eastern fringes of the Peak District.

4.23 The Character Area is subdivided into a series of Landscape Types. The site, and the landscape south of Deepcar and Stocksbridge, is located within the large *Enclosed Gritstone Upland* Landscape Type (**Figure 6**). This is described as:

"An enclosed upland landscape associated with high, gently undulating uplands and broad ridge summits which radiate from the Dark Peak core, sloping in places up to higher ground. This is a landscape of isolated stone farmsteads, straight roads and regular fields enclosed by drystone walls. Rolling uplands and broad ridge summits with some steeper slopes"

4.24 Its key characteristics are defined as:

- *"Thin soils over gritstone bedrock with localised pockets of peat*
- *Remnant patches of rough land with bracken and gorse, some heather and bilberry*
- *Permanent pasture and rough grazing enclosed by gritstone walls*
- *Regular pattern of medium to large fields*
- *Straight roads with wide verges of grass and, in some places, heather*
- *Isolated gritstone farmsteads with stone slate roofs*
- *Trees grouped around farmsteads to provide shelter"*

Peak District Landscape Strategy & Action Plan (2009)

- 4.25 This document follows on from the Peak District Landscape Character Assessment and provides *"particular priorities for each of the different landscape character types in the Dark Peak Yorkshire Fringe"*.
- 4.26 For the *Enclosed Gritstone Uplands*, the report states that:
- "This is a pastoral upland landscape with drystone walls, straight roads and isolated farmsteads. Agricultural improvement and grazing have reduced the ecological diversity of the pastures. The priority should be to protect the historic field pattern and conserve or restore the biodiversity of pastoral farmland. Where opportunities arise, consideration should be given to the creation of an open landscape, restoring and creating heathland."*
- 4.27 The report contains a series of landscape guidelines. The following are considered to be a *"priority throughout the landscape type"*.
- "Protect and maintain historic drystone walls"*
- "Drystone walls are an important historical feature in the more upland landscapes in the Dark Peak Yorkshire Fringe, e.g the Enclosed and Densely Enclosed Gritstone Uplands. In places, the management of walls is declining and there is a need to enhance their management in order to conserve and retain the cherished historic field pattern"*
- "Manage and enhance the diversity of agricultural grasslands"*
- "Many grasslands have been improved or reseeded with a consequent loss of species diversity. There is a need to manage these grasslands in a more sustainable way that retains species diversity whilst supporting productive agriculture. Opportunities to extend and enhance the management of unimproved grasslands should be sought, mainly in the Enclosed Gritstone Upland."*

5.0 BASELINE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER & VISUAL AMENITY

Site Context

- 5.1 The baseline appraisal has been formulated through a review of landscape characterisation work, together with field surveys of the site and the surrounding landscape¹⁶. This has included an understanding of the area of the landscape that may be affected, and the area in which the Proposed Development may be visible.
- 5.2 The site location plan and an aerial photograph (**Figures 1-2**) help to illustrate the site's landscape context.
- 5.3 The site covers around 2.67 ha of agricultural land. It is located on the southern edge of the built-up area of Deepcar. Stocksbridge lies to the north and west of the site.
- 5.4 The site comprises six gently sloping agricultural field that are open in their character. Common to the local and wider landscape they are used for grazing. Fields are bound by a combination of gritstone walls of varying condition.

¹⁶ Field survey work undertaken in 28 September and 10 October 2016

- 5.5 Fox Glen comprises contains a watercourse (Clough Dike), a number of small ponds and a Public Footpath. Beyond the woodland is residential development that includes housing at Bloomfield Grove and Broomfield Lane. The wider urban area of Stocksbridge lies to the north.
- 5.6 The site's western boundary is defined by a drystone wall and some intermittent mature trees. To the west the landscape comprises grazing fields and housing at Broomfield Lane. Broomfield Lane connects with the built-up area of Hollin Busk and East Whitwell (Stocksbridge) at Hollin Busk Road and Hollin Busk Lane.
- 5.7 The site's southern boundary is defined by a low stone wall and the adjacent footway and carriageway of Hollin Busk Lane. To the south, beyond gently rising agricultural land and Cockshot Hill, is the village of Bolsterstone, around 0.6km from the site.
- 5.8 The site's eastern boundary is defined by low stone walls and the properties of Royd Farm and Royd Cottage. Lying adjacent is the residential area of Royd (Deepcar) with Royd Lane and Carr Road characterised by relatively modern buildings. The wider built up area of Deepcar lies to the north east.

Landform

- 5.9 The landform character of the landscape is illustrated by the Topography Plan (**Figure 7**).
- 5.10 Stocksbridge and Deepcar lie within the upland valley of the River Don and the Little Don River¹⁷, which are framed and enclosed by the prominent escarpments of Don Hill-Hunshelf Bank (c303m AOD¹⁸) to the north, and Wharnccliffe Craggs, Wharnccliffe Moor and Wharnccliffe Chase (c317m AOD) to the east.
- 5.11 As a consequence of the higher land around them, Deepcar and Stocksbridge are comparatively well contained within the wider landscape.
- 5.12 The site lies on the north facing valley slopes above the River Don and is oriented towards the wider built-up area of Deepcar and Stocksbridge. It falls steadily from its southern boundary at Hollin Busk Lane (c225 AOD) to its lowest point near Fox Glen (c230mAOD).
- 5.13 To the south the valley slopes continue to gently rise reaching at Cockshot Lane (c275 AOD), Walders Low (c306AOD), Round Hill (c310m AOD) and Allman Well Hill (c300m AOD). These small rounded hills form part of ridge of higher land that runs from the west at Salter Hills (c359m AOD) to Hollin Edge Height (c300m AOD) in the east , via the village of Bolsterstone (c290-295m)¹⁹. South of Bolstertone the landscape descends into the steeply sided valley of the River Ewden.

¹⁷ Also known as "The Porter".

¹⁸ Above Ordnance Datum

¹⁹ This ridge line, as well as that of Hunshelf Bank is identified by the Sheffield Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment, as shown on Figure 5

Landscape Value

- 5.14 Landscape value²⁰ can apply to a landscape area as a whole, or to the individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of the landscape. In all landscapes there will be variances in the level of landscape value depending on a number of factors.
- 5.15 GLVIA3²¹ describe those elements that are generally agreed to influence value as being: landscape quality (condition); scenic quality; rarity; representativeness; conservation interests; recreation value; perceptual aspects; and associations²².
- 5.16 GLVIA3 advises that in the first instance:
- “A review of existing landscape designations is usually the starting point in understanding value...”*[§]
- 5.19
- 5.17 The site, and the local landscape around it, is not subject to any landscape quality designation at a national or local level. Whilst landscape designations are not an exclusive indicator of value and that the lack of a designation does not render a landscape as having no value, designated landscapes are widely acknowledged as being of particular importance and generally of high susceptibility to change.
- 5.18 The designated landscape of the Peak District National Park lies to the south and west. **Viewpoints A and B (Figure 17)**, taken from vantage points on Heads Lane (which forms the boundary of the Peak District within this landscape), illustrate how the rising topography to the south of the site at Cockshot Hill, together with intervening vegetation, effectively prevent views of the site from the Peak District. This is further demonstrated by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV²³) exercise that has been prepared (See **Figure 8**). The ZTV is digital tool that treats the world as ‘bare earth’ and does not take into account factors other than terrain that can influence actual visibility. Prepared on a ‘worst case’ scenario that all new housing is at 2.5 storey and a maximum of 10m in height, the ZTV shows that visibility between the site and Peak District is restricted as a consequence of the landform ridge the vicinity of Bolsterstone. Whilst there are some opportunities to view the Stocksbridge and Deepcar from more distant higher vantage points within the Peak District, such as to the west at Salter Hills, the site is effectively hidden by a combination of vegetation and the intervening built-up area of Stocksbridge.

²⁰ Landscape value: The relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society. A landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons. [GLVIA3]

²¹ GLVIA3, Para 5.27, Box 5.1.

²² Landscape quality (condition): A measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements [GLVIA3]
 Scenic quality: The term used to describe landscapes that appeal primarily to the senses (primarily but not wholly the visual senses). [GLVIA3]

Rarity: The presence of rare elements or features in the landscape or the presence of a rare Landscape Character Type. [GLVIA3]

Representativeness: Whether the landscape contains a particular character and/or features or elements which are considered particularly important examples [GLVIA3]

Conservation interests: The presence of feature of wildlife, earth science or archaeological or historical and cultural interest can add to the value of the landscape as well as having a value in their own right. [GLVIA3]

Recreation value: Evidence that the landscape is valued for recreational activity where experience of the landscape is important. [GLVIA3].

Perceptual aspects: A landscape may be valued for its perceptual qualities, notably wildness and/or tranquillity. [GLVIA3]

Associations: Some landscapes are associated with particular people, such as artists or writers, or events in history that contribute to perceptions of the natural beauty of the area. [GLVIA3]

²³ Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV): A map usually digitally produced, showing areas of land within which a development is theoretically visible. [GLVIA3 definition] The ZTV is a desk based study that treats the world as ‘bare earth’ and does not take into account factors other than terrain that can influence actual visibility.

