17/04673/OUT Carr Road, Deepcar

Comments on landscape issues:

Landscape and Visual Impact

Landscape Impact

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

In summary, the landscape impact on the site and immediate context is potentially greater than stated.

Visual Impact

- Representative Visual Envelope: The ZTV plan shows that the site may be visible from areas to the west around Greave House Farm and Whitwell Moor. Also from areas to the east around Wharncliffe. However, these areas are excluded from the RVE and no viewpoints have been selected here. Impact on more distant views from Hunshelf Bank outside the RVE have been considered, but not from these locations. Recommended that additional information is provided to justify excluding these areas from visual impact analysis.
- Para 5.52: Confirmation that the site is visible from residents living on Hunshelf Bank. But views from this location are only classed as from rights of way or highway users in the rest of the report? Recommended that additional information is provided to justify excluding assessment of the impact on residential views from here.
- Para 5.58: Visual amenity summary refers only to receptors of high susceptibility with clear, close views of the site. Recommend that views from further away are also acknowledged, given a judgement needs to be made on cumulative visual impact.
- Para 8.8: Question whether the visual effect of development for receptors on Carr Road and Royd Lane would be major-moderate adverse, reducing to moderate adverse. Relative to existing open views of upland pasture, the visual effect of development for residents adjacent to and with clear views of the site would be major adverse on completion, and would remain major despite growth of new planting.

- Para 8.9: Question whether the visual impact of development for residents at Hollin Busk Lane and Broomfield Grove would reduce from moderate adverse to moderate-minor adverse. Despite growth of new planting, the site would still appear as residential development.
- Para 8.12: Question whether visual impact would reduce from moderate adverse to minor adverse for right of way receptors at Fox Glen. Little new planting is shown on this boundary on the concept masterplan and the impact would remain moderate adverse.
- Para 8.19: Question whether the visual impact for highway receptors H-J would be moderate-minor adverse reducing to minor adverse. Particularly close to and adjacent to the site, impact could be major adverse relative to existing views. Recommend that this impact level is amended to a minimum of moderate adverse overall for these receptors on completion.

In summary, more justification is required for the exclusion of visual receptors beyond the identified RVE, and additional recognition and analysis of these views may be required. The visual impact of development for receptors close to the site is also potentially greater than stated.

Trees

- T42/T44: Road and built development shown within the RPA of retained trees. Construction within RPAs of retained trees should be avoided.
- G5: Impact of the proposed path link to Fox Glen on existing trees should be clarified and avoided.
- T33: The proposed path junction and alignment should be amended to avoid impact on retained trees.
- An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and tree protection proposals to BS5837 should be produced taking into account all aspects of the proposed development including level changes, hard landscape works, construction access and working areas.

Landscape Design

- Consider amending the development layout including buildings and roads as well as SUDs and landscape to better reflect the existing landscape structure. Retention of stone walls as important landscape features welcome, but built form does not reflect the landscape structure these create.
- Tree planting welcome. But again, this should be used more to reinforce the structure of the development and GI layout.
- Tree species selection will be important to ensure integration with the surrounding semi-rural and woodland context. This will require including a majority of large species and allowing them adequate growing conditions to develop as landscape and amenity assets in the long term.
- Detailed landscape design and specification will also be important to ensure the development reflects and enhances the semi-rural context, eg in the design of open spaces, boundaries and the form of SUDs features.
- More emphasis should be given in the landscape to reflect the importance of the junction of Carr Road and Hollin Busk Lane.
- The proposed woodland belt running directly up the sloping western boundary may not be an appropriate feature given the local landscape context dominated by stone walls and open views with the Fox Glen woodland following lower ground up the valley bottom. Suggest a hedge with intermittent trees and a stone wall would be more appropriate here?

- Careful consideration of access to, ownership of and management of the western field will be vital to ensure this is a successful space. The intended public access status of this area is unclear and no access routes appear to be provided from the housing area or Fox Glen.
- Consideration should be given to an additional connection to Fox Glen to ensure this open space is well integrated with the development and to improve accessibility from the site and surrounding area.

From: Foxall Jack
To: Turner Bob
Subject: RE: 02.09.CP.BT.YK2758.DEEPCAR -LANDSCAPE RESPONSE
Date: 27 February 2018 13:10:29
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png

Hi Bob

Nothing new here. There seems to be some differences of opinion on the detail of the significance/magnitude of impacts.

Jack Foxall
Landscape Architect

Urban and Environmental Design
Planning Service
City Growth
Sheffield City Council

[redacted]

From: Turner Bob
Sent: 20 February 2018 10:58
To: Foxall Jack
Subject: FW: 02.09.CP.BT.YK2758.DEEPCAR -LANDSCAPE RESPONSE

Jack,

Please see attached response to some of the matters raised. Does this raise any new issues?

