

9. Landscape and Visual

Introduction

- 9.1 This chapter assesses the effects of the proposed development on landscape character and visual amenity. In particular it identifies and assesses the anticipated effects of change resulting from the proposed development on the character and features of the landscape; and on people's views and visual amenity within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Study Area as defined in paragraph 9.3 below.
- 9.2 The chapter describes the methods used to assess the likely significant effects, the baseline conditions currently existing at the Site, as defined in 9.3, and surroundings, the potential direct and indirect effects of the development arising from the loss of vegetation, open ground and other landscape features and the introduction of new features, and the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce, or offset the identified significant effects and the residual effects. It has been written by Xanthe Quayle Landscape Architects.
- 9.3 The ES Chapter has been written to support two outline planning applications for residential-led mixed use development, as detailed in Chapter 5: The Proposed Development. The different areas, known as 'Application A' and 'Application B' are indicated on the Site Location Plans at Chapter 5: The Proposed Development, **Figures 1.1 and 1.2**. It is assumed that the impacts of both application areas will be the same due to the current widespread land use as predominantly agricultural land, as well as overlap in impacts arising from redevelopment proposals. In conjunction the two application areas are hereafter referred to as 'the Site' and will be assessed as a single entity.

Planning Policy Context

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 9.4 With respect to landscape and visual matters the following revised NPPF (2021) paragraphs are relevant:

Achieving Sustainable Development

7 - 14: "There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (Para 11)."

Achieving well-designed places

124 - 132: "The creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve."

Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

(174)“Proposals should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils ... recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services ... minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures”.

(175)“...distinctions between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in the Framework; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries.”

Local Planning Policy

Central Lancashire Core Strategy (adopted in July 2012)

- 9.5 Relevant Policies to this chapter are Policies 18 (Green Infrastructure), 21 (Landscape Character Areas), and 22 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity).

Policy 18 - Green Infrastructure

“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 [...] (c) secure mitigation and/or compensatory measures where development would lead to the loss of, or damage to, part of the Green Infrastructure network.”

Policy 21 - Landscape Character Areas

“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.”

Policy 22 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

“Conserve, protect and seek opportunities to enhance and manage the biological and geological assets of the area [...]”

South Ribble Local Plan 2012 – 2026 (adopted in July 2015)

- 9.6 The following policies are relevant from a landscape and visual perspective:

Policy G7 - Green Infrastructure (GI) - Existing Provision

“Development should seek to protect and enhance existing GI. The loss of GI (as identified on the Policies Map) will not be permitted unless alternative provision of similar or better facilities will be implemented on another site or the locality; or it can be demonstrated that the retention of the site is not required to satisfy

a recreational need in the local area; and the development would not detrimentally affect the amenity and nature conservation value of the site.”

Policy G8 - Green Infrastructure and Networks - Future Provision

“All development should provide appropriate landscape enhancements; conservation of important environmental assets, natural resources, biodiversity and geodiversity; for the long-term use and management of these areas; and access to well-designed cycleways, bridleways and footways (both on and off road) to help link local services and facilities.”

Policy G10 - Green Infrastructure Provision in Residential Developments

“All new residential development resulting in a net gain of five dwellings or more will be required to provide sufficient GI to meet the recreational needs of the development in accordance with provision standards. GI will normally be provided on-site. Off-site provision will be at the Council's discretion delivered by developer contributions. Standards are to be both flexible and appropriate to each development, dependent on location, whether it is for on or off-site GI provision or enhancement of existing provision. Residential developments will normally be required to meet the needs for equipped children's play areas generated by the development on site, either as an integral part of the design or through the payment of contributions which will be used to install or upgrade play facilities in the vicinity of the proposed development.”

Policy G12 - Green Corridors/Green Wedges

“Development will not be permitted in areas designated as green corridors, which would prejudice their open character, visual amenity and purpose. New development should provide new green corridors to the existing/neighbouring communities and built-up area. Green corridors can be in the form of linear areas of GI, such as footpaths and cycleways, with appropriate landscaping features such as trees, hedges and woodland.”

