Broughton-in-Amounderness Neighbourhood Plan: Landscape/visual appraisal of small-scale housing sites

October 2017

Broughton-in-Amounderness Parish Council
Revision History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision Ref / Date Issued</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
<th>Issued to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT v1 16/10/17</td>
<td>Draft issue</td>
<td>BPC/TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT v2 17/10/17</td>
<td>Amendments following review</td>
<td>BPC/TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT v3 17/10/17</td>
<td>Minor amendments</td>
<td>BPC/TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT v4 17/10/17</td>
<td>Minor formatting changes to pdf</td>
<td>BPC/TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract

This report describes work commissioned on 15th October 2017.

Prepared by ..................................................... Nick Allin CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect

................................................................. Matt Thirsk
Assistant Landscape Architect

Reviewed by .................................................... Steve Maslen CMLI
Director, Environment

Purpose

This document has been prepared as a report for Broughton Parish Council. JBA Consulting accepts no responsibility or liability for any use that is made of this document other than by the Client for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

Copyright

© Jeremy Benn Associates Limited 2017

Carbon Footprint

A printed copy of the main text in this document will result in a carbon footprint of 289g if 100% post-consumer recycled paper is used and 367g if primary-source paper is used. These figures assume the report is printed in black and white on A4 paper and in duplex.

JBA is a carbon neutral company and the carbon emissions from our activities are offset.
Summary

This report represents an evidence-based analysis of twelve potential housing sites within the parish of Broughton, Lancashire. The analysis informs a scoring system that allows the sites to be ranked in terms of criteria related to landscape and visual matters, as well as issues such as sustainability and access. It follows recommendations provided by the Examiner during the preparation of the Broughton-in-Amounderness Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan has been developed by a Steering Group comprising Parish Councillors and residents of Broughton.

During the Plan consultation process, the importance of Broughton’s rural setting and character was highlighted. With reference to future development, the Plan Vision outlines a desire to control housing to that which is appropriate to the scale and character of the village. With reference to this, the Examiner recommended that development should ‘round off the village form and not result in an intrusive projection’ in the surrounding policy-protected Areas of Separation and the surrounding countryside.

This report therefore provides a criteria-based assessment of the 12 sites in order to comply with the Examiner’s recommendations. The findings will inform revised plan proposals that will be subject to local consultation prior to resubmission to the Examiner.

Twelve sites were selected, the majority of which are within pastoral farmland to the fringe of Broughton. The exceptions are a site within a farm complex and an overgrown former football pitch. Based on the scoring above, the sites are ranked as follows, with total scores in brackets. The highest scoring sites are considered to be the most suitable when assessed against the criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Overall score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=1</td>
<td>Former football pitch</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=1</td>
<td>Former football pitch and land to rear of Broughton Club</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No. 522 Garstang Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land to rear of Broughton Club</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Helms Farm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land to rear of Broughton Social Club (extended site)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land south of Whittingham Lane</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=7</td>
<td>Field W of Garstang Road</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=7</td>
<td>Sandy Gate Lane</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=8</td>
<td>Land north of Old Hall Farm</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=8</td>
<td>Land south of Dobson’s Farm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Keyfold Farm</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the four highest scoring sites (G, H, B and E) scored appreciably more than those ranked below. This generally reflects the reduced sensitivity of the landscape; proximity to the settlement edge; more limited views from public or private receptors; and lack of influence from heritage elements or on valued historic views. In non-landscape and visual terms, these sites were relatively close to local services and raised fewer issues or constraints in terms of access and vehicle movements.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

JBA Consulting was commissioned to provide landscape and visual professional services in relation to the preparation of housing development policy within the emerging Broughton-in-Amounderness Neighbourhood Plan. The village of Broughton lies approximately 5km north of the centre of Preston. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) is Preston City Council.

The Localism Act 2011 introduced the right for communities to undertake neighbourhood planning. This includes the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans, which set out policies in relation to development, the use of land and the determination of planning applications.

Broughton-in-Amounderness Parish Council are in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, which will encompass the area within the civil parish boundary (Figure 1). The Plan has been developed by a Steering Group comprising Parish Councillors and local residents. It underwent consultation between May 2016 and February 2017 prior to Examination in August 2017. The Examiner's report made a number of recommendations, which the Council will incorporate prior to further consultation and resubmission of the Plan to the Examiner during late 2017.

Subject to approval, the Council will arrange for a referendum on the plan. Provided that more than 50% of responding residents support the Plan, it will become part of the statutory Development Plan for Broughton, along with the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and the Preston Local Plan.

The approved plan will provide a vision, objectives and policies for the Parish that will guide development and shape the future of the village to 2026.

1.2 Context to this report

During the Neighbourhood Plan consultation process, the importance of Broughton’s rural setting and character was highlighted. With reference to future development, most respondents felt that there was sufficient housing available and 80% considered that any further provision for housing should be in developments of under 20 units.

This was reflected in the Vision for Broughton, outlined in the Plan. Of relevance to this report is the following:

A revitalised Broughton Village that:

- Has retained its rural setting, and distinct physical identity from Preston Urban Area through stringent control of development within Open Countryside areas, and maintenance of extensive areas of separation between it and Preston Urban Area to the south.
- Has grown, in the main, organically, through small scale development catering for local needs and carefully controlled to that appropriate to the scale and character of the village, excluding large scale estate housing.
- Takes pride in the quality of its natural and built environment, exercising careful control over the quality of new development and in the way it manages its public realm and green infrastructure.
As such, the submitted Plan proposed a modest relaxation of the restrictions placed on development by the Preston Local Plan. This informed draft Neighbourhood Plan Policy RESE1, which provided criteria against which application of up to 20 dwellings were to be assessed, including the character and appearance of the village; the rural setting; residential amenity; and areas intended to protect areas of separation between settlements in the Local Plan. The policy was also accompanied by two broad locations as ‘opportunities’ for small-scale housing.

Policy RES1 relied on draft Policy NE1 Key Public Views, which were predominantly oriented towards the south, from roads and public footpaths, and therefore heavily restricting development along the southern settlement boundary. Policy NE1 was considered by the Examiner to be based on inadequate evidence and he recommended it be deleted.

The Examiner also considered that Policy RES1 could give rise to unplanned piecemeal development of an unacceptable cumulative scale, that could be “detrimental to the character of the fringes of the village and open countryside”. He went on to propose a number of recommendations, including a criteria-based comparative assessment of individual housing sites. In particular the Inspector noted:

*There should be a reference to the need for development to round off the village form and not result in an intrusive projection into the area of separation or open countryside*

Such criteria should aim to ensure development is also deliverable, viable and able to generate planning obligations.

Following discussion by the Parish Council with the LPA, it was agreed that it would be difficult to arrive at a specific housing requirement for the village, as a basis for a land allocation. Rather, it was proposed to identify and assesses a number of proposed housing sites where these will be heavily influenced by opportunities for rounding off the village form in a sustainable manner, as well as according with the following objectives:

- Maintenance of the rural setting and character of the village
- Safeguarding the landscape setting of key public routes, including the Guild Wheel multi-user route around Preston
- Protecting the distinctive identity of the village, including heritage assets that are of significant historic interest in understanding its development

These criteria should also be set alongside others related to plan objectives and sustainability considerations, including:

- Proximity of the site to the village centre and community activities, when accessed on foot
- Potential impacts from increased vehicle traffic on existing routes
- Potential for sites to make a contribution to affordable housing needs, by virtue of their size.

Twelve sites were selected (refer to Figure 1). Ten of the twelve sites are broadly similar in character, being pastoral farmland to the fringe of settlement. The exceptions are site A (Helms Farm), which comprises a farm complex; and site G (also part of site H), which is an overgrown former football pitch.
This report provides an assessment of proposed sites against landscape and visual criteria, along with other objectives, in order to comply with the Examiner’s recommendations. The findings will inform the selection of sites to be carried forward in the neighbourhood plan.

2 Planning policy context

This section provides an overview of policy relevant to the application site. National policy sets the wider context of landscape, whilst local policy provides a framework that informs the sensitivity of key elements, highlights issues specific to the site and how these may be considered in relation to the overall planning balance.

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) must be taken into account in the determination of planning applications. The NPPF sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

Underpinning the NPPF is the importance of the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 7 outlines the three dimensions that contribute: economic, environmental and social. With particular reference to this plan, the importance of creating a high quality built environment that reflects the community’s needs and supports health, social and cultural well-being is noted as part of the social dimension. One aspect of the environmental role of planning is...contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity...