Bob

From: Clare Plant [redacted]
Sent: 09 February 2018 12:05
To: Turner Bob
Subject: 02.09.CP.BT.YK2758.DEEPCAR -LANDSCAPE RESPONSE

Bob,

Please see below, the response from our landscape consultant in relation to the questions that the Council has raised on the Carr Road, Deepcar application.

Many thanks

Clare

From: Brett Coles [redacted]
Sent: 09 February 2018 10:42
To: Clare Plant <[redacted]
Cc: Anthony Greaves <[redacted]; Kurt Goodman
[redacted]

Subject: DEEPCAR -LANDSCAPE RESPONSE

Dear Clare

CARR ROAD, DEEPCAR: 17/04673/OUT

LANDSCAPE RESPONSE

Please find below our response to the Council's email (Bob Turner, Principal Planning Officer, 8 February 2018) with regards to landscape and visual matters.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)

The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is a first step in the visual analysis. As explained within the LVA, the ZTV only considers landform and how this affects visibility. It does not take into account the screening effects created by woodland, trees and hedgerows, and by buildings and settlements. The second stage of the visual analysis is to undertake fieldwork and ground truthing. This is a more refined visibility exercise than the ZTV. The field work analyses the area in which the Proposed Development may be visible and considers the groups of people who may experience views.

Whilst land to the west around Greave House Farm and Whitwell Moor is identified within the ZTV, visibility of the site is effectively prevented by the intervening built up area of Stocksbridge. Furthermore, these receptors are of some significant distance from the site (Greaves Farm House is around 1.6km away, for example). Any views of the Proposed Development- which would be difficult to distinguish in any event because of distance and buildings in Stocksbridge - would be observed within the context of the wider built up area that is already experienced by these receptors.. Similarly, whilst Wharncliffe Crags lies within the ZTV, extensive woodland and the intervening built-up area of Deepcar would prevent and obscure views of the Proposed Development.

Hunshelf Bank

Along with public rights of way there are a few elevated properties on the escarpment at Hunshelf Bank. Similar to right of way users, these receptors are of high sensitivity. Whilst it was not possible to obtain views from these properties -as they are private views- Viewpoints 9 and 13 of the LVA give an indication of the visual context that is experienced looking south across the valley. The Proposed Development would form a minor component within the much wider panorama of the urban area of Deepcar and Stocksbridge. It is considered that new housing would not be an uncharacteristic element within that context as it would be observed within - and as part of -the built up area. It is judged that there would be no significant change in the viewing experience, and effects on these few residential receptors would be the same as rights of way users, i.e. Minor Adverse at the outset and reducing to Negligible in the longer term.

Visual Receptors

Paragraph 5.58 of the LVA concludes that the visual envelope of the site is comparatively limited in its extent. Clear views of the site are localised to those visual receptors within its immediate context, e.g. residents on Carr Lane and highway users on Hollin Busk Lane. Other visual receptors within the local and wider landscape that have views of the site, such as footpath users walking south from Bolsterstone to Hollin Busk

(Receptors F), have been considered and are addressed within the LVA.

Visual Effects (paras 8.8, 8.9, 8.12 and 8.18 of the LVA)

The comments on the above paragraphs are noted, but they do not alter the conclusions reached by the LVA. The level of effects are a combination of the sensitivity of the receptors (e.g. highway users are generally of lower sensitivity than residents and rights of way users) and the magnitude of effect, alongside professional qualitative judgement. Professional judgment is a very important part of the LVA process as expressed by GLVIA3 (Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition 2013). The process takes into account the scale and degree of change, and the design and mitigation measures of the Proposed Development. This includes the location of built development within the site, 'offsets' from landscape and built components, and a green infrastructure framework of retained landscape features and new landscape habitats.

Relationship with existing trees

The application is in outline and matters of layout are reserved for future determination. Through the detailed stages the built layout will be designed to ensure that built elements do not encroach onto the root protection areas of mature trees. And that those mature trees, hedges and walls that are to be retained will be appropriately and sensitively conserved.

Kind Regards,

Brett Coles MRTPI | Director
BA(Hons), Dip TP, Dip LA Landscape Architecture

fpcr | FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, Lockington Hall, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2RH
[redacted]www.fpcr.co.uk

¦ masterplanning & urban design ¦ environmental assessment ¦ landscape ¦ ecology ¦ architecture ¦ arboriculture

Offices also at: Addlepool Business Centre, Clyst St George, Exeter. EX3 ONR. 01392 874499
Unit 8 Dunley Hill Court, Dunley Hill Farm, Ranmore, Dorking. RH5 6SX. 01483 282523
The National Agri-Food Innovation Campus, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ. 01904 406112

Job Ref:

FPCR Environment and Design Ltd is a private limited company, registered in England and Wales. Company No. 07128076. Registered office: Lockington Hall, Lockington, Derby DE74 2RH. The contents of this message are confidential and are intended solely for the person or persons addressed. Any views, or opinions presented, are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd. If you are not the addressed person, be advised that you have received this message in error and notify us immediately by telephone on +44 (0)1509 672772, or reply by e-mail to the sender of this message - Exchange

From: Foxall Jack
To: Turner Bob
Subject: RE: Deepcar
Date: 13 July 2018 10:21:50
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png

Bob

I had previously questioned whether the woodland belt up the western boundary shown on the original landscape plans was appropriate, and had suggested walls and a simple hedge instead. I would favour boundary treatments more in keeping with the surrounding landscape context, so agree with ecology that boundary vegetation should be substantially reduced.