Policy G13 - Trees, Woodlands and Development

“Planning permission will not be permitted where proposals adversely affects trees, woodlands and hedgerows which are; protected by Tree Preservation Orders; ancient woodlands; in a Conservation Area; or within a recognised Nature Conservation Site. There is a presumption in favour of the retention and enhancement of existing tree, woodland and hedgerow cover on site; Unavoidable loss of trees will require replacement trees at a rate of two new trees for each tree lost; Appropriate management measures are required to protect newly planted and existing trees, woodlands and/or hedgerows.”

Policy G17 - Design Criteria for New Development

“Planning permission will be granted for new development provided that, where relevant to the development...the design, including internal roads, car parking, footpaths and open spaces, are of a high quality and will provide an interesting visual environment which respects the character of the site and local area; any new roads and/or pavements... should be to an adoptable standard; the proposal would sustain, conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of a heritage asset itself and surrounding historic environment; and, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on landscape features such as mature trees, hedgerows, ponds and watercourses. In circumstances where

it is considered acceptable to remove one or more of these features, then mitigation measures to replace the feature/s will be required either on or off-site."

Penwortham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 - 2026

- 9.7 The main policy of relevance to this assessment from the Penwortham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 – 2026 is Policy 2 regarding requirements for new large-scale residential development:

Policy 2 - Requirements for new large scale residential development

"The phased delivery of allocated large scale residential sites, such that each phase has a distinctive character of its own, will be supported."

Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Assessment Methodology

- 9.8 The methodology for undertaking the Landscape and Visual Assessment will follow the approach set out in GLVIA 3 and other 'best practice' documents as indicated below:
- 9.9 It has also been prepared to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/571) 'EIA Regulations', which implement European Council Directive No. 85/337/EEC as amended by Directive 2011/92/EU.
- 9.10 Reference has also been made to currently available good practice guidance relating to landscape and visual effects in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) including:
- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition published by Routledge (The Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013).
 - Visual Representation of Development Proposals (Landscape Technical Guidance Note 06/19, 2019).
 - Impact Assessment Guidelines and ES Review Criteria, Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA), 2004.

Establishing the study area and landscape baseline

- 9.11 Based on the landform, surrounding landscape and visual context a study area of 1km from the Site boundary was agreed at scoping stage.
- 9.12 The landscape baseline desk study considers:
- Landform.
 - Land cover, land use and built development.
 - Designations.

- Any identifiable special interests such as nature conservation, historical or cultural heritage associations.
- Landscape character assessments (LCA). An assessment will be made as to the suitability (scale, relevance, age etc) of existing LCAs to determine if new LCA is required.

9.13 The landscape baseline study also identifies potential landscape receptors.

9.14 The baseline description then includes establishing the value of the Site and the wider landscape.

“This means the relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society, bearing in mind that a landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons. Considering value at the baseline stage will inform later judgements about the significance of effects...A review of existing landscape designations is usually the starting point in understanding landscape value, but the value attached to undesignated landscapes also needs to be carefully considered.” GLVIA 3

9.15 The value of the landscape receptors will to some degree reflect any landscape designations, but these should not be used as the sole indicator of value. The range of factors that can help in the identification of value include:

- landscape quality (condition) which is a measure of the physical state of the landscape, including intactness and condition of elements (existing documents and other sources will be referred to when assessing landscape value and sensitivity);
- Scenic quality - how the landscape appeals to the senses;
- Rarity;
- Representativeness;
- Conservation interests, the presence of wildlife, cultural or historic features;
- Perceptual aspects such as wildness or tranquillity; and
- Associations with writers, artists, historical events etc.

Reporting on the landscape baseline

9.16 The landscape baseline then:

- Maps, describes and illustrates the character of the landscape, covering both the wider study area and the Site and its immediate surroundings;
- Identifies and describes the individual elements and aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape;
- Indicates the condition of the landscape; and
- Considers what the landscape may be like in the future in the absence of the proposal.