- 5.19 There are some opportunities in which to gain long ranging panoramic views across the Don valley landscape from the higher ridges and the upland moors (e.g Broomhead Moor, Howden Moor and Langett Moor) of the Dark Peak. However, there are few sensitive receptors (residents-rights of way users) within this moorland landscape. The exceptions being an elevated footpath at Cut Gate near Margery Hill (c530AOD) and on the Barnsley Boundary Walk (c460mAOD) at Fiddlers Green, near the A626. Both of these are of some substantial distance, such that views of site are not perceptible.
- 5.20 It is considered that as a consequence of the natural containment that is created by the landform to the south of the site and the surrounding fabric of intervening hedges, trees and buildings, there is no significant visibility of the site from the Peak District.
- 5.21 At a local level, the site does not lie within *Areas of High Landscape Value* (Policy UDP8), which are defined by the UDP as landscapes that are: "...very attractive..." and of "...special character...". The nearest designation oriented away from Deepcar on the south facing slopes above the Ewden valley.

Landscape Quality (condition)

- 5.22 The site's fields are heavily grazed and are subject to agricultural practices that are typical of this landscape. The site and the local landscape show no apparent signs of degradation or dereliction, albeit some of the stone walls are in a relatively poor condition. In general, however, it is considered that the landscape fabric is considered to be relatively intact and overall in a reasonable to moderate condition.

Scenic Quality

- 5.23 The wider landscape is judged to be one that is pleasant and attractive, as a result of the prominent escarpments of Hunshelf Bank and the Wharnccliffe Crags that frame the valley landscape. The landscape context in which the site is located comprises open grazing fields, stone walls, hedges, mature trees and some occasional traditionally built stone buildings.
- 5.24 The site and the immediate landscape is defined by a series of open fields within the context of the established built-up area of Deepcar and against the backdrop of woodland at Fox Glen. The site has very little in the way of significant landscape features. Whilst pleasant, it is not considered to be remarkably distinctive such that it is 'out of the ordinary' in landscape terms. It does not, in itself, display any pronounced sense of scenic quality, certainly not in comparison to the exceptional scenic qualities of the Peak District landscape, or the more marked scenic qualities of the Wharnccliffe Crags.

Rarity

- 5.25 The site and the local landscape does not lie within a rare Landscape Character Area or Type at either a national or local level, and does not contain any unusual landscape features. The site's fabric of grazing fields that are bounded by drystone walls are of some local value, although these are widespread elements within this landscape.

Representativeness

- 5.26 The site's landscape character is considered to be broadly representative of the national and local landscape characterisations.
- 5.27 Within the extensive NCA of the *Yorkshire Southern Pennine Ridge*, the local landscape shares some of the following characteristics:
- "Boundary features that change from distinctive patterns of drystone walls on the upland hills, to hedgerows becoming the predominant field boundary in the east", and*
- "Urban development constrained within valley floors and upside slopes, with location and layout strongly influenced by the landform".*
- 5.28 The local landscape also comprises some of the key characteristics of the *Upland Rolling Slopes to the West*. This includes:
- "Often distant views of the city and/or middle distance views of suburban areas",*
- "Pastoral farmland with some arable areas",*
- "Usually includes areas of woodland" and*
- "Stone boundary walls".*
- 5.29 And similarly, the landscape displays some of the key characteristics of the *Enclosed Gritstone Upland*, e.g.
- "Permanent pasture and rough grazing enclosed by gritstone walls" and*
- "Regular pattern of medium to large fields".*

Conservation Interest

- 5.30 The site is not covered by any ecological designations. As recorded by the Ecological Assessment that accompanies the application, none of the site's boundary hedgerows are judged to be "important" from an ecological perspective. Fox Glen is a Local Wildlife Site (LWS). A little further afield to the south are the LWS's of Cockshot Hill and Townend Common.
- 5.31 The Arboricultural Assessment concludes that none of the trees within site are of "veteran status". There are five trees and two tree groups that are assessed as being of high quality (Grade A). These are located around the edges of the site.
- 5.32 Grade II Listed Buildings at Royd Farm lie adjacent on Carr Road. A Heritage Desk Based Assessment has been prepared as part of the application and this considers their significance and setting issues.
- 5.33 Bolsterstone village is partly designated as a Conservation Area (CA) and includes five Listed buildings.

Recreation Value

- 5.34 Given the site's location alongside the built-up area it provides some local value for the adjacent community -as is often the case for any farmland/green fields on the edge of settlements. However, the site is not publicly accessible and is not used for any formal or informal recreational functional. The closest Public Right of Way is a circular Public Footpath that runs through Fox Glen, that connect

the nearby residential areas of Carr Road and Royd Wood Road. Other informal paths occur within the woodland.

- 5.35 Within the wider landscape there is a Public Footpath that heads from Hollin Busk Lane to Bolsterstone, and a Footpath that connects Royd Lane and Sunny Bank Road via Stocksbridge Golf Course. To the south east, Common Lane (Bridleway/Byway) skirts Townend Common and Hollin Edge Height before joining a further Footpath that heads towards Bolsterstone.
- 5.36 The long distance Recreational Route of the Barnsley Boundary Walk follows the escarpment of Hunshef Bank to the north of Stocksbridge.

Perceptual Aspects

- 5.37 The site's close relationship with the surrounding built-up area and its associated elements have an influence on the site. As a consequence, the site does not exhibit any pronounced sense of tranquillity or any notion of wildness, in comparison for example to the evident sense of wildness and tranquillity displayed within the moors of the Peak District.

Associations

- 5.38 The site is not subject to any specific cultural associations such as notable artists or writers, or prominent events in history.

Landscape Value: Summary

- 5.39 In summary:
- The site, and the local landscape, does not lie with a landscape led quality designation. It lies outside of the Peak District National Park and the local designation of "*Areas of High Landscape Value*". It is considered that the site plays no significant role within these landscapes.
 - The gently rising landform to the south of the site, together with intervening elements of vegetation and the built-up area of Stocksbridge, prevent any significant visibility between the site and the Peak District.
 - The site contains no significant or unusual landscape features and is subject to agricultural management in the form of grazing land. Whilst the gritstone walls are of some local landscape and conservation value they are in varied condition.
 - The site forms part of an open agricultural landscape of grazing fields alongside within the context of-the settlement edge of Stocksbridge and Deepcar. It is influenced to some degree by its relationship with the modern residential area of Carr Road and Royd Lane that border and overlook the site.
 - The site does not have any marked sense of scenic quality, tranquillity or wildness and is not used for any formal or informal recreation.
 - The Grade II Listed buildings at Royd Farm lie adjacent within the residential area of Carr Road, whilst the Local Wildlife Site of Fox Glen borders the site to the north.
 - It is judged that the site and the immediate landscape is of **medium landscape value**. The site is not considered to be of high landscape value, nor is it judged to be a "valued landscape" in the context of the NPPF.

VISUAL AMENITY

- 5.40 The baseline visual study includes an understanding of the area in which the Proposed Development may be visible, the groups of people who may experience views, the viewpoints where they may be affected and the nature of these views.

Visual Receptors

- 5.41 Visual receptors include residents; users of public rights of way, open spaces and recreational facilities; highways users; and people at their place of work. In general, the first two categories (residents and rights of way users) are normally of higher susceptibility to change although the surrounding context can, in some cases, have a bearing on susceptibility. The availability of views of the site for visual receptors has been undertaken in parallel with the baseline landscape study. This has determined those visual receptors within the landscape that have views of the site, taking into account factors such as landform, vegetation and buildings that determine the extent of actual visibility across the landscape.

Visibility Mapping

- 5.42 The baseline studies examine visibility through field work and by an analysis of the Proposed Development's Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) (**Figure 8**). As explained earlier, the ZTV is a desk based exercise that treats the world as 'bare earth' and only takes into account landform. The baseline site fieldwork has reviewed those additional elements within the landscape (such as woodland, hedges and buildings) that determine the actual visibility of the site.
- 5.43 A series of viewpoints have been selected to represent those receptors that have views of the site (**Viewpoints 1-13, Figures 10-16**). Photographs were taken in September 2016. Although these were taken in the late summer months, where vegetation has an effect on the levels of visibility across the landscape, this has been taken into account when arriving at the overall conclusions on the level of effects.
- 5.44 The Visual Amenity Plan (**Figure 9**) identifies the visual receptors that have been considered. The following provides a summary of the key findings of the baseline studies.

Residents

Carr Road-Royd Lane-Hollin Busk Lane

- 5.45 There are residential properties on Carr Road and on the edge of Royd Lane and Hollin Busk Lane that have views of the site. It was not possible to obtain views from these properties as they are private views, although **Viewpoints 1-5 (Figure 10-12)** are broadly representative of the context that is experienced for these receptors.
- 5.46 As illustrated by **Viewpoint 1, Figure 10** (which is taken from the southern section of Carr Road) views are gained of the southern part of the site, together with views of the wider landscape to the west. Components of the view include housing at Hollin Busk Road, woodland at Fox Glen, and the escarpment at Hunshelf Bank. Some residents (receptors) at the northern end of Carr Road (see **Viewpoints 2-3, Figures 10-11**) have views of the site, although visibility is restricted in places by intervening mature trees and buildings at Royd Farm.