Paragraph 9 states that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life...including (inter alia):

- Moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains in the future
- Replacing poor design with good design
- Improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure

Paragraph 17 outlines the 12 core planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Of relevance to this scheme are 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...recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;
- contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework;
Section 7 is titled **Requiring Good Design**, which is considered as a ... *key aspect of sustainable development... and should contribute positively to making places better for people.* Planning decisions should ensure that (Paragraph 58) developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
- respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Paragraph 61 states:

> Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

### 2.1.1 Planning Practice Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework is accompanied by a suite of web-based Planning Practice Guidance documents that provide advice on many aspects of the planning process. Sections particularly relevant to this report include those on:

- Design
- Natural environment, including Landscape

Within the **Design** section, the importance of good design is highlighted.

> Good design is an important part of sustainable development. Achieving good design is about creating places, buildings, or spaces that work well for everyone, look good, last well, and will adapt to the needs of future generations. Good design responds in a practical and creative way to both the function and identity of a place. It puts land, water, drainage, energy, community, economic, infrastructure and other such resources to the best possible use – over the long as well as the short term.

The PPG states the importance of places that are safe, equally easy to use for all and responds in a practical and creative way to both the function and identity of a place. Places should have multiple benefits to encourage a healthier environment. Furthermore, development should seek to promote character in townscape and landscape by responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development. The successful integration of development with their surrounding context is an important design objective. This includes integrating it into the wider area, reduces impacts on nature and views, as well as considering views into and out of the site. The scale of developments
should be considered, with reference to avoiding overshadowing, overlooking effects on skylines, vistas and views.

Landscape is covered within guidance on the Natural Environment, which refers to the principle that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and indicates that local plans should have policies for the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment, including landscapes, both designated and the wider countryside. The guidance refers to the use of landscape character assessment at a national and local level as a tool to help inform, plan and manage change.

2.2 Local Planning Policy

The development plan for Broughton where policies have relevance to this study comprises the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and the Preston Local Plan.

2.2.1 Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy (CLCS)

The CLCS was adopted in July 2012, covering the authorities of Preston, South Ribble and Chorley. The following policies are applicable to landscape and visual issues considered in this assessment.

Policy 5 Housing Density states:

*The authorities will secure densities of development which are in keeping with local areas and which will have no detrimental impact on the amenity, character, appearance, distinctiveness and environmental quality of an area, consideration will also be given to making efficient use of land.*

Policy 16 Heritage Assets states:

*Protect and seek opportunities to enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings by:*

1. Safeguarding heritage assets from inappropriate development that would cause harm to their significances.

2. Supporting development or other initiatives where they protect and enhance the local character, setting, management and historic significance of heritage assets, with particular support for initiatives that will improve any assets that are recognised as being in poor condition, or at risk.

3. Identifying and adopting a local list of heritage assets for each Authority.

Policy 17 Design of New Buildings states the following (inter alia):

*The design of new buildings will be expected to take account of the character and appearance of the local area, including the following:*

(a) siting, layout, massing, scale, design, materials, building to plot ratio and landscaping.

(b) safeguarding and enhancing the built and historic environment.

(c) being sympathetic to surrounding land uses and occupiers, and avoiding demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area.
(d) ensuring that the amenities of occupiers of the new development will not be adversely affected by neighbouring uses and vice versa.

(e) linking in with surrounding movement patterns and not prejudicing the development of neighbouring land, including the creation of landlocked sites.

(f) minimising opportunity for crime, and maximising natural surveillance.

(g) providing landscaping as an integral part of the development, protecting existing landscape features and natural assets, habitat creation, providing open space, and enhancing the public realm.

Policy 18 Green Infrastructure states:

Manage and improve environmental resources through a Green Infrastructure approach to:

(a) protect and enhance the natural environment where it already provides economic, social and environmental benefits

(b) invest in and improve the natural environment...[including]

iii. where it contributes to the creation of green wedges and the utilisation of other green open spaces that can provide natural extensions into the countryside.

Policy 19 Areas of Separation and Major Open Space states (with reference to Figure 1 showing Areas of Separation):

Protect the identity, local distinctiveness and green infrastructure of certain settlements and neighbourhoods by the designation of Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, to ensure that those places at greatest risk of merging are protected and environmental/open space resources are safeguarded.

Areas of Separation will be designated around the following northern settlements: (a) Broughton; (b) Goosnargh/Whittingham...

Policy 21 Landscape Character Areas states:

New Development will be required to be well integrated into existing settlement patterns, appropriate to the landscape character type and designation within which it is situated and contribute positively to its conservation, enhancement or restoration or the creation of appropriate new features.

2.2.2 Preston Local Plan

The Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD) was adopted in July 2015. Together with the CLCS (described above), this forms the development plan for all parts of the City, including Broughton.

The following policies are relevance to landscape and visual issues considered in this assessment.

Policy AD1 (b) Small scale development within Existing Villages (including the development of brownfield sites) applies to the village of Broughton. It states that development will be permitted provided it meets with the following criteria:
a) the design and scale of development is sensitive to, and in keeping with, the character and appearance of the area;

b) there would be no adverse impact on residential amenity, particularly by reason of noise, general disturbance and loss of privacy due to the activity under consideration or the vehicular/pedestrian movement it generates;

c) the proposal would not lead to an over-concentration of non-residential uses, detrimental to residential character and amenity, and; d) the proposal would not lead to an over-intensification of use of the site.

In all cases, favourable consideration will be given to proposals containing measures likely to result in an overall improvement to the environment and amenity of the area.

Policy EN1 Development in the Open Countryside, as indicated on the Proposals Map (and outside the settlement boundary to Broughton, as shown on Figure 2). It states that development, other than that permissible under policies HS4 and HS5 (which relate to affordable housing and rural worker’s dwellings respectively) will be limited to the purposes of agriculture, forestry or uses appropriate to a rural area; the re-use of rehabilitation of buildings, or “infilling within groups of buildings in smaller rural settlements”.

Policy EN2 Protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure states that development proposals should seek to protect and enhance existing green infrastructure (including woodland) as identified on the Policies Map (refer to Figure 3).

Policy EN3 – Future Provision of Green Infrastructure states (with reference to Figure 3):

All developments will where necessary:

a) provide appropriate landscape enhancements;

b) conserve and enhance important environmental assets, natural resources and biodiversity including the City’s ecological network;

c) make provision for the long-term use and management of these areas; and

d) provide access to well designed cycleways, bridleways and footpaths (both off and on road), to help link local services and facilities.

Policy EN4 Areas of Separation, refers to those areas designated on the Proposals Map (see also Figure 1), including between Broughton and the Preston Urban Area and between Goosnargh/Whittingham and Grimsargh.

It states:

Development will be assessed in terms of its impact upon the Area of Separation including any harm to the effectiveness of the gap between settlements and, in particular, the degree to which the development proposed would compromise the function of the Area of Separation in protecting the identity and distinctiveness of settlements.

Policy EN8 Development and Heritage assets states that that proposals affecting a heritage asset or its setting will be permitted where, amongst compliance with national policy and guidance, make a
positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness through high quality new design that responds to its context.

Policy EN9 Design of New Development states that all new proposals should be designed with regard to the principles set out in the Central Lancashire Design Guide SPD (see Section 2.2.3). Applications will be approved where they accord with these principles and:

*Take the opportunity to make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the area through high quality new design that responds to its context.*

**Policy EN10 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation** includes reference to the protection of features such as trees, hedgerows, ponds and streams.

2.2.3 **Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)**

The policies within the Local Plan are supported by several SPD that give further guidance on specific policy topic areas. The following SPD has relevance to this assessment.

**Central Lancashire Design Guide** (October 2012)

This SPD provides an overview of design principles that the Central Lancashire authorities will employ when considering planning proposals. Whilst it relates primarily to the design development of specific sites through the application process, it makes reference to the baseline importance of Landscape Character Assessment (through the Landscape Strategy for Lancashire, Section 3.1.2) and the requirement for site analysis to ensure that development responds appropriate to site context and specific sensitivities.