Predicting and describing landscape effects

- 9.17 Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape, which may give rise to changes in the landscape resource. Hence appraisal of landscape effect is concerned with:
- Direct effects on specific landscape elements; and
 - More subtle effects on the overall pattern of elements that give rise to landscape character and local distinctiveness.
- 9.18 It will determine the degree to which the existing landscape will be affected both directly and indirectly by the proposed development in terms of its current value and its sensitivity to change. The capacity of the landscape to accept change of the type and scale proposed is dependent on the form of proposed development, rather than an intrinsic attribute of the landscape.
- 9.19 The value of the landscape receptors is based on an assessment of landscape designations and whether the receptor is valued locally; it is not dependent on the form of the proposed development. This is defined in the baseline.
- 9.20 To determine the overall significance of landscape effects the separate judgements about the sensitivity of the landscape receptors and the magnitude of the landscape effects are combined to allow a final judgement to be made about whether the effect is important.
- 9.21 Sensitivity is determined through judgements about the combination of the susceptibility of the receptor (ability of the receptor to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies) with the value of receptor (as defined in baseline).
- 9.22 Determining susceptibility requires:
- Identifying the key components that are likely to be affected by the proposed development; and
 - Identifying the various aspects of the proposed development, at all stages, that are likely to have an effect on those key components.
- 9.23 The nature of landscape effects are categorised as positive, negative or neutral. Criteria used in reaching this judgment include:
- *“The degree to which the proposal fits with the existing character;*
 - *The contribution to the landscape that the proposed development may make in its own right, usually by virtue of good design, even if it is in contrast to existing character” (GLVIA 3)*
- 9.24 Baseline information is combined with the details of the proposed change or development to identify and describe the landscape effects.

- 9.25 The first step is to identify the components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the proposed development (landscape receptors), such as overall character and key characteristics, individual elements or features, and specific aesthetic or perceptual aspects.
- 9.26 The second step is to identify interactions between the receptors and the proposed development in its different stages (including construction, operation, decommissioning & restoration). Explain the reasons why all stages not considered (e.g. short construction period, no additional impacts during construction period etc).
- 9.27 Landscape effects are likely to include:
- Change / loss of elements, features or aesthetic / perceptual aspects that contribute to character and distinctiveness;
 - Addition of new elements or features that will influence the character and distinctiveness of the landscape; and
 - Combination of these changes on overall character.
- 9.28 All effects are described as fully as possible:
- Effects on individual components, such as loss of trees or buildings, or addition of new elements should be mapped; and
 - Changes in landscape character or quality/condition in particular places need to be described as fully as possible and illustrated by maps and images that make clear, as accurately as possible, what is likely to happen.
- 9.29 An informed professional judgement is made about whether landscape effects should be categorized as positive, neutral or negative and the criteria used in reaching the judgement should be clearly stated.
- 9.30 Each identified effect on landscape receptors is assessed in terms of:
- Size or scale:
- The extent of existing landscape elements that will be lost, the proportion of the total extent that this represents and the contribution of that element to the character of the landscape; and
 - The degree to which aesthetic / perceptual aspects of the landscape are altered (e.g., scale, skylines etc).
- Geographical extent of the area influenced:
- At the site level, its immediate setting, at the scale of the character area or on a larger scale (such as influencing several character areas).
- Duration and reversibility:
- Duration judged as short, medium or long term; and

- Reversibility is a judgement about the likelihood and practicality of the effect being reversed (some forms of development can be considered permanent, whilst others are reversible).

9.31 This assessment informs judgments regarding the magnitude of change, which is described as high, medium, low or negligible.

The Visual Baseline

9.32 The visual baseline establishes the area in which the proposed development may be visible, *“the different groups of people who may experience views of the proposed development, the places where they will be affected and the nature of views and visual amenity at those points”* (GLVIA 3).

9.33 The visual baseline provides information on:

- Type and relative numbers of people (visual receptors) likely to be affected;
- Location, nature & characteristics of representative viewpoints;
- Location, nature & characteristics of the existing views; this will include elements such as landform or vegetation which influence the views; and
- The value attached to particular views.

9.34 The visual study area represents the area within which the views affected by the proposed development are expected to be of interest or concern. At the scoping stage the study area for the visual assessment is as for the landscape assessment, 1km.

9.35 Within this study area, the approximate extent of the potential visibility of the proposed development (defined as the Zone of Theoretical Visibility or ZTV) was identified. The ZTV was used to identify the groups of people who may experience views of the proposed development, the places where they will be affected, the nature of the views and the visual amenity at those points. Viewpoints will be identified and selected with reference to this ZTV and any comments from Officers at the Scoping stage.