- 5.47 Those residents that directly border the site at Royd Farm, for example, experience close range views of the site, although vegetation around their properties provides some filtering of the view.
- 5.48 **Viewpoint 4, Figure 11** is largely representative of the context that is experienced for residential receptors on the edge Royd Lane, near the junction with Carr Road- Hollin Busk Lane. Views are gained of the site, alongside views of the wider agricultural landscape to the north and west. Components of the view include housing at Hollin Busk Lane-Hollin Busk Road, Broomfield Lane and Broomfield Grove. Woodland is visible at Fox Glen and more distant views are observed of the valley slopes and higher land at Hunshelf Bank.
- 5.49 **Viewpoint 5, Figure 12** is taken from Hollin Busk Lane on the edge of the built-up area. This is broadly representative of the context that is experienced for those receptors looking east towards the site and Carr Road. Views of the site are gained together with views of housing at Broomfield Lane and Carr Road. There are more distant views of the escarpments at Wharncliffe Crags and Hunshelf Bank.
- 5.50 Aside from close range and localised views for residents that border the site or within its immediate vicinity, there are no views of the site for the vast majority of the residential receptors in Deepcar or Stocksbridge.
- 5.51 As a consequence of its elevated position within the landscape some receptors (residents) on the northern edges of the Bolsterstone have views down the valley slopes. This includes views of the built-up area of Stocksbridge within the valley and distant views of the escarpment at Hunshelf Bank. The site is effectively obscured by the intervening feature of Cockshot Hill and by rises in the landform at Cockshot Lane and Folderings Lane.
- 5.52 There are a few individual properties that are situated on higher land at Hunshelf Bank. And, as a result, they afford wide ranging views. Looking across the valley the site is distant (Hill Top Farm, for example is 1.6km away) and observed as minor component within the much wider expansive view of the built up area Stocksbridge and Deepcar. **Viewpoint 7, Figure 13**, demonstrates the general view that is experienced from Hunshelf Bank.

Right of Way Users

- 5.53 There is very limited visibility of the site from the circular Public Footpath that runs through Fox Glen. For the most part the Footpath is located within the lower lying section of the woodland with mature trees effectively preventing views out towards the site and the wider landscape. There are, however, one or two locations (as illustrated by **Viewpoint 6, Figure 12**) where there are gaps in the tree line that allow receptors close range views of the site's northern most field and filtered views of housing on Carr Road.
- 5.54 From the Public Footpath that crosses Stocksbridge Golf Course, the site is effectively hidden by overlapping mature trees within the Golf Course and by roadside vegetation along Cockshot Lane. Further containment is created by the built-up area of Royd Lane. As the route reaches Round Hill (in the vicinity of Walders Low) there are opportunities for more elevated views across the wider landscape with distant views of higher land at Hunshelf Bank (see **Viewpoint 7, Figure 13**). The built-up area of Deepcar and Stockbridge is visible, albeit filtered by tree cover.
- 5.55 The site is visible to varying degrees on the Footpath that heads south of Bolsterstone. In places the site is obscured by intervening landform, whilst along other sections of the route there are

clearer views of the site seen against the backdrop of woodland at Fox Glen and housing at Carr Road. Housing at Hollin Busk- East Whitwell is a constant component of the view, whilst the overall experience for includes the higher land north of Stcoksbridge at Hunshelf Bank. (**Viewpoint 8, Figure 13**)

Highway Users

- 5.56 There are close range views of the site for highway users that are pasings by on Hollin Busk Lane and at the junction with Carr Road-Royd Lane. Receptors travelling on Hollin Busk Lane experience transient views of the landscape, which includes the experience of open grazing fields, mature trees, woodland at Fox Glen, and housing at Bloomfield Grove and Carr Road (see **Viewpoint 10-11, figures 14-15**). The nature of the route on Carr Road includes intermittent close range views of the site together with views of existing residential properties that align the road.
- 5.57 Along an elevated section of Cockshot Lane there are open, albeit rather fleeting views of the site, as receptors descend Cockshot Hill (**Viewpoint 12, Figure 15**). The context includes the wider agricultural landscape together with built elements at Broomfield Lane and Broomfield Grove. More distant views are gained of the rising valley slopes and the escarpment of Hunshelf Bank.

Visual Amenity: Summary

- 5.58 Through the baseline analysis and fieldwork it is assessed that the visual envelope of the site is relatively limited in its extent and that the number of receptors of high susceptibility (i.e., residents and right of way users) that have clear views of the site are comparatively limited. Receptors that have clear views are judged to be:
- i) Residential receptors that are opposite the site on Carr Lane and Royd Lane, and those nearby at Hollin Busk Lane, Broomfield Lane and Broomfield Grove;
 - ii) Right of Way users on the Footpath in Fox Glen – albeit views are limited in extent to one or two locations - and those on the Footpath heading south from Bolsterstone; and
 - iii) Highway users travelling past the site or in close proximity to it on Hollin Busk Lane, Carr Lane, Royd Lane and Cockshot Lane;
- 5.59 For *all* of these receptors the actual degree of visibility varies and so does the nature and context of the view. For example, users of the Fox Glen Footpath experience occasional views of the site, but for the most part the Footpath's woodland setting prevents views of the site, whilst for nearby highway users transient views of the site are observed within the context of built elements.

6.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT- DESIGN

Development

- 6.1 The Proposed Development is explained within the Planning Statement and the Design & Access Statement (DAS). The DAS includes a number of overarching design principles and a Concept Masterplan that will be used to inform the detailed design stage of reserved matters applications.

Design Process & Green Infrastructure

- 6.2 The masterplanning process has been guided by the baseline studies of landscape character and visual amenity. It has also evolved through engagement with Sheffield City Council through the pre-application stage.
- 6.3 Design and mitigation measures are adopted and imbedded within the scheme, which includes the provision of a Green Infrastructure (GI)²⁴ framework. A purpose of which is to sensitively assimilate development into the landscape through the conservation of existing site features and the provision of new landscape habitats so that adverse impacts on landscape and visual receptors are minimised. This incorporates carefully considered design measures and landscape strategies. At the same time the Proposed Development explores opportunities for environmental improvements, such as new planting and the delivery of accessible greenspace.
- 6.4 The proposed GI is identified on the Concept Masterplan and the Green Infrastructure Indicative Principles Plan (**Figure 17**). The purpose of this latter plan is to illustrate the overarching design character of the GI, and to help guide the detailed landscape design as part of reserved matters applications.
- 6.5 The Proposed Development is founded on the following landscape principles.
- i) To accord with the aspirations for good design and green infrastructure contained within the NPPF;
 - ii) To accord with the "priority" landscape guidelines of the Peak District Landscape Strategy;
 - iii) Minimising impacts on landscape and visual receptors by:
 - a) Locating the built elements of the development close to the built edge of Carr Road and Royd Lane, so that new housing is observed within the existing context of the residential area.
 - b) Having regard to the development's relationship with the surrounding landscape. This includes, for example, the interface with the Listed Buildings on Carr Road and woodland at Fox Glen.
 - c) Using an appropriate scale, mass and height for new buildings that is comparable to existing buildings, and adopting a select palette of locally distinct materials and recessive colours that would assist in assimilating buildings within this landscape context;
 - d) Using a 'ground up' approach to masterplanning whereby the site's landscape features are conserved and enhanced. This includes the retention of the site's field pattern and the stone walls to inform the residential layout. Although the site's walls vary in age, condition and value, this approach would: "*protect the historic field pattern*" which is a "*priority action*" of the *Enclosed Gritstone Uplands* Landscape. Whilst the context of these walls would be different, i.e. they would be located within the setting of new housing as opposed to open grazing fields, they would form an integral part of the development. They would be located within corridors of open space providing informal recreational routes to and from the main areas of open

²⁴ Green Infrastructure: A network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities [NPPF]

space, as well as providing biodiversity opportunities through the planting of new species rich hedgerows and broadleaved trees.

- e) Acknowledging and responding to the Core Strategy Policy (CS72) by locating new housing alongside the existing built-up area and establishing broad areas of accessible open space within the southern and western parts of site. The westernmost field would be designed as a new recreational space that can connect with the accessible woodland at Fox Glen. This would accord with the aspiration of the "*Green Network*" (UDP Policy GE10). Furthermore, this can be designed and managed so that it delivers biodiversity benefits through the provision of new species rich grassland and broadleaved planting. This would meet a "*priority action*" of the *Enclosed Gritstone Uplands* which is to: "...*conserve or restore the biodiversity of pastoral farmland*" and the landscape guideline of: "*manage and enhance the diversity of agricultural grasslands.*" New tree planting would connect with the established woodland of Fox Glen and help to filter and 'soften' views of new housing.
- f) Delivering a range of new landscape habitats to maximise on-site biodiversity. To include, the planting of broadleaved woodland trees on the western boundary, species rich hedgerow planting along Hollins Busk Lane, and the creation of varied species diverse grassland to include appropriate mixes around the drainage feature.
- g) Where there are losses in landscape features, such as part of the boundary wall and hedgerow on Carr Road to accommodate the proposed access, the GI proposals will provide compensatory new walls, trees and hedges.
- h) To explore opportunities in which to further 'green' the residential layout with the use of street trees and native shrubs and hedges for front gardens;
- i) The detailed design of the GI and the selection of species – which can be based upon locally occurring species common to this landscape- would be developed through the reserved matters applications and can be agreed with the LPA; and
- j) To ensure there is an appropriate mechanism in place that covers the long-term maintenance and management of the GI. This could be dealt with through a Landscape & Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), or similar, that can be addressed through a suitably worded planning condition.