2.2.4 **Broughton-in-Amounderness Neighbourhood Plan (CLCS)**

A Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Broughton-in-Amounderness has been produced by the Parish Council, comprising Parish Councillors and local residents. The plan is being prepared under the Localism Act 2011, in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. It covers a 10-year period of 2016 - 2026, setting out a vision for the neighbourhood area and a blueprint for development that is consistent with the objectively assessed needs and expressed opinions of residents.

The preparation of the NP, in particular the recommendations following Examination, has informed this assessment. This is described in Section 1.2 above.

Following examination, a number of policies within the draft report have been recommended by the Examiner to be deleted or amended, with new policies proposed where appropriate. The following provides a brief review of policies relevant to landscape, visual and constraint issues, including a short commentary of proposed changes prior to resubmission.

**Policy NE General** relates to managing development in order to enhance and protect the rural setting of Broughton. This includes limiting built development within open countryside; maintaining the Areas of Separation (Policy EN4 in the Preston Local Plan), Green Infrastructure including wildlife corridors and ponds; protection of key public views; and minimising loss of natural features that contribute to the character of the area.
The Examiner has recommended that Policy NE is deleted, largely due to repetition of Local Plan policies.

Policy NE 1 Key Public Views identified on a plan those that were to be protected from any adverse impact of development. NE 1 has been recommended for deletion by the Examiner and is therefore not considered further in this assessment.

The Examiner has recommended that Policy NE1 is deleted, due to the lack of any evidence base to support the identification of key views.

Policy NE3 Trees relates to the importance and safeguarding of trees and hedgerows as part of the rural character of the Plan area.

The Examiner has recommended that Policy NE3 is deleted, largely due to repetition of Local Plan policies.

Policy NE4 Visual Impact of New Development in Broughton Village states that impacts from development on the defined edge of the settlement when viewed from approaching routes should be minimised by landscape screening and tree planting.

The Examiner has recommended minor amendments to the wording of Policy NE4.

Policy RES1 Broughton Village – Housing Development adjoining the defined settlement boundary states that small-scale development of up to 20 dwellings will be permitted in such locations, provided all of the following criteria are met:

The development would not, by virtue of its location, scale or design impact detrimentally on:

- the character and appearance of the village
- the village’s rural setting in particular the key public views identified under Policy NE2
- residential amenity
- the Area of Separation between Broughton and Preston Urban Area designated under Preston Local Plan Policy EN4)
- The development will offer convenient access on foot to the centre of the village.

Further to this, two small-scale housing sites were identified on the Plan.

The Examiner considered that Policy RES1 did not confirm to basic conditions, including lack of clarity and precision; lack of conformity with the development plan; and lack information regarding the identification of the two sites. As a result, the Examiner made a series of recommendations, including the requirement to undertake a criteria-based assessment of potential housing sites and the need for development to “round off the village form and not result in an intrusive projection into the area of separation and the open countryside”. These recommendations form the basis of the assessment, for which further detail is provided in Section 1.2.

Policy RES2 Broughton Village – Housing development within the Settlement Boundary stated that such development will be permitted in accordance with Local Plan Policy and a number of criteria.
The Examiner has recommended that Policy RES2 is deleted and replaced with an amended policy that incorporates elements of RES4 (not noted here), that establishes the objective of encouraging good design.

**Policy RES3 Village Housing Design** provided requirements to be satisfied, along with that set out in the Core Strategy. This included densities to be around 25 dwellings per hectare, new development to encourage walking and cycling; and retention of existing natural features such as trees and hedgerows.

The Examiner has recommended minor amendments to the wording of Policy RES3.

**Policy CF6 Improving health and well-being of the community and visitors through the Guild wheel, footpaths and bridleways** states that any proposals that would increase safety risk, destroy vistas and views and would detrimental to the use of such routes would not be permitted (refer to Figure 4).

The Examiner has recommended minor amendments to the wording of Policy CF6, as follows:

“Development which impacts on the Guild Wheel, public footpaths and bridle ways shall not have a detrimental impact on the safety of users or the landscape setting of these routes.

Proposals, which improve these facilities and benefit users will be supported in principle”.

**Policy HE General** states that the historic environment, as indicated on accompanying plans that show designated and non-designated heritage assets, should be enjoyed, sustained, conserved and enhanced through proposals that, inter alia, respect the character, appearance, setting and sense of place of such features. Heritage assets are shown on Figure 4.

The Examiner has recommended that Policies HE and HE1 are deleted and replaced with an amended General Policy that is worded below:

*The heritage assets identified in the Heritage Register in this plan shall be protected in accordance with policies EN8 and EN9 in the Preston Local Plan and national panning guidance.*

*The views shown on the map [11.4.2] below are considered to have significance in terms of the historic setting of the village. Development proposals will be considered in relation to the need to protect these historic settings and will be resisted where it results in a significant detrimental impact.”*

**Policy HE2 Gateway features** relates the creation of a strong sense of arrival when entering Broughton on the remodelled A6.

The Examiner has recommended that Policy HE2 as it reflects an aspiration rather than a policy.

The Plan includes a Heritage Register, which outlines assets those assets that are listed; those that merit heritage registration but not listing; those that are suggested for listing and those that are considered to be part of the village scape.
3 Landscape baseline and assessment of effects

This section provides a brief description of the baseline conditions for the landscape context to Broughton, as described through existing Landscape Character Assessments. The landscape character of the area under consideration can be assessed at a variety of different scales, from national to site-based. Desk-based and site-based studies considering these differing scales are outlined below.

3.1 Landscape character: baseline

3.1.1 National Character Areas

England has been divided into areas with similar landscape character, called National Character Areas (NCAs). The resulting map subdivides England into 159 NCAs and provides an overview of the differences in landscape character at the national scale. Each NCA is accompanied by a character description explaining the influences and features which determine the character of the area.

The site lies within NCA 33 Lancashire and Amounderness Plain, an area of low-lying farmland that extends from the northern edge of Liverpool around Preston and Blackpool as far north as Morecambe Bay.

NCAs are high-level, strategic assessments that cover a wide area; effects arising on the landscape would not be significant at this scale. However, the information provided in the NCA descriptions is helpful in providing high-level guidance in relation to landscape management and opportunities. Each NCA description includes a number of Statements of Opportunity (SEO), of which the following has relevance to this assessment.

SEO 3: Promote the sense of place of the coastal and inland settlements, and protect the remaining rural character of the wider landscape from further loss and change from development pressures. Manage urban fringe development to ensure that it does not negatively impact the rural character of the area, and ensure that all development is of an appropriate type and scale. Provide good green infrastructure links to enhance people’s enjoyment of and access to the varied landscapes and valuable recreational assets that the area provides.

For example, by:

- Ensuring that development respects local settlement patterns and uses traditional building materials where possible.
- Incorporating green spaces into new developments, in particular around the urban fringe. Connecting green spaces with semi-natural habitats where possible, providing communities with recreational green space and wildlife corridors.
- Managing development around the urban fringe and within rural settlements to enhance the distinctive character and countryside setting of the rural landscape.
- Encouraging landscaped buffers for any development that impacts on land outside settlement boundaries, in order to limit the effect on the landscape.
- Managing the key approach routes to the main urban centres as gateways, so as not to detract from the resort experience with generic urban expansion.
- Using an understanding of the area’s traditional and historic architecture, and its distinct patterns of settlement, to inform the appropriate conservation and use of historic buildings.
and to plan for and inspire any environmentally beneficial new development that makes a positive contribution to local character and retains key views.


Lancashire County Council—in partnership with the Countryside Agency, District Councils and others—published a comprehensive integrated landscape assessment of Lancashire. The study consists of two reports: a Landscape Character Assessment and a Landscape Strategy. 21 Landscape Types (LCT)—with a range of distinctive but generic characteristics that can recur in different areas—and 81 Landscape Character Areas (LCA)—geographically specific units with their own distinctive character—were recorded. The study has a range of applications and intended users, including LPAs where it would be used as guidance in implementing the development control process.

Broughton straddles two LCT/LCA, the approximate boundary to which runs north south along the A6.

To the east is LCT 5 Undulating Lowland Farmland, LCA 5h Goosnargh Whittingham. The description for LCA 5h notes the area as being a transition from the upland landscapes of the Bowland Fells to the agricultural Amounderness Plain. The landscape is pastoral, although is noted as being relatively open and with few trees or woodland; site observations suggest that this is less apparent around Broughton. The pressure of build development around Preston is highlighted.