Visual effects

9.36 Visual effects relate to the changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape elements of the Site. Therefore, the appraisal of the visual effect will be concerned with the impact of the development on views of the Site, and the sensitivity of viewers who may be affected by these changes.

9.37 Visual receptors are people and their sensitivity ‘should be assessed in terms of both their susceptibility to change in views and visual amenity and also the value attached to particular views’.

9.38 The susceptibility of the visual receptor to the proposed change is a function of:

- ‘The occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and

- The extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focused on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations' (GLVIA 3)

9.39 Those visual receptors most likely to be more susceptible to change include:

- Residents at home;
- People engaged in outdoor recreation whose interest is likely to be focused on the landscape;
- Visitors to identified viewing places or heritage assets where the surrounding landscape makes an important contribution to the experience; and
- Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting.

9.40 Travellers on transport routes and people involved with outdoor recreation which does not involve an appreciation of the landscape are considered to have less susceptibility to change.

Value attached to views

9.41 Judgements are also made about the value attached to the views experienced. This should take account of:

- Recognition of the value attached to particular views, for example in relation to heritage assets, or through planning designations; and
- Indicators of the value attached to views by visitors (for example through appearances in guidebooks / tourist maps), provision of facilities for their enjoyment and references to them in literature or art (GLVIA 3).

Magnitude of visual effects

9.42 The assessment will determine the magnitude of change in the view based on the following considerations.

Size or scale

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

Geographical extent

9.43 The geographical extent of a view is likely to reflect:

- The angle of view;
- The distance of the viewpoint from the proposed development; and
- The extent of the area over which the changes would be visible.

Duration and reversibility

- 9.44 Categories are used (short, medium, long term) with their meaning clearly stated and reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and practicality of effect reversal.
- 9.45 This assessment informs judgments regarding the magnitude of change, which is described as high, medium, low or negligible.
- 9.46 For each representative viewpoint a narrative description, which explains the rationale for the conclusions reached regarding the significance of the effects on the visual receptors, is provided.

Table 9.1: Magnitude of change: rating definitions

Rating		Landscape	Views
Adverse	High	Major loss/alteration of key characteristics and/or major introduction of uncharacteristic elements	Large scale change in the view; large proportion of view occupied by the proposed development And/or new features contrast highly And/or viewpoint is close to proposed development and/or proposed development seen at centre of view
	Medium	Partial loss/alteration of key characteristics and/or partial introduction of uncharacteristic elements	Medium proportion of view occupied by the proposed development and/or new features contrast slightly and/or proposed development not seen at centre of view
	Low	Minor loss/alteration of key characteristics and/or minor introduction of uncharacteristic elements	Small proportion of view occupied by the proposed development and/or new features blend in and/or viewpoint is distant from the proposed development and or proposed development seen at the far edge of the view
	Negligible	Barely perceptible loss/alteration of key characteristics and/or minor	Very small proportion of view occupied by the proposed development and/or new features blend in and/or viewpoint is distant from the

Rating		Landscape	Views
		introduction of uncharacteristic elements	proposed development and or proposed development seen at the far edge of the view
Neutral		No / neutral alteration of key characteristics and negligible introduction of uncharacteristic elements	No / neutral change to the view
Beneficial	High	Substantial introduction of characteristic elements and/or substantial removal of uncharacteristic or detrimental elements	Large proportion of view improved by the proposed development and/or view considerably improved by introduction of characteristic elements and/or removal of uncharacteristic/detrimental elements
	Medium	Moderate introduction of characteristic elements and/or moderate removal of uncharacteristic or detrimental elements	Medium proportion of view improved by the proposed development and/or view moderately improved by introduction of characteristic elements and/or removal of uncharacteristic/detrimental elements
	Low	Minor introduction of characteristic elements and/or minor removal of uncharacteristic or detrimental elements	Small proportion of view improved by the proposed development and/or view slightly improved by introduction of characteristic elements and/or removal of uncharacteristic/detrimental elements
	Negligible	Barely perceptible introduction of characteristic elements and/or minor removal of uncharacteristic or detrimental elements	Very small proportion of view improved by the proposed development and/or view slightly improved by introduction of characteristic elements and/or removal of uncharacteristic/detrimental elements