7.0 LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

Assessment of Landscape Effects

- 7.1 The Landscape Effects Table (**Appendix B**) provides an assessment of the landscape effects on receptors as a result of the Proposed Development. The LVA evaluates the level of effects during the construction phase, on completion of the development and in the longer term (10 years after completion of the development). The assessment takes into account the susceptibility to change, landscape value and the magnitude of effects.

Landscape Susceptibility to Change

- 7.2 The susceptibility to change is the ability of the landscape to accommodate change arising from the specific development proposal. In all landscapes there will be variances in susceptibility to change depending on the type of change, the development that is proposed and the receiving landscape in which the change would occur.
- 7.3 Through the baseline process, and through an evaluation of the change that is proposed, it is concluded that this landscape is tolerant of change in the form of well-planned built development. New housing would lie alongside the settlement edge and would therefore be observed in the context of existing (and largely modern) housing that is an inherent part of this landscape. The GI elements that are imbedded within the scheme, would assist in minimising impacts on landscape character. In summary, the site and the immediate landscape is considered to be of medium susceptibility to change and has the ability to absorb well-planned development.

Magnitude of Landscape Effects

- 7.4 As a consequence of the overall scale of the *Yorkshire Southern Pennine Ridge* (NCA), the level of change -and indeed the level of effect- arising from the Proposed Development upon this landscape receptor is deemed to inconsequential and no more than **Negligible**.
- 7.5 At a more local level the Proposed Development would result in an alteration to the characteristics and features upon part of the *Upland Character Area -Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West*, and part of the *Enclosed Gritstone Uplands* Landscape Type. The proposed GI framework introduces new landscape elements such as hedges, trees and drystone walls that would be characteristic of these landscapes. Given the scale of these receptors, and the comparatively limited visual envelope, much of these landscapes would not be directly affected by the Proposed Development. Impacts upon these receptors are judged to be localised in extent with the degree of landscape change on the *Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West*, and the *Enclosed Gritstone Upland* Landscape Type being **Medium -Low**.
- 7.6 Across the wider landscape of the neighbouring character and sub character areas (*Valley Character Area and Upland Landscape Areas*) and landscape type (*Slopes and Valleys and Woodlands*) (see **Figures 5-6**), it is judged that the overall key characteristics, elements and features of these receptors would not be fundamentally altered and the degrees of landscape change on these receptors are assessed as being **Low to Negligible**.
- 7.7 As a result of the alteration from agricultural use to built development it is concluded that a more pronounced magnitude of change would arise within the landscape context of the site itself. This is judged to be **High-Medium**. Whilst there would be a localised level of change and an adverse

level of effect this would be tempered by the fact that the Proposed Development would occur within a settlement edge landscape, that already exhibits similar built characteristics.

Landscape Effects: Construction

- 7.8 It is expected that all construction works would be carried out in accordance with best practice procedures to minimise adverse impact on landscape character and the site's landscape elements. This will include appropriate methods to protect retained trees and hedgerows following guidance contained within BS 5837²⁵.
- 7.9 The landscape effects during the construction phase on the extensive landscape receptor of the NCA Profile are assessed as being **Negligible**.
- 7.10 The more marked effects during the construction phase would be restricted to direct effects upon a relatively small component of the *Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West* Character Area and the *Enclosed Gritstone Uplands* Landscape Type (which are assessed as being **Moderate-Minor Adverse**) and more particularly the site itself, which is judged to be **Major-Moderate Adverse**. Whilst there would be level of harm these effects would be temporary in nature and would be over the short term in duration.

Landscape Effects: On Completion

- 7.11 It is judged that the direct impacts on the landscape would be restricted to that of the site with some indirect effects on the immediate landscape around it. The combined elements of woodland at Fox Glen, the built-up of area Broomfield Grove-Carr Road-Royd Lane-Hollin Busk Road, and rising land at Cockshot Hill results in the site having a relatively contained nature, such that it is considered that would be no marked landscape impacts upon the wider landscape.
- 7.12 As an outcome of the Proposed Development there will be a loss of the site's agricultural fields. It is concluded that the loss of the agricultural fields would be adverse, permanent and irreversible- albeit they are commonplace elements within this landscape. Although the westernmost field would no longer be under agricultural use it will be planted with species rich grassland and would form an 'open' green field on the edge of the development, that could, potentially, revert to managed grazing land.
- 7.13 The Proposed Development would result in some disruption in the site's landscape fabric with the loss of some boundary features on Carr Road to facilitate the construction of a new vehicular access. There will be some removal of parts of the site's stone walls to accommodate the infrastructure required for development, such as streets, footways and drainage features etc. These impacts have been factored into the overall evaluation alongside the design and mitigation measures that have been adopted. This includes the retention of the majority of the site's drystone walls as integral elements of the design (which meets the landscape guideline of the *Enclosed Gritstone Uplands* Landscape Type) and having regard to the scheme's interface with surrounding mature trees and woodland at Fox Glen. Environmental benefits include new accessible greenspace for play and recreation and the introduction of new habitats that are characteristic of this landscape, such as broadleaved woodland, trees and hedgerows and new/restored stone walls. These elements can be suitably managed in the long term through various mechanisms such as the adoption of a Landscape & Ecological Management (LEMP).

²⁵ BS5837, Trees in Relation to construction.

- 7.14 It is judged that on the completion of the Proposed Development the impact on the site would result in a **Moderate Adverse** landscape effect. In the longer term, the GI would be delivering a series of maturing habitats. In conclusion it is assessed that the landscape effects on the site would reduce to **Moderate - Minor Adverse**. Whilst there would remain a degree of harm, effects would be localised in their extent, whilst the GI would be providing environmental benefits through accessible greenspace and habitat creation.

8.0 VISUAL EFFECTS

Assessment of Visual Effects

- 8.1 The Visual Effects Table (**Appendix C**) provides an assessment of the visual effects on receptors as a result of the Proposed Development. The LVA evaluates the level of effects during the construction phase, on completion of the development and in the longer term (10 years after completion of the development). The assessment takes into account the susceptibility to change, the value of views and the magnitude of effects.

Visibility Mapping

- 8.2 The baseline fieldwork has reviewed the ZTV and those elements within the landscape such as existing woodland, hedges, trees and buildings that determine the *actual* degree of site visibility. This results in a refined Representative Visual Envelope (RVE) (**Figure 9**). The RVE identifies the potential area of the landscape in which the Proposed Development is likely to be visible for those visual receptors that are within that area. It is recognised that some views may potentially occur outside the RVE (such as from receptors at Hunshelf Bank, for example), although it is assessed that distance and intervening elements, together with the surrounding built-up area are likely to reduce the perceptibility of the Proposed Development. Similarly, those receptors within the RVE are likely to experience different degrees of visibility. Additionally, the amount of time over which the Proposed Development will be seen may also differ.

Visual Receptors & Photographs

- 8.3 It is assessed that the most sensitive receptors that would have a degree of change and effect would be residents and right of way users. These are of high susceptibility to change.
- 8.4 The Visual Amenity Plan (**Figure 9**) identifies a number of visual receptors (A-J) that have been assessed. In the main, photographs are representative of the experience for these receptors although some are taken from specific locations where there are opportunities in which to view the site and the Proposed Development. The photographs (**Figures 10-16**) assist in the judgments on the level of change and effects.

Visual Effects: Construction

- 8.5 Inevitably those visual receptors that have full views of the site, such as residents on Carr Road, will experience close range views of general construction activity. This would include construction vehicles and associated machinery, site compounds, earthworks and ground modelling etc. It is expected that all construction works would be carried out in accordance with best practice procedures to protect and to minimise, as far as practicable, adverse impacts on visual amenity during the construction phases.

- 8.6 Effects on the various receptors during the construction phase are contained within the Visual Effects Tables (**Appendix C**). In summary, none of these effects would be permanent and would be over the short term in duration.

Visual Effects: On completion

- 8.7 The following summarises the key findings from the Visual Effects Table. It focuses on those receptors identified as having the greatest level of change and effect. A full analysis of *all* of the visual receptors is addressed within the Visual Effects Table.

Residents

Carr Road-Royd Lane

- 8.8 Close range views would be gained of the Proposed Development for residents on the edge of Carr Road (Receptors A) and Royd Lane (Receptors B). The extent and nature of these views would vary depending on location. As demonstrated by **Viewpoints 2-3 (Figure 10-11)** some residential receptors would have close range views of new housing and the access junction. Elsewhere, residents on the southern part of Carr Road would experience views of new housing seen behind areas of intervening greenspace and trees. Wider views of the landscape towards Hollin Busk and the higher land of Hunshelf Bank would remain. Effects for receptors A-B (Carr Road-Royd Lane) are judged to be **Major-Moderate Adverse** on completion, reducing to **Moderate Adverse** in the longer term on account of the maturing GI.