The presence of woodland and tree cover is nevertheless noted in the Key Environmental features of LCT 5 which describes a “...a well wooded landscape from ground level and a patchwork of wood and pasture from raised viewpoints on the fells”. These are also described as follows in the Strategy:

- Small mixed woodlands provide important habitats and cover for wildlife and contribute to the overall appearance of a ‘wooded’ farmland. They reflect an important phase in landscape evolution when 19th century estate woods and shelterbelts were developed for game shooting.

Human influence through country houses and parklands is noted:

- Country houses, and estates are important in terms of architecture and landscape design - they indicate the county’s growing wealth in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The Strategy also notes the high pond density, particularly in LCA 5h; such ponds are stated as being of “...landscape and heritage interest, as well as valuable habitats for wildlife”.

For each LCT, the Strategy documents list a number of local Forces for Change with their implications for the landscape. Those that have relevance include the following:

- A decline in mature hedgerow and parkland trees which are a valuable ecological resource and important hedgerow boundary markers. The presence of many trees provides the impression of a well managed, healthy landscape. There is little evidence of regeneration in hedgerows or of new planting to replace existing ageing or declining trees.

- Increasing pressures for residential development on the edges of settlements...[which] influences the landscape setting and approach to these small rural settlements. Many new
developments use imported inappropriate materials such as red brick, which can be intrusive in this rural setting.

The following Strategies and Recommendations for LCT 5 have relevance to the Broughton area:

**Conserve the distinctive rural hedgerow network**, by encouraging continued hedgerow management, replanting gaps and planting of a new generation of hedgerow saplings to conserve the hedgerow network.

**Conserve country houses and parkland** as features of the landscape, by retaining traditional parkland features such as railings and veteran trees.

**Conserve the distinctive settings to rural settlements**, by ensuring new development on the edges of villages reflects the characteristic clustered form; development should be sited to retain views to landscape features and landmarks. Ribbon development should be avoided; and tree planting should be encouraged as an integral part of new development, creating links with existing woodland and the network of hedgerows.

To the east of the A6 along an approximate zone of transition between the two LCT and LCA is LCT 15 Coastal Plan, LCA 15d The Fylde. The description for LCA 15d notes the land use as being predominantly dairy farming on improved pasture. LCT 15 is described as being characterised by gently undulating or flat lowland farmland divided by low clipped hedges, with a high density of marl pit field ponds. Key environmental features relevant to the area around Broughton include the historic brick-built farms that reflect the history of the working landscape; estate plantations, shelter belts and parkland trees the provide a sense of enclosure, a backdrop to views and shelter for wildlife; and meandering rural lanes.

The following Forces for Change described for LCT 15 that are relevant to the Broughton area:

**Continued suburbanisation and large scale residential development** will create harsh edges to local villages and introduce urbanising elements into a rural landscape. It may also result in the loss of local landscape features on the edges of rural settlements such as hedges, banks and mature trees. Infill development may disrupt the characteristic spacing of traditional settlement and impinge on the setting of older buildings. All built development is likely to be prominent in this relatively open landscape. Pressure for such development is particularly intense on the fringes of the major coastal urban areas and in the vicinity of the M6 motorway corridor.

**Fragmentation of historic estates** and their associated designed parklands, trees, shelterbelts and coverts as a result of changes in land ownership and opportunities for development. This may lead to the loss or degradation of historic landmark woodlands which are key features in this relatively large scale open agricultural landscape.

**Degradation and loss of field ponds** due to...in-filling. These ponds are important cultural remnants (of the historic marl pits) and have become valuable refuges for wildlife in an intensively farmed landscape.

The following Strategies and Recommendations for LCT 15 have relevance to the Broughton area:
Conserve distinctive field patterns and related landscape features and landforms, by encouraging retention and enhancement of hedgerows and hedgerow trees, especially in relation to those of visual, historic and wildlife importance; initiate tree planting to fringes of settlements, to help screen development.

Conserve remaining field ponds, restricting infilling and loss by development; ensuring that they are retained and conserved, or new ponds created; and develop buffers around ponds to create habitats.

Enhance the distinctive character and landscape setting of rural settlement, by resisting infill development along open lanes; retaining and enhancing historic landscape features such as hedgerows and open spaces within settlements; encourage the use of local materials; new tree planting on the fringes of settlements to improve views and approaches to the built edge; retention of existing field boundaries and use as a framework for new development; and consideration of the landscape setting of historic buildings.

Restore, retain, manage and replant hedgerows and hedgerow trees, by encouraging replanting and gapping up, giving priority to those that contribute to the overall hedgerow pattern and those which provide links between hedgerows and semi-natural habitats.

3.1.3 Broughton-in-Amounderness Heritage and Character Assessment (2016)

This report, produced by AECOM, provides a summary of the history and character of the parish, based on a detailed appraisal and desk study. The character assessment considers elements such as heritage, enclosure, views and cultural associations. Key characteristics, with specific reference to this study, include the following:

- Strong rural area dominated by pastoral farming with a quiet and remote character, which generally results in a high degree of tranquility away from urban areas;
- 20th century ribbon development along the historic A6 (Garstang Road) and B5269 (Woodplumpton Lane and Whittingham Lane) with later post war development making up the largest settlement area of Broughton;
- Lowland and undulating landscape with a number of ponds, brooks, streams and ditches;
- Fields of varied size and irregular pattern, bounded by hedgerows with hedgerow trees and well-vegetated watercourses;
- Enclosure created by mature tree cover focused around residential areas, within private gardens, along streets, field boundaries and along Dean Brook and Blundel Brook;
- Strong parkland estate character within the rural landscape defined by mature scattered and avenue trees and further emphasised by estate railings;
- Network of PRoW providing access across the open farmland;
- The visual and audible prominence of the M55 and M6 through the area.

The report also considers future change on the landscape and settlement character of the village and how this might be managed. Positive aspects of the character include:

- The survival of historic buildings and structures, which provide a reference to the historical development of the area;
- Verdant character created by mature trees lining roads and within private gardens.
• Mature vegetation on screening the urban influence of Broughton from the surrounding rural landscape
• Open farmland surrounding Broughton which provides areas of separation between urban areas
• Generally large, landscaped plots and mature street trees which contribute to the green infrastructure of the area
• Enclosure provided by the quantity and maturity of hedgerows and hedgerow trees in field boundaries and alongside roads enhances the rural character of the landscape
• The public rights of way network that provides recreational opportunities across the landscape;
• Commonality in materials but differentiation between the architectural style and detailing of buildings which enhances the richness and sense of place within the area and charts the development of Broughton

Elements that are considered to be sensitive to change include heritage buildings and their settings; mature street trees, some with Tree Preservation Orders; open farmland within the green wedge that separates Broughton and Preston; parkland features; and the Guild Wheel, as a recreational resource.

A number of Character Management Principles are described. Those of most relevance to this study include:

• Conserve and protect heritage assets and their setting.
• Protect the rural character of the landscape by maintaining screening around the urban edge of Broughton
• Preserve the sense of enclosure in the landscape by maintaining hedgerow trees and trees along watercourses

3.1.4 Study area: baseline

The study area is confined to the immediate surroundings of the village of Broughton, other than a single site (ref. C) which lies around 1.3km northeast of the village crossroads, beyond the M6. Ten of the twelve sites are broadly similar in character, being pastoral farmland to the fringe of settlement, bounded by hedgerows that are sometimes overgrown or unmanaged, with frequent hedgerow trees and occasional ponds. The exceptions are site A (Helms Farm), which comprises a farmhouse with attendant, large-scale outbuildings; and site G (also part of site H), which is an overgrown former football pitch.

Key elements of the landscape character within the study area that includes the sites are as follows:

• Network of small to medium-scale pastoral fields, low-lying, flat or gently undulating; providing a rural setting to the village.
• Field bounded by hedgerows (generally dominated by hawthorn) of varying quality and condition, including sections that are trimmed, gappy or outgrown.
• Numerous hedgerow trees and isolated field trees, often large mature specimens, including oak, sycamore and ash.
• Mature trees associated with former parkland estates such as Broughton Park (now the Marriott Hotel) as isolated specimens, along with areas of woodland.

• The network of hedgerows (particularly when outgrown) and trees combining to create a strongly wooded appearance, reducing views and providing a sense of enclosure in some directions.

• Timber post-and-rail fences providing more open boundaries to some fields; also ornamental hedges and close-boarded fences to private gardens, creating a more ‘settlement fringe’ appearance.