Significance Criteria

Judging the overall Significance of landscape effects

- 9.47 To assess this, the separate judgements about the sensitivity of the landscape receptors and the magnitude of the landscape effects are combined to allow a final judgement to be made about whether each effect is significant.
- 9.48 Significance can only be defined in relation to each development and its specific location. As a guide, major loss or irreversible negative effects over an extensive area, on elements and/or aesthetic or perceptual aspects that are key to the character of nationally valued landscapes are likely to be of the greatest importance, with reversible

negative effects of short duration, over a restricted area, on elements and/or aesthetic or perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key characteristics are likely to be of least importance.

- 9.49 This assessment combines judgements sequentially: susceptibility and value are combined into an assessment of sensitivity for each receptor, and size/scale, geographical extent and duration/reversibility are combined into an assessment of magnitude for each effect. Magnitude and sensitivity are then combined to assess overall significance.
- 9.50 Landscape mitigation proposed as part of the proposed development design (secondary mitigation) and the ability of this mitigation to reduce or compensate for identified adverse effects is also considered by assessing residual effects of the proposed development at year 15.
- 9.51 The conclusions are then summarized in a table which sets out the overall profile for each receptor.

Judging the overall Significance of visual effects

- 9.52 To draw final conclusions about significance the separate judgements about the sensitivity of the visual receptors and the magnitude of the visual effects need to be combined, to allow a final judgement about whether each effect is significant or not.
- 9.53 Judgements are sequentially combined into assessments of sensitivity for each receptor and magnitude for each effect. Sensitivity and magnitude can then be combined to assess overall importance.

Table 9.2: Significance of landscape & visual effects definitions

Category	Definition
No determinable effect	Temporary negligible changes to non-key elements such that the landscape character/condition or any visual receptors are either not affected or imperceptibly affected.
Negligible (adverse / beneficial)	Temporary minor changes to minor (non-key) elements such that the landscape character / condition or any visual receptors are only negligibly affected, causing a barely perceptible deterioration or improvement in the baseline conditions.
Minor (adverse / beneficial)	Permanent or temporary detrimental / beneficial change to minor elements such that the landscape character / condition or any visual receptors are only slightly affected. The proposal would cause a perceptible but small deterioration or improvement in the baseline conditions.
Moderate (adverse / beneficial)	Permanent or temporary change to key elements, or permanent change to less important elements such that the landscape character / condition or any visual receptors are

Category	Definition
	moderately affected. The proposal would cause a noticeable and clear deterioration or improvement in the baseline conditions.
Major (adverse / beneficial)	Permanent or long-term change to key elements such that the local or wider landscape character / condition or any visual receptors are substantially affected. The proposal would cause a significant deterioration or improvement in the baseline conditions. Potential mitigation measures would be ineffective to prevent adverse residual effects.

9.54 For the purposes of the assessment major adverse/beneficial effects that are permanent are deemed to be significant impacts in terms of the EIA regulations.

Assumptions/Limitations

9.55 The landscape and visual assessment makes the following assumptions:

- All proposed tree/shrub vegetation would be locally appropriate and established / maintained in accordance with horticultural good practice;
- As it was not possible to experience first-hand views from private dwellings the descriptions are assumed only based on an understanding of visual effects from relevant, publicly accessible viewpoint locations;
- Effective implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP);
- The visual assessment assumes no secondary mitigation is undertaken within the application site with regards to residential receptors. This therefore represents a 'worse case' scenario; and
- All visual assessments are based on winter views unless indicated otherwise.

9.56 The landscape and visual assessment has the following limitations:

- Much of the assessment of visual effects and the assessment of effects on general landscape character and quality are necessarily subjective and there is reliance on common sense and reasoned judgments. However, the assessment methodology seeks to overcome these deficiencies by setting out effects in a systematic, logical and transparent format, supported wherever possible by substantiated evidence;
- Landscape Character Area boundaries are indicative as differences between these areas may change gradually on the ground; and
- All spot heights are approximate only, as derived from OS Mastermap Topography layer.

