

**From:** [Hope Dinah](#)  
**To:** [dcscan@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:dcscan@sheffield.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** FW: 17/04673/OUT  
**Date:** 14 January 2020 14:10:50

---

Please scan as 'Landscape Officer comments' (consultee)

Thank you

---

**From:** Foxall Jack  
**Sent:** 14 January 2020 12:19  
**To:** Hope Dinah  
**Subject:** 17/04673/OUT

Dinah

Updated summary landscape comments following review of the latest amended masterplan and applicant email response on landscape issues dated 9 Feb 2018:

I have not copied these in to scanning, as unsure what process is being followed with external consultants.

### **Landscape Impact**

No response from applicant on these initial comments:

- Para 7.3: Question if the site and immediate landscape context are of medium susceptibility to change and have the ability to absorb development. The openness, regularity and consistency of upland pasture enclosed with stone walls is a key part of this landscape. Housing development on a large scale is not compatible with maintaining these characteristics.
- Para 7.7: Question whether the magnitude of landscape change within the site and immediate context would be high-medium. Given the majority of the site would change from open, regular and consistent grazing agriculture to built development this would be a high magnitude of change?
- Para 7.10: Question whether the landscape effects during construction on the site itself would be major-moderate. Given a large part of the open agricultural site would be occupied by built development and construction activity, this would be a major landscape effect?
- Para 7.14: Question the conclusion of moderate adverse landscape effect on the site on completion, reducing to moderate-minor adverse. Given the majority of the site would be occupied by housing and associated infrastructure and domestic landscape features rather than open pasture, this would be a major landscape effect on completion. Maturing new landscape features may have an effect, but as presented, scattered tree cover and belts of trees are not characteristic of the existing landscape, particularly across contours, and at best the effect may be reduced to major-moderate over time.
- In summary, the landscape impact on the site and immediate context is potentially greater than stated.

### **Visual Impact**

Applicant response dated 9 Feb noted. However, this does not deal with some

specific issues raised, and these initial comments still stand:

- Para 8.8: Question whether the visual effect of development for receptors on Carr Road and Royd Lane would be major-moderate adverse, reducing to moderate adverse. Relative to existing open views of upland pasture, the visual effect of development for residents adjacent to and with clear views of the site would be major adverse on completion, and would remain major despite growth of new planting.
- Para 8.9: Question whether the visual impact of development for residents at Hollin Busk Lane and Broomfield Grove would reduce from moderate adverse to moderate-minor adverse. Despite growth of new planting, the site would still appear as residential development.
- Para 8.12: Question whether visual impact would reduce from moderate adverse to minor adverse for right of way receptors at Fox Glen. Some new planting is shown on this boundary on the latest revised masterplan, but the impact is likely to remain moderate adverse.
- Para 8.19: Question whether the visual impact for highway receptors H-J would be moderate-minor adverse reducing to minor adverse. Particularly close to and adjacent to the site, impact could be major adverse relative to existing views. Recommend that this impact level is amended to a minimum of moderate adverse overall for these receptors on completion.

In summary, the visual impact of development for receptors close to the site is potentially greater than stated.

### **Trees**

- T33: The proposed path junction and alignment should be amended to avoid impact on retained trees.
- G5: Impact of the proposed path link to Fox Glen on existing trees should be clarified and avoided.
- An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and tree protection proposals to BS5837 should be produced taking into account all aspects of the proposed development including level changes, hard landscape works, construction access and working areas.

### **Masterplan Layout**

- The development layout could be amended to better reflect the existing landscape structure, including buildings, roads, SUDs and landscape. Retention of stone walls as important landscape features is welcome, but built form does not reflect the landscape structure these create.
- Tree planting is welcome, but should be used more to reinforce the structure of the development and GI layout.
- Tree species selection will be important to ensure integration with the surrounding semi-rural and woodland context. This will require including a majority of large species and allowing them adequate growing conditions to develop as landscape and amenity assets in the long term.
- Detailed landscape design and specification will also be important to ensure the development reflects and enhances the semi-rural context, eg in the design of open spaces, boundaries and the form of SUDs features.
- Amendments to retain existing boundaries around the western field are

welcome. However, arrangements for combining biodiversity enhancement and recreation remain unclear, including access and public status.

- The amended plan shows a larger area of green open space in the south-west corner. This space is largely undefined and poorly overlooked, with the play space isolated from the new development and existing housing. Landscape treatment and management of the remaining space is not clear, but mown amenity grass would not complement or integrate well with the surrounding landscape.
- The development layout could be amended to integrate the play space more fully with housing and create greater overlooking. Possibly by moving this feature further north near the Suds basin to improve association with and access from other new and existing amenity areas.
- Amendments showing creation of a new strong green boundary on the south-western edge of built development appears a valid approach, effectively creating a new field boundary. However, the angled alignment of this boundary and creation of a triangular space beyond does not fit well with the surrounding landscape context. Moving this boundary to a more perpendicular alignment with surrounding fields could have a number of benefits including better integration with the surrounding enclosed landscape, omitting built development from the highest point of the site, and creation of a more functional open space.

## **Jack Foxall**

Landscape Architect

Urban and Environmental Design

Planning Service

City Growth

Sheffield City Council

---