• Localised openness, where fields are of a larger scale and with lower boundary features, allowing views as far as woodland around Broughton House and Hall; or to the more distant Bowland Fells, particularly to the north.

• Historic red-brick buildings, such as Keyfold Farm, Bank Hall Farm, often set within mature trees; older buildings clustered around the crossroads within the village.

• Influence of more modern residential development, with domestic gardens backing onto fields, including ribbon development along Whittingham Lane.

• Areas of recreational open space to the southern edge of the village, including both private (Broughton School and District Club) and public (King George Field). More recent tree planting, often formal and including conifer boundary features.

• More modern, functional farm buildings around Helms Farm.

• Small ponds, often surrounded by trees; also transient areas of wetland such as south of Broughton School.

• Presence of the bypass, with new highways infrastructure including lighting, signage, bunds.

• Areas of comparative tranquility, but also influence of traffic noise, e.g. from M6, M55 and A6.

4 Visual baseline and assessment of effects

This section provides a description of the baseline conditions for the key visual receptors. Visual receptors are people that may experience views of the landscape. These may include residents and visitors to settlements, roads, footpaths, trails, visitor facilities or particular viewpoints.

4.1 Visual qualities of the proposal site: baseline

As described in Section 3.1.4, the study area is influenced by the presence of a network of hedgerows frequently punctuated by trees, which cumulatively serve to limit views in some directions, creating localised enclosure. Views are also constrained by built form in Broughton and ribbon development along Whittingham Lane, although this accentuates any views that are available. More open views are also available in some directions, where they allow an appreciation of the wider rural context and glimpses towards the distant Bowland fells.
Key views include the following:

- From the southwestern edge of the village around the School and Sandy Gate Lane, towards Preston but generally as far as the mature trees and woodland around Broughton House, restricting onward views.
- North and south along Garstang Road, when entering or leaving Broughton to/from Preston, where mature trees provide a strong sense of character and transience from built form to parkland/rural, as well as a sense of arrival as a ‘gateway’.
- West and east from Garstang Road, around the War Memorials, across the rural ‘gap’ that lies south of the village.
- Northeast from Garstang Road, leaving the village near Helms Farm, where the open aspect allows longer-distance panoramas towards the Forest of Bowland.
- East and west along Whittingham Lane, leaving or entering the village; these views include glimpses between mature trees along the entrance to Old Hall Farm and within adjacent fields.
- From the bypass, particularly close to the northern roundabout where open views available.

Visual receptors include the following:

- Public rights of way, which are shown on Figure 5 (reference numbers relate to the Lancashire online rights of way map). These generally follow field boundaries, provide accessible amenity value to local residents as both short circular routes and linking to the wider network.
- The Preston Guild Wheel, a 34km (21-mile) cycling and walking route that encircles the city of Preston, created in 2012 and fully signposted. The route attracts around 500-600 users each weekend, whilst also offering accessible routes to the countryside for residents.
- Road users, including cyclists, motorists and pedestrians, including those walking along routes such as Garstang Road between destinations such as the Marriott Hotel, parks and schools.
- Users of recreational spaces, such as King George’s Field and playground.
- Owners and occupier of private residential dwellings.

Further to the above, the Neighbourhood Plan identifies a number of ‘significant views’ that contribute to the historic setting (11.4.2).
5 Methodology

5.1 Introduction

This study aims to assess the sensitivity of twelve sites to small- and medium-scale housing development. The context to the selection of these sites is described in Section 1.2. The individual sites are assessed in Appendix 1, supported by maps and photographs.

Specific details of schemes for each of the sites are not available, although some sites form part of larger development proposals that are subject to planning applications or appeal at the time of writing. These wider proposals have not been assessed as part of this report because they are—by virtue of their size—unsuitable for taking forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, as this would breach basic conditions.

Given the lack of detailed proposals for each site, no specific assessment of effects has been provided for each site. The outcome is the provision of a criteria-based ‘scoring system’, in order to determine the most suitable sites for development, in line with the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.

5.1.1 Outline of assessment process

The development of the scoring criteria in landscape and visual terms has informed, where appropriate, by Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd edition (GLVIA3), published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment in 2013. The process is supported by the use of viewpoints to illustrate each site, although it should be noted that both these and the scoring are not intended to provide a specific assessment for each site.

5.1.2 Assessment terminology

The process of landscape and visual assessment, as guided by GLVIA3, requires consideration of the nature of the landscape or visual receptor likely to be affected, often referred to as its sensitivity; and the nature of the effect likely to occur, which is often referred to as the magnitude of the likely change.

In order to inform the sensitivity of site or view, a number of factors should be taken into account. These might include the quality or condition of the landscape; the nature of the development proposed; or the likely recipient (receptor) of a particular view. Where relevant, this has been noted in the description of the criteria, noted below. A more comprehensive methodology behind the process of Landscape and Visual Assessment is provided in Section 5.

5.1.3 Professional judgement

GLVIA3 recognises that professional judgement is an important concept within LVIA. Whilst there is scope for quantitative measurements of some factors, in many situations the assessment must rely on qualitative judgements that are based on reasoned and informed justifications.

5.1.4 Consideration of residential receptors

The consideration of development on residential receptors is at an outline level only. Observations were made only from publicly accessible locations and/or using online aerial mapping. No access to private properties or gardens was undertaken.
5.1.5  Timing of surveys
Surveys and fieldwork were carried out in September 2017 when deciduous trees were in leaf. The effects of screening by vegetation were therefore approaching their highest. Where deemed relevant, consideration of seasonal vegetation has been given within the assessment.

5.1.6  Glossary
Some of the terms used within the assessment have a specific meaning. A glossary of these terms is provided in Appendix A. The definitions are based on those provided within GLVIA 3.

5.2  Criteria scoring methodology
Scoring criteria have been selected in order to best address the issues highlighted by the Examiner of the Neighbourhood Plan, along with other non-landscape and visual constraints that are related to sustainability and plan objectives.

For the purposes of this assessment, an indicative housing density of 25 units per hectare has been used to determine the likely yield (number of dwellings) for each site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Local Plan examiner has judged this figure to be too prescriptive, this is considered here to be appropriate as a means of determining consistency between results. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy describes densities generally in the region of 25-35 per hectare and the overall assumed density for NW Preston is 30 per hectare. Two current applications to the edge of Broughton are for densities of between 20 and 25 dwellings per hectare.

This figure of 25 dwellings per hectare has a consequential impact on the scoring for affordable housing contributions, as well as the potential effects on access and highways constraints. However, in all cases, it should be noted that the total number of dwellings indicated on each site may vary, due to site-specific characteristics.

5.2.1  Landscape condition
This relates to the physical state of the landscape, including the extent to which physical elements are represented within individual sites; the intactness of these features, and the condition of these elements. High quality elements may include intact hedgerows, managed woodland, specimen parkland trees or ponds. Lower quality elements may include post-and-wire boundary fencing, developed sites, or gappy hedgerows. Lower scoring sites are of better condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most or all landscape elements in good repair and/or quality and make a high contribution to landscape character.</td>
<td>Some landscape elements in good repair and/or quality and make a medium-high contribution to landscape character.</td>
<td>A higher proportion of landscape elements display disrepair and/or are of low quality and make a medium-low contribution to landscape character.</td>
<td>Most or all landscape elements display disrepair and/or are of low quality and make a very limited contribution or are detrimental to landscape character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 Visual/sensory/perceptual qualities

This relates to the elements that primarily appeal to the senses, relating to scenic quality, how attractive these elements may appear and how easily they may be appreciated. Elements that contribute to such qualities may also include tranquillity, the proximity of built form or settled influences, or how the site is perceived within the wider landscape, e.g. as a valued part of open views. Lower scoring sites are of better visual/sensory/perceptual quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The most attractive landscapes with valued features that make an important contribution to the wider rural setting of the village, including sites where elements are readily visible and appreciated.</td>
<td>Medium-high quality landscape with some valued features that make a contribution to the wider rural setting of the village, including sites where elements may be appreciated in certain contexts.</td>
<td>Medium-poor quality landscape with few valued features that make a limited contribution to the wider rural setting of the village, where elements are not likely to be readily visible or where they will be perceived as unattractive or detractors.</td>
<td>Poor quality landscape with little or no valued features that make a no or a very low contribution to the wider rural setting of the village, where elements are likely to be perceived as detractors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Visibility from private residential receptors.