Consultation

Table 9.3: Consultation

Consultee	Date and Time	Comments	Actions
South Ribble Borough Council - Greg Clark	19/02/2019	Draft LVIA methodology and receptor tables provided as part of Scoping Report, including 1km study radius and viewpoints.	Confirmed no comments by telecom.
South Ribble Borough Council - Zoe Harding	28/02/2019	Draft POS Provision and Supporting Schedule of Calculations provided 28 th February 2019.	Confirmation that POS provision exceeded SRBC requirements.

Baseline Conditions

Landscape Baseline

9.57 This section defines the study area for the LVIA and describes the conditions within it. The aim of this baseline is to provide an understanding of the landscape and its constituent elements together with its character, its history, its condition, the way in which the landscape is experienced and the value that is attached to it.

Study area

9.58 The study area includes the Site itself for the proposed development and extent of the wider landscape within which the proposed development may potentially have an influence upon landscape character. At the scoping stage this was set at 1km from the Site boundary.

Application site, land cover and land use

9.59 Within this chapter “the Site” encompasses land that falls within the two application boundaries – Application A and Application B - identified in the Site Location Plans (**Figures 1.1 and 1.2**). The Site is irregular in shape and occupies approximately 52.28ha on land to the east of Penwortham Way to the south of the settlement of Penwortham. The Site is located within the administrative authority of South Ribble Borough Council (SRBC). The northern extent of the Site is located within the ward of Charnock and the southern extent is located within the ward of Farington West.

Topography

- 9.60 The Site is generally flat with only gentle undulations of approximately 5-10m (maximum) across the entire application site. To the east at Flag Lane the Site sits at circa 32mAOD, with a low point of 27mAOD to the west adjacent to Holme Farm and Bee Lane. Considering the scale of the application site, the topographical variations are relatively minimal and result in reduced long-distance views and vistas across or within the Site boundary (in combination with other landscape elements).

Watercourses

- 9.61 The small Mill Brook meanders through the South West corner of the Site, following the local angular field patterns. This is a small tributary of the River Ribble which runs through central Preston. Mill Brook eventually leads to the small water body in Farmington Lodges Recreation ground, beyond the southern boundary of the Site. Within the Site there are also numerous wet ditches closely associated with boundaries and the lanes.

Settlement Patterns

- 9.62 The settlement boundary of Penwortham defines the north boundary of the Site. Comprising of two – three storey modern detached and semi-detached properties the settlement is predominately laid out as small scale cul de sac streets. Larger buildings of note including Penwortham Town Council & Community Centre, Penwortham Grange & Lodge and St Leanord's Church and Lodge. The housing is broken up with pockets of green space including Kingsfold Play Area and Kingsfold Primary School.
- 9.63 The eastern boundary is defined by the railway embankments of the Faringdon Curve and main line between Preston and Chorley. It is in deep cutting such that it is not immediately evident in the landscape. To the east of the railway corridor lies Tardy Gate, comprising of higher density detached and semi-detached housing along longer street patterns. This predominately residential area is again broken up with both Moor Hey High School, Lockstock Primary School and Our Lady & St Gerard's Roman Catholic Primary School as well as the local shopping facilities of Lostock Hall.
- 9.64 Within the open landscape to the south and west loose, linear settlement including modern housing and small-scale vernacular farmsteads are located along the narrow grid system of lanes strongly relating to the grid pattern of field boundaries. This pattern of development is also characteristic of the Site area.

Historical & Cultural Heritage

- 9.65 There are no statutory heritage designations (Scheduled Monuments, Grade I Grade II Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens or Registered Battlefields) within the Site boundary.
- 9.66 There are a number of designated heritage assets located within the 1km radius study area of the Site which, the closest of which are as follows:

- Parish Church of St Paul: Grade II Listed Church of England red brick building located 0.4km south of site boundary, the closest of all listed structures to The Lanes site;
- Nutters Platt Farmhouse: this Grade II listed building is located approximately 0.5km west of the Site boundary on Lindle Lane;
- Rawstone House: this Grade II listed building is a former Parish Workhouse and was built in 1827, now a residential property the building lies 0.5km west of the Site boundary;
- Penwortham Hall & Lodge: Grade II listed building dating back to 1801, located on Penwortham Hall Gardens 0.7km north of the Site boundary; and
- Middleforth Hall; Grade II listed farmhouse building dating back to the early 18th Century, is located 1km north east of the Site boundary on Factory Lane and still operates as a farm today.