Hollin Busk Lane- Broomfield Lane

- 8.9 The Proposed Development would be visible for those residents on the edge of Hollin Busk Lane-Broomfield Lane (Receptors C). They would have views of the development's western and southern areas of open space with new housing seen alongside the wooded edge of Fox Glen and against the backdrop of existing housing on Carr Road (see **Viewpoint 5, Figure 12**). The intervening woodland at Fox Glen, would prevent and obscure views of the site for those residents at Broomfield Lane and Broomfield Grove. Effects on receptors C (Hollin Busk Lane-Broomfield Lane) are considered to be **Moderate Adverse** at the outset, lessening to **Moderate-Minor Adverse**.
- 8.10 For *all* of these surrounding residential receptors (A-C) views of existing built features are part of their context. Residents on the edge of Carr Road and Royd Lane have views of housing at Broomfield Grove and housing at Hollin Busk Lane, and similarly, residents at Hollin Busk Lane, experience views of housing at Broomfield Grove, Carr Road and Royd Lane. Whilst new development would be apparent, it would not be a completely uncharacteristic element as it would be observed within the context of existing built features that are already evident within this landscape.
- 8.11 It is concluded that the approach adopted by the Concept Masterplan and its GI framework delivers a sensitive and appropriate design solution that would minimise visual impacts upon these receptors. It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect, but would not result in any unacceptable long term harm on these receptors. Effects would lessen over time on account of the GI framework of new planting that would filter and 'soften' views of the built form.

Rights of Way Users

- 8.12 There would be some views of the Proposed Development from one or two locations of the Public Footpath within Fox Glen (Receptors D, **Viewpoint 6, Figure 12**). From these vantage points, new housing would be observed behind an area of intervening green space and new tree planting. For much of the route -and indeed for those using the informal routes that criss-cross the wood - views of the development would be prevented by existing mature woodland. In conclusion, effects on these receptors is judged to be **Moderate Adverse**, reducing to **Minor Adverse**.
- 8.13 For Footpath users venturing through Stocksbridge Golf Course -and indeed for users of the Golf Course -views of the Proposed Development would effectively be filtered and obscured by intervening and overlapping trees within the Golf Course and along Cockshot Lane. There would be some minor glimpsed views of the Proposed Development (upper parts of housing and roof line) from elevated sections of the Footpath, near Walders Low. These would be observed as a minor component of the view within the wider context of existing built elements in Deepcar and Stocksbridge that are apparent (**Viewpoint 7, Figure 13**). Effects on these receptors is judged to be **Minor Adverse**, reducing to **Negligible**.
- 8.14 Along sections of the Footpath that runs south of Bolsterstone (Receptors F) views of the Proposed Development would be afforded. These would be observed within the context of existing built features that are already evident, such as housing at Hollin Busk Lane, Broomfield Lane and Broomfield Grove (**Viewpoint 8, Figure 13**). Proposed tree cover along the site's western boundary would connect with woodland at Fox Glen, such that views of the built form would be filtered and 'softened' by tree cover. The much wider view of the Hunshelf Bank escarpment that is experienced would not be significantly affected. Effects on these receptors is judged to be **Moderate-Minor Adverse**, reducing to **Minor Adverse**.
- 8.15 From the elevated vantage point on the Barnsley Boundary Walk (Receptors G, **Viewpoint 9, Figure 14**) at Hunshelf Bank, the Proposed Development would form a rather minor component within the much wider panoramic view of the urban area of Deepcar and Stocksbridge. It is concluded that the Proposed Development would not result in any significant change in the viewing experience. Effects on these receptors is judged to be **Minor Adverse**, reducing to **Negligible**.

Highway Users

- 8.16 The predominate receptors on Hollin Busk Lane are highway users. These receptors are inherently of lower susceptibility to change as they are travelling at speed through the landscape, affording transient and fleeting views. There would be full and close range views of the Proposed Development as they pass the site (**Receptors H, Viewpoint 10-11, Figures 14-15**). It is considered that the approach adopted in terms of the Concept Masterplan delivers a sensitive and appropriate design solution that would minimise the level of visual effects upon these receptors. New housing would be set back from the road behind areas of open space with groups of trees and hedges (to include tree planting along the western boundary) filtering and 'softening' views of the built form. Furthermore, new housing would be experienced within the context of other built elements that are visible, such as housing at Broomfield Grove, Carr Road and Royd Lane.
- 8.17 Whilst the Proposed Development would be visible from Cockshot Lane (Receptors I) this would be over a comparatively short duration. (see **Viewpoint 12, Figure 15**). The much wider view that is

afforded looking north to Hunshelf Bank would not be significantly affected. In addition new housing would be seen within the context of existing properties at Broomfield Grove and Broomfield Lane that are apparent in the view.

- 8.18 Close range views of the Proposed Development would be observed for those highway users travelling past the site on Carr Road (Receptors K). Views of new housing would be seen fleetingly within the context of existing residential properties that form part of the route's character. It is reasoned that the new road junction -whilst clearly a new feature -would be experienced by these receptors as a typical highway element common to a residential area.
- 8.19 It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect, but no unacceptable long term harm on these receptors (H-J), which are judged, in any event, to be of limited sensitivity. Effects on these receptors is judged to be **Moderate-Minor Adverse**, reducing to **Minor Adverse**.

9.0 SUMMARY

- 9.1 In conclusion, it is assessed that the site's landscape character has the ability in which to absorb development of the scale and type proposed, as presented by the Concept Plan. The Proposed Development of well-designed locally distinct new homes, attractive streets and a varied GI of open space and new broadleaved planting is considered to be an appropriate design approach within this landscape context.
- 9.2 It is considered that the design and mitigation approaches adopted by the Proposed Development, through its masterplanning approach and GI provision would minimise impacts on landscape and visual receptors. In conclusion it is judged the Proposed Development would not result in any unacceptable long term landscape and visual harm on landscape character and visual amenity.

Appendix A

Landscape and Visual Appraisal – Methodology and Assessment Criteria

Introduction

The methodology for the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) undertaken for the proposed development is detailed in the LVA report. The following information should be read in conjunction with this methodology.

As advised in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition) (GLVIA3), the judgements made in respect of both landscape and visual effects are a combination of an assessment of the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of the landscape or visual effect. The following details the definitions and criteria used in assessing sensitivity and magnitude for landscape and visual receptors.

Where it is determined that the assessment falls between or encompasses two of the defined criteria terms, then the judgement may be described as High/ Medium or Moderate/ Minor etc. This indicates that the assessment lies between the respective definitions or encompasses aspects of both.

Landscape

Landscape Sensitivity

Landscape receptors are assessed in terms of their 'Landscape Sensitivity'. This combines judgements on the value to be attached to the landscape and the susceptibility to change of the landscape from the type of change or development proposed. The definition and criteria adopted for these contributory factors is detailed below.

There can be complex relationships between the value attached to landscape receptors and their susceptibility to change which can be especially important when considering change within or close to designated landscapes. For example, an internationally, nationally or locally valued landscape does not automatically or by definition have a high susceptibility to all types of change. The type of change or development proposed may not compromise the specific basis for the value attached to the landscape.

Landscape Value

Value can apply to a landscape area as a whole, or to the individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of the landscape. The following criteria have been used to categorise landscape value. Where there is no clear existing evidence on landscape value, an assessment is made based on the criteria/ factors identified below (based on the guidance in GLVIA3 paragraph 5.28, Box 5.1).

- Landscape quality (condition)
- Scenic quality
- Rarity
- Representativeness
- Conservation interest
- Recreation value
- Perceptual aspects
- Associations

| Landscape Value | Definition |
|------------------------|---|
| High | Landscape receptors of high importance based upon factors of quality, rarity, representativeness, conservation interest, recreational value, perceptual qualities and associations. |
| Medium | Landscape receptors of medium importance based upon factors of quality, rarity, representativeness, conservation interest, recreational value, perceptual qualities and associations. |
| Low | Landscape receptors of low importance based upon factors of quality, rarity, representativeness, conservation interest, recreational value, perceptual qualities and associations. |

Landscape Susceptibility to Change

This means the ability of the landscape receptor (overall character type/ area or individual element/ feature) to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline position and/ or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies. The definition and criteria for the assessment of Landscape Susceptibility to Change is as follows:

| Landscape Susceptibility to Change | Definition |
|---|---|
| High | A highly distinctive and cohesive landscape receptor, with positive characteristics and features and no or very few detracting or intrusive elements. Landscape features intact and in very good condition and/ or rare. Limited capacity to accept the type of change/ development proposed. |
| Medium | Distinctive and more commonplace landscape receptor, with some positive characteristics/ features and some detracting or intrusive elements. Landscape features in moderate condition. Capacity to accept well planned and designed change/ development of the type proposed. |
| Low | Landscape receptor of mixed character with a lack of coherence and including detracting or intrusive elements. Landscape features that may be in poor or improving condition and few that could not be replaced. Greater capacity to accept the type of change/ development proposed. |

Magnitude of Landscape Effects

The magnitude of landscape effects is the degree of change to the landscape receptor in terms of its size or scale of change, the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration and reversibility. The table below sets out the categories and criteria adopted in respect of the separate considerations of Scale or Size of the Degree of Change and Reversibility. The geographical extent and duration of change are described where relevant in the appraisal.

Scale or Size of the Degree of Landscape Change

| Scale or Size of the Degree of Landscape Change | Definition |
|--|---|
| High | Total loss of or substantial alteration to key characteristics / features and the introduction of new elements totally uncharacteristic to the receiving landscape. Overall landscape receptor will be fundamentally changed. |
| Medium | Partial loss of or alteration to one or more key characteristics / features and the introduction of new elements that would be evident but not necessarily uncharacteristic to the receiving landscape. Overall landscape receptor will be obviously changed. |
| Low | Limited loss of, or alteration to one or more key characteristics/ features and the introduction of new elements evident and/ or characteristic to the receiving landscape. Overall landscape receptor will be perceptibly changed. |
| Negligible | Very minor alteration to one or more key characteristics/ features and the introduction of new elements characteristic to the receiving landscape. Overall landscape receptor will be minimally changed. |
| None | No loss or alteration to the key characteristics/ features, representing 'no change'. |

Reversibility

| Reversibility | Definition |
|----------------------|---|
| Irreversible | The development would be permanent and the assessment site could not be returned to its current/ former use. |
| Reversible | The development could be deconstructed/ demolished and the assessment site could be returned to broadly its current/ historic use (although that may be subject to qualification depending on the nature of the development). |

Visual

Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

Visual sensitivity assesses each visual receptor in terms of their susceptibility to change in views and visual amenity and also the value attached to particular views. The definition and criteria adopted for these contributory factors is detailed below.