Views from private dwellings, including gardens, invariably include a rural or valued aspect when located on the edge of settlement. As a result, proposals may result in loss of private visual amenity when located on the village fringe. The most open sites with greatest number and/or most valued views have the lowest scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open views from many properties, or in very close proximity, particularly where these views are likely to be of a rural nature and valued.</td>
<td>Some open views in certain directions, often with a rural aspect and/or in close proximity.</td>
<td>Localised views or from limited directions, and/or subject to screening from boundary features; views which may be in the context of traffic along roads.</td>
<td>Limited or no views from private dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4 Visibility from public receptors.

Views from publicly accessible locations, such as roads, footpaths and recreational areas (refer to Figure 4). Receptors that are slower-moving (such as walkers and cyclists on footpaths or the Guild Wheel) are considered to be higher sensitivity, contributing to lower scores. Those travelling at higher speeds and less concerned with the view, such as in vehicles on the bypass, are of lower sensitivity and contribute to higher scores.
5.2.5 Erosion and intrusion into countryside and/or Area of Separation (where applicable)

This criterion reflects the Examiner’s requirement that the plan should reference the need for development to round off the village form and not result in an intrusive projection into the area of separation or open countryside. The scoring references the relationship between each site and the indicative line shown in Figure 5, which is informed by the existing outline of settlement and recreational/open spaces areas. The likely level of erosion/intrusion into the Area of Separation (Preston Local Plan policy EN4, refer to Figure 1 will depend on the location of the site relative to the most sensitive areas of the designation. Lower scoring sites will result in the highest level of intrusion/erosion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant intrusion into the countryside or rural setting, outside the line indicated in Figure 5, and/or the Area of Separation, where applicable; particularly where the intrusion is within a valued or more sensitive part of the setting or designation.</td>
<td>Medium-high level of intrusion into the countryside or rural setting, outside or straddling the line indicated in Figure 5, and/or the Area of Separation, where applicable.</td>
<td>Some or limited intrusion into the countryside or rural setting, mainly within the line indicated in Figure 5, and/or the Area of Separation, where applicable. Sites where intrusion may be within less valued or sensitive parts of the setting/designation.</td>
<td>No intrusion into countryside and/or area of separation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.6 Tree Protection Orders and Local Policy Green Infrastructure Areas

Figure 6 shows the outline of areas where Tree Protection Orders are in place, as indicated on the Lancashire online mapping resource. Figure 3 indicates areas subject to Preston Local Plan policies related to Green Infrastructure and woodland, although it should be noted that no sites conflict with the latter. These policies imply some degree of policy protection to areas that may have greater visual, ecological or habitat value, although no detailed surveys of individual protected trees or woodland have been undertaken. Lower scoring sites have the highest TPO and policy constraints.
### 5.2.7 Landscape/visual relationship to valued/historic assets, features and views

This section makes particular reference to the presence and landscape context of designated and locally listed heritage assets, as outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan (refer to Figure 4). It also reflects the significant views that contribute to the historic setting, also indicated in the Plan. Lower scoring sites may result in adverse change to such views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site likely to result in significant adverse change or loss of views that have high historic significance and contribute to the wider historic landscape value of Broughton.</td>
<td>Site likely to result in medium-high adverse change or loss of views that have historic significance and contribute to the wider historic landscape value of Broughton.</td>
<td>Site likely to result in medium-low adverse change or loss of views that have historic significance and contribute to the wider historic landscape value of Broughton.</td>
<td>Site likely to result in very limited or no change to views that have historic significance and contribute to the wider historic landscape value of Broughton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non landscape/visual criteria

### 5.2.8 Distance to community facilities and public transport on foot

This criterion relates to the relative distance to service/community facilities from most of these facilities. These include café/restaurants & shops etc at the crossroads including the defined Village Centre; as well as (where appropriate) the club; playing fields, pre-school and high school; and bus stops. Sites closest to such facilities are the most sustainable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites over 1km from facilities (furthest).</td>
<td>Sites c. 500m to 1km from facilities.</td>
<td>Sites c. 300m to 500m from facilities.</td>
<td>Sites 0m to c.300m from facilities (closest).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2.9 Access constraints

Scores for this criterion have been provided with input from Parish Council representatives who have had extensive discussions with the local highway authority on local highway matters in the course of development of the bypass and consideration of local planning applications. These relate to the potential to establish safe access onto the highway network without disruption to the operation of the immediate local network or conflict with other highway users by provision of this...
access and take into account the general transport considerations set out in Preston Local Plan Policy ST2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites where there are constraints on access for which there is no identifiable solution.</td>
<td>Sites where safe access can be provided but in a form that will have a significant impact on the operation of the local network and other highway users.</td>
<td>Sites where there is an identifiable access solution that does not impact significantly on the network or other highway users and any constraints can be addressed.</td>
<td>Sites where access provision is straightforward with no significant impacts on the immediate network or other highway users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.10 Impact on network and local environment.

Scores for this criterion have been provided with input from Parish Council representatives who have had extensive discussions with the local highway authority on local highway matters in the course of development of the bypass and consideration of local planning applications. These relate to the potential to accommodate traffic generated by the development without any significant wider impact on operation of the local network (again reflecting Local Plan Policy ST2) or on local environmental quality. The lowest-scoring sites will result in the greatest adverse effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites likely to result in greatest detrimental effects on local environmental quality or traffic conditions.</td>
<td>Sites likely to result in medium-high level detrimental effects on local environmental quality or traffic conditions.</td>
<td>Sites likely to result in medium-low detrimental effects on local environmental quality or traffic conditions.</td>
<td>Sites likely to result in lowest detrimental effects on local environmental quality or traffic conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.11 Assessment against affordable housing contributions.

Scores relate to the ability of a scheme to include a significant element of affordable housing. As noted above, the number of dwellings stated for each site is indicative only, based on a figure of 25 dwellings per hectare. This is calculated on the red line boundary, but may vary due to site-specific access, environmental and technical constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
<th>Score = 2</th>
<th>Score = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site with provisionally 10 or fewer units and therefore no contribution to affordable housing.</td>
<td>Site with provisionally 11-20 units and therefore up to 6 affordable dwellings.</td>
<td>Site with provisionally 21-34 units and therefore 6-10 affordable dwellings.</td>
<td>Site with provisionally 35 and over units and therefore over 10 affordable dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Final scoring table

Table 1 below outlines the final scores for each site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual/sensory/perceptual qualities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility from private residential properties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility from Public Receptors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion of and intrusion into Countryside and/or Area of Separation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Protection Orders and Local Policy Green Infrastructure Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape/visual relationship to valued/historic assets, features and views</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE (Landscape and Visual)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RANKING (Landscape and Visual)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5=</td>
<td>7=</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7=</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5=</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to local village services/community facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe access possible onto highway network without detriment to traffic conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation of traffic without detriment to public realm or conflict with other highway users.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to meeting affordable housing needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE (non-Landscape and Visual)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RANKING (non-Landscape and Visual)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>6=</td>
<td>6=</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>4=</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>4=</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Ranking</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8=</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>11=</td>
<td>7=</td>
<td>7=</td>
<td>8=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the scoring above, the sites are ranked as follows (Table 2 below), with total scores in brackets. The highest scoring sites are considered to be the most suitable when assessed against the criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Overall score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=1</td>
<td>Former football pitch</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=1</td>
<td>Former football pitch and land to rear of Broughton Club</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No. 522 Garstang Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land to rear of Broughton Club</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Helms Farm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land to rear of Broughton Social Club (extended site)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land south of Whittingham Lane</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=7</td>
<td>Field W of Garstang Road</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=7</td>
<td>Sandy Gate Lane</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=8</td>
<td>Land north of Old Hall Farm</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=8</td>
<td>Land south of Dobson’s Farm</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Keyfold Farm</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the four highest scoring sites (G, H, B and E) scored appreciably more than those ranked below. This generally reflects the reduced sensitivity of the landscape; proximity to the settlement edge; more limited views from public or private receptors; and lack of influence from heritage elements or on valued historic views. In non-landscape and visual terms, these sites were relatively close to local services and raised fewer issues or constraints in terms of access and vehicle movements.
6 Outline methodology for landscape and visual assessment

6.1.1 Introduction

For the purposes of LVIA, the landscape is considered to be a resource in its own right, The European Landscape Convention (2000)—which is noted in GLVIA3—provides the following definition of landscape:

*Landscape means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors.*

The assessment of landscape effects considers the effects the proposed development or change will have on this landscape resource.