9.67 Early OS maps indicate the importance of the railway corridor, which still exists today as the West Coast Railway Line, located immediately east of the Site boundary. Penwortham Cop Lane Railway Station was on the West Lancashire Railway between Preston and Southport, until the line closed in 1964. The cutting which carried the railway under Cop Lane has been widened and now carries the A582 Penwortham bypass, known as Golden Way (Penwortham Way).

9.68 Much of the field patterns from the early 1848 OS map remain evident today, with the network springing from the railway line to the east. A significant modern-day alteration is the introduction of Penwortham Way, which defines the now remaining greenbelt to the west but creates a new field pattern layout when compared to the OS Maps from 150 years ago.

9.69 By 1912, the OS Map reveals more Farmhouses being present across the Site, including Lord's House Farm, Crook's Farm and indeed Pickering's Farm, by 1960 Mill Brook river had defined a path for a road which would eventually become Penwortham Way.

Public Rights of Way Network

9.70 There are a number of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) across the application site and immediate context. Those identified as potential receptors are detailed in **Figure 9.2 – Viewpoint Receptors (790_502)**. PRoWs 7-9-FP 42/46/49 and 52 link the residential neighbourhood of Kingsfold to the north into the Site at Bee and Moss Lane and are well used. 7-9-FP 52/53 is also well used for access between Kingsfold and Tardy Gate however 7-9-FP 58/7-4-FP1 is not well walked. In combination with the lanes, and centred around Holme Farm, PRoW 7-9-FP 54, 55, 56 and 57 form a loop of PRoWs within the landscape with 7-4-FP 4 and 25 allowing access from Nib/Moss Lane to the open countryside (across Penwortham Way) and Chain House Lane. However, these routes do not appear to be well walked. A further important link to the open countryside is also achievable from Balshaw Farm in the north west corner of the Site via 7-9-FP 43 and 24.

- 9.71 There are currently no bridleways within the Site area or immediate environs. The nearest is 7-9-BW 24 located in Lower Penwortham, 1km north of the Site.

Land use

- 9.72 Much of the Site area is open pasture used for dairy and equestrian purposes. Activity is centred on Holme Farm Dairy on Moss Lane. Livery stables are provided at Bee Lane and Flag Lane.
- 9.73 There are further commercial uses including Claytons (egg suppliers at Flag Lane) within the Site and Welch Fencing and market gardening (glasshouses) relating to Chain House/Coote Lane.

Green Infrastructure

- 9.74 In strategic terms the most significant GI within the study area is the open landscape designated as Green Belt, and whilst not being located within the Site the designation follows the western boundary on the opposite site of the main road, Penwortham Way. This Green Belt stretches from Lower Penwortham to New Longton and beyond (refer to **Figure 9.1** – Landscape Receptors 790_501).
- 9.75 Immediately adjacent to the Site Penwortham Way Amenity Greenspace (AGS) & Goldenway Natural and Semi-Natural Open Space (NSN) are key local GI resources. Further examples within the study area include Middleforth Green Park, north of the application site, the grounds of Kingsfold Primary School and Kingsfold Play area.
- 9.76 Within the Site boundary the network of green spaces including hedgerows, trees and open pasture provide local GI resource.

National Landscape Character

Strategic Landscape Character Areas

- 9.77 At a national level the Site falls within the National Character Area 32 – Lancashire & Amounderness Plain.
- 9.78 At a regional level, within *A Landscape Strategy for Lancashire: Landscape Character Assessment* (Lancashire County Council, 2000) the Site falls within the Coastal Plain Landscape Type, described as follows:
- 9.79 *Generally below 50m, this landscape type is characterised by gently undulating or flat lowland farmland divided by ditches in West Lancashire and by low clipped hedges elsewhere. The Fylde landscape in particular is characterised by a high density of small marl pit field ponds. Many hedgerows have been removed to give very large fields, open road verges and long views. Although woodland cover is generally very low, these views are punctuated by small deciduous secondary woodlands, mostly in the form of shelter belts or estate plantations; they provide a backdrop to views. The history of the area as an arable landscape is reflected in the farm buildings, particularly the highly distinctive red brick barns with brickwork detailing. Settlement is relatively dense in this lowland landscape; clustered red brick farm buildings, hamlets, rural villages and historic towns are all present. Older farm sites and red brick barns are often surrounded by recent development and the many converted barns now provide characterful homes. There is a dense infrastructure network;*

meandering roads connect the farms and villages while major roads and motorways provide a fast route across the landscape, linking major towns.