Jack Foxall
Landscape Architect

Urban and Environmental Design
Planning Service
City Growth
Sheffield City Council
[redacted]

From: Turner Bob
Sent: 09 July 2018 12:38
To: Foxall Jack
Subject: FW: Deepcar

Hi Jack,

You have previously provided comments on planning application 17/04673/OUT (Carr Rd, Deepcar).

Discussions on the proposals impact on ecology has raised an issue about whether some of the proposed hedgerows will harm the habitat value of the retained field for birds and its potential for providing mitigation (see Richard's email below).

Your thoughts on removing these proposed hedgerows from the proposed general landscape plan would be appreciated.

Richard (ext 34481) says he is willing to give you the background to his discussions and his thoughts on the matter.

Thanks,
Bob

From: Harris Richard
Sent: 06 July 2018 14:43
To: Turner Bob

Cc: Smith Christopher
Subject: FW: Deepcar

Hi Bob,

Further to the email below, I spoke with Kurt Goodman on Monday 2nd July. I queried a number of issues which we had already covered at our meeting in May which don't appear to have been carried forward onto the indicative plan.

1. The new hedgerows surrounding the conservation field (N & W & S). His landscape team didn't want to remove these until it was confirmed with our landscape officers that these could go. I have asked our bird ecologist to review the position and provide comments.
2. I queried what appears to be 3 hedges! separating the housing from the conservation field. This can be reduced to 1 on the housing side of the wall separating it from the conservation field.
3. The position of the wader scrape is very close to housing. The position is indicative only. I have asked our bird ecologist to review the position and provide comments.
4. Access is shown through the estate. This needs to be blocked up and access off Hollin busk lane. Kurt didn't forsee any problem with this.
5. S41 species under the NERC Act. Kurt will review this to check for any potential impacts and that enhancement is fit for purpose.
6. Graded woodland edge – maintain as habitat for white letter hairstreak butterfly

I said we hadn't seen the information from the meeting of the 30th May. He said there was a hold-up was with those dealing with the balancing facility.

He will provide an updated Hedgerow assessment sheet and clarification.

He understood the fields were being cut or grazed (and I confirmed this subsequently with a site visit).

He is carrying out a water framework directive screening assessment on the SUDS impact on the watercourse in terms of potential impacts on water quality.

This is for you information. Before this is sent to Kurt I'd need to include a bit more information for clarity.

Regards,

Richard

Ecology Manager
Parks & Countryside
3rd Floor
West wing
Moorfoot Building
Sheffield

S1 4PL
[redacted]

From: Kurt Goodman [redacted]
Sent: 23 June 2018 09:48
To: Harris Richard
Cc: Clare Plant; Brett Coles
Subject: Deepcar

Hi Richard

Further to our recent meeting, the drainage discussion and agreement seem to be reaching a conclusion. Whilst we haven't got the final drainage details or the route for the open channel through Fox Glen we have update the GI principle plan for the field to the west of the site so we can progress matters relating to this element of the GI.

Attached is a draft copy of the plan for this area for comment, so we can progress the ecology matters.

If you have any further queries or problems please do not hesitate to contact me at this office.

Regards

Kurt Goodman MCIEEM | Director
BSc(Hons) MSc

fpcr | FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, Lockington Hall, Lockington, Derby, DE74 2RH
[redacted] www.fpcr.co.uk

¦ masterplanning & urban design ¦ environmental assessment ¦ landscape ¦ ecology ¦ architecture ¦ arboriculture

Offices also at: Addlepool Business Centre, Clyst St George, Exeter. EX3 ONR. 01392 874499
Unit 8 Dunley Hill Court, Dunley Hill Farm, Ranmore, Dorking. RH5 6SX. 01483 282523
The National Agri-Food Innovation Campus, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ. 01904 406112

Job Ref:

FPCR Environment and Design Ltd is a private limited company, registered in England and Wales. Company No. 07128076. Registered office: Lockington Hall, Lockington, Derby DE74 2RH. The contents of this message are confidential and are intended solely for the person or persons addressed. Any views, or opinions presented, are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd. If you are not the addressed person, be advised that you have received this message in error and notify us immediately by telephone on +44 (0)1509 672772, or reply by e-mail to the sender of this message - Exchange

---