Landscape effects that may arise include a change, loss or addition of elements; features, aesthetic or perceptual aspects that contribute to the distinctiveness or character of the landscape.

6.1.2 Establishing the landscape baseline

To enable the assessment of the effects of a proposed development or change, the landscape baseline, or starting point must be established. This enables the identification of landscape receptors and the effects of the proposed changes on these landscape receptors can then be considered. In this study the landscape baseline studies consider the following:

**Landscape fabric** - physical landscape elements present within the landscape such as landform, land cover, boundary features and trees and woodland. Physical elements that make up the landscape we see, and that may be affected during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed development.

**Landscape character** - the distinct and recognisable pattern of elements that occurs consistently in a particular type of landscape and how this is perceived by people. It reflects particular combinations of geology, landform, soils, vegetation, land use and human settlement but also encompasses its perceptual and aesthetic qualities. It creates the particular sense of place of different areas of the landscape. Assessment of the effect of the development on landscape character is a crucial element of the landscape assessment.

**Landscape designations** - sites with landscape designations are considered in addition to the overall landscape character areas, to enable site specific judgements of effects on particularly valued sites.

These studies can then be considered in conjunction with the ZTV, to enable a list of potential landscape receptors to be compiled.

6.1.3 Determining landscape sensitivity

The next stage is to determine the sensitivity of the landscape receptors to the type and scale of development proposed. In order to do this, the *susceptibility and value* of the receptor are considered, although within the assessment these may not always be explicitly noted. In many
cases, it is considered sufficient to describe only the sensitivity, which is informed by an overall professional judgement.

**Susceptibility** is the "ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character of quality/condition of a particular landscape or area, or an individual element and/or feature or a particular aesthetic or perceptual aspect) to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline and/or the achievement of planning policies and strategies". (GLVIA3).

Where noted, susceptibility is described as follows:

- **High** – where undue negative consequences are expected to arise from the proposal.
- **Medium** – where undue negative consequences may arise from the proposal.
- **Low** – where undue negative consequences are unlikely to arise from the proposal.

Susceptibility may be informed by existing Landscape Character Assessments, which often note sensitivity. However, this is frequently 'intrinsic' or 'inherent' sensitivity, which may not directly relate to the type of development proposed. In such cases, a judgement must be made as to how this sensitivity might relate to the development in question.

The **value** of a landscape receptor is informed by designations, planning policy and documents, the contribution of special (cultural, historic or conservation) contributors or associations, scenic quality, rarity, recreational value and aesthetic, perceptual and experiential qualities. These are again reinforced by judgements, particularly where no designations are established. Conversely, care should be taken not to rely on designations as the sole indicator of value; this should be reinforced by rationale where necessary. Where noted, value is described as follows:

- **High** - landscapes with national or international designations on account of landscape value, such as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coasts or World Heritage Sites; landscapes informed by presence of significant heritage designations
- **Medium** - landscapes of local value, subject to local Planning policy protection (such as Areas of High Landscape Value), or undesignated areas where it is considered that particular features are more valued and/or appreciation of the landscape is greater than other nearby areas
- **Low** - landscapes that are not subject to designation and may be valued only at a community or local level.

It should be noted that ‘undesignated’ landscapes and the value which should be attributed to them is a complex area, potentially subject to a number of contributory factors. Landscapes that are not valued but offer visual and amenity value to local communities may not necessarily be of low sensitivity.

**Landscape sensitivity** combines the judgements made for susceptibility and value, as described above. Three levels of sensitivity are recorded:

- **High** sensitivity – a landscape of high value and a particularly distinctive character that is susceptible to relatively small changes of the type proposed;
• **Medium** sensitivity – a landscape of valued characteristics reasonably tolerant of change of the type proposed; and

• **Low** sensitivity – a landscape of relatively low value or importance which is potentially tolerant of substantial change of the type proposed.

Within the assessment, an overall assessment of sensitivity is only provided, through professional judgement, where this is considered sufficient to allow an informed assessment of the receptor.

### 6.1.4 Other landscape considerations

The considerations noted above are further informed by general observations regarding the condition and quality of the landscape. These support the overall narrative and judgement of sensitivity. Landscape quality or condition may relate to the level of management, distinctiveness, number of detracting features, pattern, unity, structure, sense of place, function, definition and aesthetic value.

Areas of landscape quality may not necessarily correlate directly with landscape character areas or designated sites as defined by statutory agencies or local planning authorities. Where it is considered that this is the case, mention is made within the description and sensitivity evaluation.

### 6.1.5 Magnitude of landscape change

Effects on landscape receptors are assessed in terms of their magnitude of change. This is a combination of the size or scale, geographic extent of the area influenced and the duration and reversibility of the impact. Within the assessment, size and scale or extent may not always be noted. In many cases, it is considered sufficient to describe only the magnitude of change, which is informed by an overall professional judgement.

Size and scale concerns the amount of existing landscape elements that will be lost, the extent to which these represent or contribute to the character of the landscape. It also relates to the degree to which aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape are altered through removal or addition of new features, such as hedge loss or introduction of tall features on skylines.

**Size and scale, where noted,** may be rated as follows:

- **Large** – major change to the existing landscape including key elements, characteristics and qualities.
- **Medium** – partial or noticeable change to key elements, characteristics and qualities.
- **Small** – some discernible but largely minor change to key elements, characteristics and qualities.
- **Negligible** – very minor or virtually imperceptible change to key elements, characteristics and qualities.

The geographical extent over which landscape effects are felt is distinct from the size or scale. For example, large scale effects may be limited to the immediate site area. Again, extent is subject to a degree of professional judgement, but where noted these may be rated as follows:
- **Wide** – influencing several landscape types or areas, beyond around 5km.
- **Medium** – generally within the local character area or up between 1 and 5km.
- **Local** – the site and immediate surrounds, up to around 0.75 to 1km.
- **Site** – within around 0.75km of the site.

The **duration** of the effect relates to the time period during which the changes to the landscape will occur. This is rated as follows:

- **Long-term** – beyond 10 years.
- **Medium-term** – 2 to 10 years.
- **Short-term** – up to 2 years.

Consideration should also be given as to whether the change is temporary or permanent.

The **magnitude of change** is a product of the size/scale, extent and duration of the impacts. This is judged as a four-point scale:

- **High** – notable and long term change in landscape characteristics over an extensive ranging to a very intensive, long term change over a more limited area.
- **Medium** – moderate, short term change over a large area or moderate long term change in localised area.
- **Low** – slight long term or moderate short term change in landscape components.
- **No change/negligible** – no discernible/virtually imperceptible change to the landscape’s resources.

Within the assessment, size and scale or extent may not always be noted. In many cases, it is considered sufficient to describe only the magnitude of change, which is informed by an overall professional judgement.

### 6.2 Baseline studies: visual

#### 6.2.1 Introduction

Visual effects relate to how the development may affect the views available to people and their **visual amenity**. Visual amenity is the visual quality of a site or area as experienced by residents, workers or visitors. Visual receptors are people that experience the view. Development can change people’s direct experience and perception of the view depending on existing context, the scale, form, colour and texture of the proposals, the nature of the activity associated with the development, and the distance and angle of view. Visual effects can be experienced through development intruding into existing views experienced by residents and day to day users of the area, and the views of tourists and visitors passing through or visiting the area.

#### 6.2.2 Establishing the visual baseline
Identification of potential visual receptors is informed by desk and field studies in conjunction with consideration of the ZTVs for the proposed development, to identify places where people might be expected to receive a view of the proposed development. Once receptors have been identified, it is necessary to document the following information, though the degree of detail required will vary depending on the nature of the receptor and the view experienced:

- Type, relative numbers and activities of potential receptors.
- The nature, composition and characteristics of the existing views, for example the nature and extent of the skyline, aspects of vertical scale and proportion, key foci, and elements which interrupt, filter of otherwise influence the view.

### 6.2.3 Determining visual receptor sensitivity

In order to determine the scale of visual effects, it is necessary, as with the assessment of landscape effects, to determine the sensitivity of the receptor. This is achieved through the consideration of the susceptibility of the receptor and the value of the view. Within the assessment, susceptibility and value may not always be noted. In many cases, it is considered sufficient to describe only the sensitivity, which is informed by an overall professional judgement.