Visual Susceptibility to Change

The susceptibility of different visual receptors to changes in views and visual amenity is mainly a function of; firstly, the occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and secondly, the extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focussed on the views and visual amenity they experience.

| Visual Susceptibility to Change | Definition |
|--|---|
| High | <p>Residents at home with primary views from ground floor/garden and upper floors.</p> <p>Public rights of way/ footways where attention is primarily focussed on the landscape and on particular views.</p> <p>Visitors to heritage assets or other attractions whose attention or interest is likely to be focussed on the landscape and/ or on particular views.</p> <p>Communities where views make an important contribution to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents.</p> <p>Travellers on recognised scenic routes.</p> |
| Medium | <p>Residents at home with secondary views (primarily from first floor level).</p> <p>Public rights of way/ footways where attention is not primarily focussed on the landscape and/ or particular views.</p> <p>Travellers on road, rail or other transport routes.</p> |
| Low | <p>Users of outdoor recreational facilities where the view is less important to the activities (e.g. sports pitches).</p> <p>Travellers on road, rail or other transport where views are primarily focussed on the transport route.</p> <p>People at their place of work where views of the landscape are not important to the quality of the working life.</p> |

Value of Views

The value attached to a view takes account of any recognition attached to a particular view and/ or any indicators of the value attached to views, for example through guidebooks or defined viewpoints or references in literature or art.

| Value of Views | Definition |
|-----------------------|--|
| High | A unique or identified view (eg. shown as such on Ordnance Survey map, guidebook or tourist map) or one noted in literature or art. A view where a heritage asset makes an important contribution to the view. |
| Medium | A typical and/ or representative view from a particular receptor. |
| Low | An undistinguished or unremarkable view from a particular receptor. |

Magnitude of Visual Effects

Magnitude of Visual Effects evaluates each of the visual effects in terms of its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration and reversibility. The table below sets out the categories and criteria adopted in respect of the Scale or Size (including the degree of contrast) of Visual Change. The distance and nature of the view and whether the view will be permanent or transient are also detailed in the Visual Effects Table.

| Scale or Size of the Degree of Visual Change | Definition |
|--|--|
| High | The proposal will result in a large and immediately apparent change in the view, being a dominant and new and/ or incongruous feature in the landscape. |
| Medium | The proposal will result in an obvious and recognisable change in the view and will be readily noticed by the viewer. |
| Low | The proposal will constitute a minor component of the wider view or a more recognisable component that reflects those apparent in the existing view. Awareness of the proposals will not have a marked effect on the overall nature of the view. |
| Negligible/ None | Only a very small part of the proposal will be discernible and it will have very little or no effect on the nature of the view. |

Level of Effect

The final conclusions on effects, whether adverse or beneficial, are drawn from the separate judgements on the sensitivity of the receptors and the magnitude of the effects. This overall judgement is formed from a reasoned professional overview of the individual judgements against the assessment criteria.

GLVIA3 notes, at paragraphs 5.56 and 6.44, that there are no hard and fast rules with regard to the level of effects, therefore the following descriptive thresholds have been used for this appraisal:

- **Major:** A Major landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change;
- **Moderate:** A Moderate landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change;
- **Minor:** A Minor landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change;
- **Negligible:** A Negligible landscape or visual effect based on an evaluation of the susceptibility and value of the receptor, combined with the magnitude of change.

Where it is determined that the assessment falls between or encompasses two of the defined criteria terms, then the judgement may be described as, for example, Major/ Moderate or Moderate/ Minor. This indicates that the effect is assessed to lie between the respective definitions or to encompass aspects of both.

| LANDSCAPE EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Landscape Receptor | Judged Sensitivity of Landscape | | Judged Magnitude of Landscape Effect | | Commentary | Overall Effect at Construction Phase | Overall Effect upon Completion | Overall Effect at 10 Years post Completion |
| | Susceptibility to Change | Landscape Value | Scale or Size of the Degree of Change including degree of contrast/integration at Stages of Project | Where applicable, are the effects reversible? | | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None |
| | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | High Medium Low Negligible None | Yes No N/A | | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial |
| Natural England, National Character Area Profile (NCA) 37: Yorkshire Southern Pennine Ridge | High-Medium-Low Variations will occur across the NCA. Within the context of the site it is considered to be Medium | High-Medium-Low Variations will occur across the NCA. Within the context of the site it is considered to be Medium | Construction: Negligible Completion: Negligible 10 years post Completion: Negligible | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site forms a very small part of the NCA which covers a substantial area of the landscape. Change and effects would on the NCA would be inconsequential, and limited to a very small part of the NCA that lies within the context of existing built development and highway infrastructure There would be no impacts upon the vast majority of the NCA. It is assessed that the overall key characteristics and features across this wider substantial character area would not be fundamentally changed, and that the Proposed Development would not lead to any substantial impacts and consequential effects on the NCA. | Negligible | Negligible | Negligible |

| LANDSCAPE EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Landscape Receptor | Judged Sensitivity of Landscape | | Judged Magnitude of Landscape Effect | | Commentary | Overall Effect at Construction Phase | Overall Effect upon Completion | Overall Effect at 10 Years post Completion |
| | Susceptibility to Change | Landscape Value | Scale or Size of the Degree of Change including degree of contrast/integration at Stages of Project | Where applicable, are the effects reversible? | | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None |
| | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | High Medium Low Negligible None | Yes No N/A | | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial |
| Peak District National Park | High-Medium-Low Variations will occur across the Peak District. Overall, it is considered to be High . | High-Medium-Low Variations will occur across the Peak District. Overall it is considered to be High . | Construction: Negligible-None Completion: Negligible-None 10 years' post Completion: None | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site lies outside of the Peak District National Park. As demonstrated through the visual analysis, the rising topography to the south of the site at Cockshot Hill, together with intervening vegetation, effectively prevent clear views of the site from the closest parts of Peak District. The site plays no inherent role in the Peak District landscape. Whilst there are some opportunities to view the landscape of from higher vantage points within the Peak District, such as to the west of Stocksbridge at Salter Hills, for example, the site itself is effectively obscured by a combination of landform, intervening vegetation and by the built-up area of Stocksbridge. Any views of the Proposed Development would be observed within the context of the built-up area. It is assessed that the overall key characteristics and features across the National Park would not be fundamentally changed, and that the Proposed Development would not lead to any substantial impacts and consequential effects on the NCA. | Negligible-None | Negligible-None | None |

| LANDSCAPE EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Landscape Receptor | Judged Sensitivity of Landscape | | Judged Magnitude of Landscape Effect | | Commentary | Overall Effect at Construction Phase | Overall Effect upon Completion | Overall Effect at 10 Years post Completion |
| | Susceptibility to Change | Landscape Value | Scale or Size of the Degree of Change including degree of contrast/integration at Stages of Project | Where applicable, are the effects reversible? | | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None |
| | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | High Medium Low Negligible None | Yes No N/A | | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial |
| <p>Sheffield Preliminary Landscape Character Assessment</p> <p>Upland Character Area- Upland Rolling Slopes and Valleys to the West</p> | <p>High-Medium-Low-</p> <p>The LCA does not provide a judgment on susceptibility to change. Variations will occur across the LCA. Within the context of the site it is judged to be Medium</p> | <p>High-Medium-Low</p> <p>The LCA does not provide a judgment on value. Variations will occur across the LCA. Within the context of the site it is judged to be Medium</p> | <p>Construction: Medium-Low</p> <p>Completion: Medium-Low</p> <p>10 years' post Completion: Low-Negligible</p> | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site lies within part of this larger Landscape Character Area (LCA). There would be an impact as a result of the permanent loss of the agricultural fields within the site, and some disruption in the site's landscape elements to accommodate the Proposed Development. Whilst there would be level of change and adverse effect at the outset this would be limited in extent to a comparatively small part of the LCA. Furthermore, this part of the LCA is a settlement edge landscape that is influenced by existing built elements, such that the Proposed Development of new housing would be observed within that context, and, as a result, would not be an uncharacteristic element within this part of the landscape receptor. It is considered that much of the wider LCA would not be changed and effected, and that there would be no substantial impacts and consequential effects upon the wider characteristics of the LCA. | Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse-Negligible |

