



Ricardo Ares – Summary Proof of Evidence

Ricardo Ares B.Eng (Hons) PG Dip LA CMLI

On behalf of Sheffield City Council

May 2021

Appellant : HALLAM LAND MANAGEMENT LIMITED
Appeal Site : Land at Hollin Busk, Stocksbridge, Sheffield

Planning Inspectorate Appeal Ref APP/J4423/W/21/3267168

Application Ref 17/04673/OUT

- 1.1 My Proof of Evidence addresses issues of impact on Landscape Character and Visual Amenity, and must be read alongside the evidence of my colleagues; Adam Chapman, Laura Stephens and Ruth Masood. Taken together the submitted evidence addresses the reasons for refusal relating to planning application 17/04673/OUT.
- 1.2 I first demonstrate that the Landscape and Visual impact Assessment originally submitted by the applicant fails to accurately assess the Landscape Value of the existing site and surrounding area, including that within the Green Belt. Through the examination of objective criteria, I provide analysis to establish that the site and surrounding landscape are of High Landscape Value.
- 1.3 I provide further assessment of the Sensitivity of the site to development. This is achieved by combining the Landscape Value of the site with its Susceptibility to Change. The proposed development would result in a permanent loss of significant features which define its character meaning it has a high Susceptibility to Change.
- 1.4 The magnitude of change to the site is also likely to be high should the proposed scheme go ahead. The balancing of existing landscape sensitivity against the high magnitude of change means the proposal would result in Significant Harm to the landscape character of the site and surrounding area, such that the effects to the site and immediately surrounding area Major Adverse. With no identified Landscape benefits to balance the harm to Landscape Character, I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm the Landscape Character of the site and wider area.
- 1.5 I then turn to an assessment of the likely impact on visual amenity and set out a number of limitations within the original Visual Impact Assessment. I explain how the selection and extent of visual receptors in the submitted assessment does not constitute an accurate reflection of the areas from which the development will be clearly visible. The original assessment was not also able to accurately quantify the likely change to views given no visualisations of the scheme were produced. This has compounded the error in the original assessment, and so underestimates the likely scale of impact on the overall visual amenity of receptors. I establish that the proposal is likely to result in an overall Major Adverse Visual Impact to visual receptors nearest the site, in particular those from the south of the site, and a large number of sensitive receptors to the north would experience Moderate Adverse effects.

- 1.6 With no visual amenity benefits identified as a result of the proposal going ahead, I conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to visual amenity at both local and wider levels.
- 1.7 I conclude by detailing how the proposal would result in the loss of an important visual separation between the settlements of Deepcar and Stocksbridge.
- 1.8 The proposal therefore breaches UDP Policies GE4 & LR5(l&j), Core Strategy Policy CS72, and the guidance in NPPF Paragraphs 127(c) & 170(b)