Visual receptor susceptibility is a function of receptor type, location and activity. In assessing visual receptor susceptibility, factors such as the following have been accounted for with a degree of professional judgement:

- Receptor activities – for example, relaxing at home, undertaking leisure, recreational and sporting activities, at work.
- Movement/duration – whether receptors are likely to be stationary or moving, which influences how long they will be exposed to the change.
- Orientation – of receptors in relation to the development.
- Purpose/expectation – of receptors at that location.
- Context – the quality of the landscape.
- Importance of the view/location – popularity of location as indicated by existence of designations or local value.

The **value** of the view that is experienced may relate to associated landscape or planning designations, cultural references or the presence of facilities (car parking, interpretation boards, signage) that may emphasise importance.

In this assessment, sensitivity is judged as a combination of susceptibility and value and is ranked as follows:

- **High** – visitors to promoted or valued viewpoints especially those with panoramic views; visitors to heritage or tourism sites where views are important; viewpoints noted within planning guidance or policy; receptors to public rights of way particular those receiving high numbers of visitors or signposted trails; receptors in residential properties.
- **Medium** – receptors travelling along cycle routes or local roads particularly those in rural areas where speeds are slower.
• **Low** – receptors that are fast-moving (due to speed on roads and motorways) or because they are engaged in an activity not concerned with the landscape or view (such as work or sport).

As with all aspects of the methodology, these definitions are not rigid; where professional judgement has been applied, this would be noted in the narrative.

### 6.2.4 Visual receptor magnitude of change

The assessment of the magnitude of change on visual receptors follows similar principles to landscape assessment in terms of size or scale, the geographic extent of the area influenced and its duration and reversibility. Within the assessment, size and scale or extent may not always be noted. In many cases, it is considered sufficient to describe only the magnitude of change, which is informed by an overall professional judgement.

Size and scale concerns the relative change in the elements, features, qualities and characteristics that make up the view.

**Size and scale, where noted,** are rated as follows:

- **Large** – major change to the existing view including key elements, characteristics and qualities.
- **Medium** – partial or noticeable change to elements, characteristics and qualities within the view.
- **Small** – some discernible but largely minor change to key elements, characteristics and qualities within the view.
- **Negligible** – very minor or virtually imperceptible change to key elements, characteristics and qualities such that the view essentially remains unchanged.

Where specifically noted, the **geographical extent** over which visual effects is described as follows:

- **Wide** – influencing most of a view or receptor (over half).
- **Medium** – generally between one quarter or one half of a view or receptor.
- **Small** – generally less than one quarter of a view or receptor.
- **Limited** – generally affecting only a small part of the receptor.

The **duration** of the effect relates to the time period during which the changes to the landscape will occur. This is rated as follows:

- **Long-term** – beyond 10 years.
- **Medium-term** – 2 to 10 years.
- **Short-term** – up to 2 years.

The **magnitude of change** is a product of the size/scale, extent and duration of the impacts. These are judged as a four-point scale:

- **High** – where the development causes a very significant change in the existing view for a sensitive receptor.
• **Medium** – where the development would cause a very noticeable change in the existing view.

• **Low** – where the development would cause a noticeable change in the existing view.

• **Negligible/no change** – where the development would cause a barely perceptible change in the existing view.

### 6.3 Assessment of effects

The next step is to determine the scale of effects. This is evaluated by combining the sensitivity (or nature) of the landscape or visual receptor and the magnitude (or nature) of change. The following matrix provides an objective rationale for determining the scale of effects, in order to provide consistency and transparency to the process; however a degree of professional judgement is a key element of the evaluation.

Table 2-1: Scale of effects matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Change resulting from impacts identified</th>
<th>Sensitivity to change (nature of receptors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Change/ Negligible</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight - Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Slight - Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate - Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate - Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scale of effects detailed above can be classed as Beneficial, Neutral or Adverse.

#### 6.3.1 Classification of landscape effects

**Adverse landscape effects** occur when features or key landscape characteristics such as established planting, old buildings or structures which—when considered singularly or collectively—help to define the character of an area are lost, or where new structures out of scale or character with the surroundings are introduced.

- **Substantial adverse landscape effects** occur where the proposals are at considerable variance with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape and would be a dominant feature, resulting in considerable reduction in scenic quality and large scale change to the intrinsic landscape character of the area.

- **Moderate adverse landscape effects** occur where proposals are out of scale with the landscape, or inconsistent with the local pattern and landform and may be locally
dominant and/or result in a noticeable reduction in scenic quality and a degree of change to the intrinsic landscape character of the area.

- **Slight adverse landscape effects** occur where the proposals do not quite fit with the scale, landform or local pattern of the landscape and may be locally intrusive but would result in a minor reduction in scenic quality or change to the intrinsic landscape character of the area.

Neutral landscape effects arise when the change proposed results in no discernible improvement or deterioration to the landscape resource. The proposals sit well within the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape and/or would not result in any discernible reduction in scenic quality or change to the intrinsic landscape character of the area.

Beneficial landscape effects occur where derelict buildings, land or poorly maintained landscape features are repaired, replaced and maintained or where new features are introduced such as new tree planting which helps to define landscape structure where none currently exists. Beneficial landscape effects can be slight, moderate or substantial.

### 6.3.2 Classification of visual effects

**Adverse Visual Effects** occur when the proposed development will introduce new, non-characteristic, discordant or intrusive element/s into views.

- **Substantial adverse visual effects** occur where the proposed development would cause a considerable deterioration in the existing view or visual amenity.
- **Moderate adverse visual effects** occur where the proposed development would cause a noticeable deterioration in the existing view or visual amenity.
- **Slight adverse visual effects** occur where the proposed development would cause a barely perceptible deterioration in the existing view or visual amenity.

Neutral visual effects occur where the change proposed results in no discernible improvement or deterioration to views or visual amenity.

Beneficial visual effects occur when the proposed development would enhance the quality of the receptor's view e.g. by creating a new focal point in a degraded landscape that includes a range of existing detractors. Beneficial visual effects can be slight, moderate or substantial.

The scale indicates the importance of the effect, taking into account the sensitivity (or nature) of the receptor and the magnitude (or nature) of the effect. It is usually rated on the following scale of effects:

- **Substantial** indicates an effect that is very important in the planning decision making process.
- **Moderate - substantial** indicates an effect that is, in itself, material in the planning decision making process.
- **Moderate** indicates a noticeable effect that is not, in itself, material in the planning decision making process.
- **Slight** indicates an effect that is trivial in the planning decision making process.
- **Negligible/No Change** indicates an effect that is akin to no change and is thus not relevant to the planning decision making process.
6.3.3 Overall importance of the effects

The final step is to judge the overall importance of the effects. Effects may be described as notable in projects that are not subject to EIA. However, whilst an effect may be notable, it does not necessarily mean that such an effect would be unacceptable. Account is taken of the effect that any mitigation measures—for example planting or landform—may have in terms of minimising potentially detrimental effects or improving the landscape composition of the area.
7  Glossary

**Impact**
The action being taken - e.g. the felling of trees or the construction of the development.

**Effect**
The result of an action being taken or the change within an existing view or landscape resulting from the impact e.g. the construction of a development forming a new and dominant element within a view.

**Direct Effect**
An effect that is directly attributable to the proposed development.

**Indirect Effect**
Effects that result indirectly from the proposed project as a consequence of the direct effects, often occurring away from the site, or as a result of a sequence of interrelationships or a complex pathway. They may be separated by distance or time from the source of the effects.

**Notable Effects**
Effects which are considered material or very important within the planning decision making process.

**Landscape**
*Landscape is an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors’* (Council of Europe, 2000)

This definition was adopted by European Landscape Convention and is within GLVIA3 guidance.

**Landscape Character**
A distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that make one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse.

**Landscape Effects**
Effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right.

**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.

**Landscape Receptors**
Defined aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal.

**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.

**Magnitude or nature (of effect)**

A term that combines judgments about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short or long term in duration.

**Sensitivity or nature (of receptor)**

A term applied to specific receptors, combining judgments of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor.

**Susceptibility**

The ability of a defined landscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific proposed development without undue negative consequences.

**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 the people living, working recreating, visiting or travelling through an area.

**Visual Effects**

How the surroundings of individuals and groups of people may be specifically affected by changes in the content and character of views as a result of the change, loss or addition of elements.

**Visual Receptors**

Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal.

**Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)**

A digitally produced map, showing areas of land within which a development is theoretically visible.