| LANDSCAPE EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Landscape Receptor | Judged Sensitivity of Landscape | | Judged Magnitude of Landscape Effect | | Commentary | Overall Effect at Construction Phase | Overall Effect upon Completion | Overall Effect at 10 Years post Completion |
| | Susceptibility to Change | Landscape Value | Scale or Size of the Degree of Change including degree of contrast/integration at Stages of Project | Where applicable, are the effects reversible? | | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None |
| | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | High Medium Low Negligible None | Yes No N/A | | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial |
| <p>Peak District Landscape Assessment</p> <p>Dark Fringe Landscape Character Area-Enclosed Gritstone Uplands</p> | <p>High-Medium-Low-</p> <p>The LCA does not provide a judgment on susceptibility to change. Variations will occur across the LCA. Within the context of the site it is judged to be Medium</p> | <p>High-Medium-Low</p> <p>The LCA does not provide a judgment on value. Variations will occur across the LCA. Within the context of the site it is judged to be Medium</p> | <p>Construction: Medium-Low</p> <p>Completion: Medium-Low</p> <p>10 years' post Completion: Low -Negligible</p> | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site lies within part of this larger Landscape Character Area (LCA) and Landscape Type (LT) There would be an impact as a result of the permanent loss of the agricultural fields within the site, and some disruption in the site's landscape elements to accommodate the Proposed Development. Whilst there would be level of change and adverse effect at the outset this would be limited in extent to a comparatively small part of the LCA/LT. Furthermore, this part of the LCA/LT is a settlement edge landscape that is influenced by the existing built elements, such that the Proposed Development of new housing would be observed within that context, and, as a result, would not be an uncharacteristic element within this part of the landscape receptor. The "priority" landscape guidelines of: "Protect and maintain historic drystone walls", and: "manage and enhance the diversity of agricultural grasslands" are adopted by the development's green infrastructure framework. Walls are retained, whilst the site's westernmost field is enhanced with new species rich grassland. It is considered that much of the wider LCA would not be changed and effected, and that there would be no substantial impacts and consequential effects upon the wider characteristics of the LCA. | Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse-Negligible |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>Site and its immediate context</p> | <p>Medium</p> | <p>Medium</p> | <p>Construction: High-Medium</p> <p>Completion: High-Medium</p> <p>10 years' post Completion: Medium</p> | <p>No</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and mitigation measures are adopted and imbedded within the scheme, which includes the provision of a Green Infrastructure (GI) framework. A purpose of which is to sensitively assimilate development into the landscape through the conservation of existing site features and the provision of new landscape habitats so that any adverse impacts on landscape and visual receptors are minimised. This incorporates carefully considered design measures and landscape strategies. At the same time, the Proposed Development explores opportunities for environmental improvements, such as new planting and the delivery of accessible greenspace. The mitigation approach includes a landscape framework that incorporates the conservation of the site's existing landscape elements in addition to new habitats such as broadleaved trees, hedges, and an appropriate landscape design with regards to the interface with woodland at Fox Glen. • Through the baseline process, and through an evaluation of the change that is proposed, it is concluded that this landscape is tolerant of change in the form of new built development. New housing would lie alongside the settlement edge and would be observed in the context of existing (and largely modern) housing that is an inherent part of this landscape. The GI elements that are imbedded within the scheme would assist in minimising impacts on landscape character. • As an outcome of the Proposed Development, there will be a loss of the site's agricultural fields. It is concluded that the loss of the agricultural fields would be adverse, permanent and irreversible, albeit they are commonplace elements within this landscape. • The Proposed Development would result in some disruption in the site's landscape fabric with the loss of some boundary features on Carr Road to facilitate the construction of a new vehicular access, and the removal of parts of the site's stone walls to accommodate the infrastructure required for development, such as streets, footways and drainage features etc. These impacts have been factored into the overall evaluation alongside the design and mitigation measures that have been adopted. In terms of minimising impacts, this includes the retention of the majority of the site's drystone walls as key elements of the design (which meets the landscape guideline of the Enclosed Gritstone Uplands Landscape Type) and having regard to the scheme's interface with surrounding mature tree and woodland at Fox Glen. • Environmental benefits include new accessible greenspace for play and recreation, and the introduction of new habitats that are characteristic of this landscape, such as broadleaved woodland, trees and hedgerows and new/restored stone walls. | <p>Moderate Adverse</p> | <p>Moderate Adverse</p> | <p>Moderate-Minor Adverse</p> |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|

| LANDSCAPE EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Landscape Receptor | Judged Sensitivity of Landscape | | Judged Magnitude of Landscape Effect | | Commentary | Overall Effect at Construction Phase | Overall Effect upon Completion | Overall Effect at 10 Years post Completion |
| | Susceptibility to Change | Landscape Value | Scale or Size of the Degree of Change including degree of contrast/integration at Stages of Project | Where applicable, are the effects reversible? | | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None | Major Moderate Minor Negligible None |
| | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | High Medium Low Negligible None | Yes No N/A | | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial | Adverse Beneficial |
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is judged that on the completion of the Proposed Development the impact on the site would result in a Moderate Adverse landscape effect (i.e. an effect that will markedly change the existing landscape, but may retain or incorporate some characteristics/features currently present). In the longer term, the GI would be delivering a series of maturing habitats and, in conclusion, it is assessed that the landscape effects on the site would reduce to Moderate - Minor adverse. Whilst there would remain a degree of harm, effects would be localised in extent, whilst the GI would be providing environmental benefits through accessible greenspace for recreation, and biodiversity gains through habitat creation. It is concluded that there would be no unacceptable long term landscape harm on the site. | | | |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| A | Residents Carr Road (VP 1-3) | High | Medium | Adjacent | Full | Construction: High-Medium Completion: High-Medium 10 years' post completion: Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was not possible to obtain views from these properties as they are private views, although Viewpoints 1-3 are broadly representative of the context that is experienced for these receptors on Carr Road. As illustrated by Viewpoint 1, which is taken from the southern section of the road, views are observed of the southern part of the site, together with views of the wider landscape to the west. Components of the view including housing at Hollin Busk, woodland at Fox Glen and the escarpment at Hunshelf Bank. Some residents (receptors) at the northern end of Carr Road (see Viewpoints 2-3) have views of the site, in addition to more restricted views to the west as consequence of the natural containment formed by woodland at Fox Glen. Tree cover and buildings around Royd Farmhouse obscure, in places, views across the site. Residents that directly border the site at Royd Farmhouse and have close range views of the site, although vegetation around the property boundaries provide some filtering of the view. Close range views would be gained of the Proposed Development for residents on Carr Road. The extent and nature of these views would vary depending on location. Those residents on the southern part of Carr Road would observe views of new housing together with areas of open space within the southern part of the site, that will enable wider views across the landscape to the west to be retained. Elsewhere, as demonstrated by Viewpoints 2-3, close range views of new housing would be observed, together with the scheme's new access junction. It is considered that the approach adopted in terms of the masterplan and landscape framework is a sensitive and appropriate design solution that would minimise the visual effects upon these receptors. In the longer term, new tree planting within the site -which includes additional planting around Royd Farmhouse – would, for example, assist in 'softening' views | Major-Moderate Adverse | Major-Moderate Adverse | Moderate Adverse |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| | | | | | | | <p>of the built form. There are, in places, views of existing built features (e.g. housing at Broomfield Grove seen through the tree line of Fox Glen, buildings at Royd Farmhouse, and properties to the west at Hollin Busk Lane) such that new development, whilst evident, would not be a completely uncharacteristic element within this landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect on these receptors but would not result in any unacceptable long term harm on these receptors. | | | |
| B | Residents Royd Lane (VP 4) | High | Medium | Adjacent | Full | Construction: High-Medium Completion: High-Medium 10 years' post completion: Medium | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was not possible to obtain views from these properties as they are private views, although Viewpoint 4 is broadly representative of the context that is experienced for residential receptors on Royd Lane, near the junction with Carr Road- Hollin Busk Lane Views are observed of the site, together with views of the wider landscape to the north and west. Components of the view include housing at Hollin Busk Lane, Broomfield Lane and Broomfield Grove, in addition to woodland at Fox Glen, and the escarpment at Hunshelf Bank. Close range views would be gained of the Proposed Development. Receptors would observe new housing set back behind areas of greenspace, with views of the development's open space along the southern frontage of the site. Views of the landscape to the west toward Hollin Busk and the higher land of Hunshelf Bank would remain. It is considered that the approach adopted in terms of the masterplan and landscape framework is a sensitive and appropriate design solution that would minimise the visual effects upon these receptors. These receptors have views of existing built features, such as housing at Broomfield Lane and Broomfield Grove. New housing would be seen within that context and would not be a completely uncharacteristic | Major-Moderate Adverse | Major-Moderate Adverse | Moderate Adverse |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| | | | | | | | <p>element within this landscape. In the longer term, new tree planting around the perimeter of the housing area and within area of open space would assist in 'softening' views of the built form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect on the receptors overall experience, but would not result in any unacceptable long term harm on these receptors. | | | |
| C | Residents Hollin Busk Lane- Broomfield Lane (VP 13) | High | Medium | Varies VP 13 is | Full | Construction: Medium Completion: Medium 10 years' post Completion: Medium Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was not possible to obtain views from these properties as they are private views, although Viewpoint 5, taken from Hollin Busk Lane on the edge of the built-up area is broadly representative of the context that is experienced for those receptors looking east. Views of the site are experienced, seen beyond intervening fields. Components of the view include housing at Broomfield Lane and Carr Road, woodland at Fox Glen, and more distant views of the escarpment at Wharcliffe Crags and Hunshelf Bank. Views would be gained of the Proposed Development for residents on the edge of Hollin Busk Lane. They would observe the development's western and southern areas of open space with new housing seen alongside the wooded edge of Fox Glen and against the backdrop of buildings on Carr Road. New housing, whilst evident, would not, therefore, be a completely uncharacteristic element within this landscape given that these receptors have views of existing built features with housing visible at Broomfield Lane, Broomfield Grove and Carr Road. In the longer term, new tree planting around the western site perimeter and within the development's open space would filter views and assist in 'softening' views of the built form. It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect on the receptors overall experience, but would not result in any unacceptable long term harm on these receptors | Moderate Adverse | Moderate Adverse | Moderate - Minor Adverse |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| D | Rights of Way Users Public Footpath, Fox Glen (VP 6) | High | Medium | Adjacent | Full-Partial | Construction: Medium-Low Completion: Medium-Low 10 years' post Completion: Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a very limited visibility of the site from the circular Public Footpath that runs through Fox Glen, and connects the residential area of Carr Road and Broomfield Grove. For the most part, the Footpath is located within the lower lying woodland area with mature tree cover preventing views out from the woodland across the landscape. There are, however, one or two locations (as illustrated by Viewpoint 6) where the route follows the edge of the wood and skirts an elevated bank where there are gaps in the tree line. Receptors afford close range views of the site's northern most field and views of housing on Carr Road to include buildings at Royd Farmhouse. There would be some Full/Partial views of the development from this location, which would new housing overlooking an area of open space within the northern part of the site. The built development is set back from Fox Glen and intervening new tree re planting would assist in 'softening' views of the built form. For much of the route, and indeed for users of the informal routes that criss-cross the wood, views of the development would be restricted and obscured by mature tree cover and by the landform character of Fox Glen. Departing from Carr Road, Broomfield Grove or at its northern edge of Wood Royd Road, receptors have an awareness of the settlement edge and the influences that this brings on the nature of their walk, such that intermittent and occasional views of new housing would not be uncharacteristic or intrusive element for these receptors as they move through the wood. It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in limited change and effect on the receptors <i>overall</i> experience, and would not result in any unacceptable long term harm on these receptors. | Moderate Adverse | Moderate Adverse | Minor Adverse |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| F | Rights of Way Users Public Footpath from Bolsterstone to Hollin Busk (VP 8) | High | Medium | Varies. VP 7 is 700m from the site) | Partial | Construction: Medium-Low Completion: Medium -Low 10 years' post Completion: Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Public Footpath runs between the village of Bolsterstone and Hollin Busk Lane. Viewpoint 8 provide a representative view of the general experience as these receptors head south through the landscape form Bolsterstone. Receptors afford distant views across the landscape towards Hunshelf Bank and the wooded Wharncliffe Craggs. Components of the view include the built-up area of Hollin Busk Lane and properties at Broomfield Grove together with foreground views of grazing land, hedges and stone walls. The site is visible to varying degrees along the route, seen alongside the woodland of Fox Glen and filtered views of properties of Carr Road. Some views of the Proposed Development would be afforded and these would be observed within the context of existing built features that form part of the experience for these receptors as they move through the landscape. As a consequence, views of new housing that would, in the longer term, be filtered by the development's landscape framework would not be an uncharacteristic element for these receptors. The much wider view that is experienced of Hunshelf Bank would not significantly affected. It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect- on certain sections of the Footpath -, but no unacceptable long term harm on these receptors. | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse |
| G | Rights of Way Users Barnsley Boundary Walk (VP 9) | High | Medium | Varies. VP 9 is 1.4km from the site. | Full-Partial | Construction: Low Completion: Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a number of Rights of Way on the escarpment of Hunshelf Bank. One of which is the long distance recreational route of the 'Barnsley Boundary Walk' that skirts the upper slopes. As consequence of its elevation, these receptors – and other rights of way receptors on this high point- experience panoramic views across the wider landscape. This | Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse | Negligible |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| | | | | | | 10 years' post Completion: Negligible | <p>includes extensive views of built up area of Deepcar and Stocksbridge in the valley and rising land to the south and east.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viewpoint 9 provide a representative view of the general viewing experience. • The site is visible -albeit it is not particularly easy to distinguish for the casual observer – and forms a minor component of the view • Views would be gained of the development with new housing seen as part of the existing built up area, forming a rather distant component of the much wider panoramic view of the urban area of Deepcar and Stocksbridge. It is considered that views of the Proposed Development would not result in any significant change in the viewing experience. Development would neither be an intrusive or uncharacteristic element given that new housing would be experienced as part of the wider built up area. • It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in very limited change and effect, and no unacceptable long term harm on these receptors. | | | |
| H | Highway Users Hollin Busk Lane (VP 10-11) | Medium-Low | Medium | Varies VP 14 is 1.6km from the site. | Full | Construction: Medium Completion: Medium 10 years' post completion: Medium-Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By and large the predominate receptors on Hollin Busk Lane are highway users and these receptors are inherently of lower susceptibility to change as they are travelling at comparative speed through the landscape, affording transient views. • Viewpoint 10-11 provide sequential representative views for receptors as they head towards the site from Hollin Busk. • Close range views of the site are experienced. This includes views of the site's field, low stone walls, woodland at Fox Glen, and intermittent views of properties at Broomfield Lane, Broomfield Grove and Carr Road. Views to the south are restricted by rising land. Distant views are gained of Hunshelf Bank on the skyline and higher land in the vicinity of Wharnccliffe | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| | | | | | | | <p>Crags. As receptors move along the route in either direction there is an awareness of the settlement within this landscape with views of residential properties at Hollin Busk Lane and those at Carr Road and Royd Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be full views of the Proposed Development as these receptors pass the site. • It is considered that the approach adopted in terms of the masterplan and landscape framework is a sensitive and appropriate design solution that would minimise the visual effects upon these receptors. • New housing, for example, would be set back from the road behind intervening areas of open space with groups of trees and hedges (to include planting along the western boundary) filtering and 'softening' view of the built form, would be observed within the context of other built elements that are apparent in the overall viewing experience, such as housing at Broomfield Grove and at Carr Road. • It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect, but no unacceptable long term harm on these receptors, which are judged, in any event, to be of limited sensitivity. | | | |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| I | Highway Users Cockshot Lane (VP 12) | Medium-Low | Medium | 200m | Full | Construction: Medium Completion: Medium 10 years' post completion: Medium-Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From Cockshot Lane, highway users only experience clear views of the site as they descend the hill and, at this location, these receptors also gain wider and more distant views across the landscape, which includes higher land of Hunshelf Bank on the skyline and the built-up area of Deepcar that is observed within the context of the site (see Viewpoint 12) These receptors are inherently of lower susceptibility to change as they are travelling at comparative speed through the landscape and consequently they afford transient views. Whilst the Proposed Development would be visible over a short duration from certain parts of Cockshot Lane, it is considered that the approach adopted in term of the masterplan and landscape framework would minimise the visual effects upon these receptors. New housing is set back behind an area of open space and tree cover and would be seen against the backdrop of woodland at Fox Glen. New housing would be observed alongside those properties at Broomfield Grove and Broomfield Lane that are apparent in the view. It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect, but no unacceptable long term harm on these receptors, which are judged, in any event, to be of limited sensitivity. | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| J | Highway Users Carr Road (VP 13) | Medium-Low | Medium | Adjacent | Full-Partial | Construction: Medium Completion: Medium 10 years' post completion: Medium-Low | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Carr Road, the nature of the route includes intermittent and close range views of the site, together with views of existing residential properties that align the road. These receptors are inherently of lower susceptibility to change as they are travelling at comparative speed through the landscape and consequently they afford transient views. Close range views of the Proposed Development would be observed for those highway users travelling past the site Views of new housing would be seen fleetingly within the context of existing residential properties that are form part of the routes character. It is concluded that the new road junction, whilst clearly a new feature, would be observed by these receptors as a rather typical highway element. It is considered that the Proposed Development would result in some change and effect, but no unacceptable long term harm on these receptors, which are judged, in any event, to be of limited sensitivity. | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Moderate-Minor Adverse | Minor Adverse |
| K | Highway Users Don Hill Height (VP 13) | Medium-Low | Medium-Low | 1.4km | Partial-Glimpsed | Construction: Low Completion: Low 10 years' post completion: Negligible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoint 13 provides a representative view from Don Hill Height on the lower slopes of Hunshelf Bank. These receptors are inherently of lower susceptibility to change as they are travelling at speed through the landscape and consequently they afford transient and views. The site is visible -albeit not particularly easy to distinguish for the casual observer as these receptors are moving at speed through the landscape. – Views would be gained of the new housing seen as part of the existing built up area and would form a rather forming a minor component of the view within the much wider panorama of the urban area. | Minor Adverse-Negligible | Minor Adverse – Negligible | Negligible |

| VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Ref | Receptor Type, Location, and Representative Viewpoints | Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | | Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects | | | Commentary | Overall Level of Effect on receptors at Construction Phase | Overall Level of Effect on receptors on completion | Overall Level of Effect on receptors 10 years post completion |
| | | Susceptibility to Change | Value of Views | Distance from site (approx. m/km) | View of Proposed Dev. i.e. nature of view | Size/Scale of Visual Change/Effect (including degree of contrast/integration) at Stages of Project | | | | |
| | | High Medium Low | High Medium Low | | Full Partial Glimpsed None | High Medium Low Negligible/None | | | | |
| | | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered that views of the Proposed Development would not result in any significant change in the viewing experience, and would neither be an intrusive or uncharacteristic element given that new housing would be experienced as part of the built form. | | | |

NB: None of the effects are judged to be reversible.