- 9.80 The Site falls within the Landscape Character Area of 15b – Longton Bretherton of the regional assessment. The Longton landscape character area lies close to the south-western urban fringes of Preston. The proximity to a large urban centre has influenced landscape character. The network of minor lanes is dominated by dense ribbon development and the A 59(T), now a dual carriageway, links the former villages of Hutton, Longton, Walmer Bridge and Much Hoole. Red brick is the dominant built material in these areas. The agricultural landscape is influenced by urban fringe elements such as schools, colleges, nurseries, glass houses, hotels, horse paddocks, communication masts and electricity pylons; the network of hedgerows and hedgerow oaks is gradually being eroded by these uses. The village of Bretherton has remained separate and therefore displays a more traditional character; a former windmill lies on its western edge.
- 9.81 The study area is broadly consistent with these descriptions; in particular; the recti-linear landscape forms and angular woodland blocks, extensive agricultural drainage systems define fields, raised ditches, causeways within flat/gently undulating land form; characteristic patchwork of fields and farmland with dispersed settlement pattern comprising scattered farmsteads A network of enclosure field patterns defined by native hedge boundaries and mature tree clusters; extensive network of footpaths and Public Rights of Way; network of narrow winding lanes connecting the farmsteads with wider settlements; urban fringe influences including road, rail, power infrastructure, and suburban housing development.

Local Landscape Character

- 9.82 Through desk and field survey it was concluded that whilst there are subtle differences across the extent of the Site in essence defining characteristics and elements are very consistent and can be summarised as:
- Strong landscape framework of hedges and trees forming a rectilinear landscape pattern;
 - Medium scale open pasture land with some rough grazing;
 - Narrow lanes defined with hedges and ditches;
 - Dispersed farmsteads with loose ribbon development associated with lanes;
 - Urban influences of adjacent housing areas; and
 - Urbanising influences of Penwortham Way road corridor (including lighting,) pylon and railway corridors.

South Ribble Green Belt

- 9.83 An area of designated Green Belt is located to the west of the Site defined by the main road, Penwortham Way which acts as the defensible boundary that separates the two areas. The Green Belt land stretches approximately 8km from Lower Penwortham to Tarleton with the boundary defined by the River Douglas. This is an open, simple

and relatively intact rural landscape with a strong landscape pattern of small irregular fields, limited tree cover, narrow winding lanes, scattered farmsteads with small settlements including Longton and New Longton.

Identification of potential key Landscape Receptors

9.84 Following the baseline review potential key landscape receptors have been identified. These are listed as follows:

- Tree Cover;
- Hedgerows;
- Open Pasture;
- Lanes including PRow;
- Local Landscape Character;
- 15b: Longton-Bretherton Regional Landscape Character Area; and
South Ribble Green Belt.

Value, Susceptibility & Sensitivity of landscape receptors

Tree Cover

9.85 The value of this receptor is judged to be Medium. There are numerous, mature trees located across the application site, commonly associated with hedgerows. They contribute to the character of the locality but are not distinctive in their own right. This landscape element is susceptible to direct effects from housing development however through effective site planning and design can commonly be accommodated effectively and therefore susceptibility is considered to be Medium. The resultant sensitivity of the is therefore judged as **Medium**.

Hedgerows

9.86 The value of this receptor is judged to be Medium. There are numerous hedgerows located across the application site, both continuous and fragmented. They contribute to the character of the locality but are not distinctive in their own right. This landscape element is susceptible to direct effects from housing development however through effective site planning and design can commonly be accommodated effectively within proposed development and therefore susceptibility is considered to be Medium. The resultant landscape sensitivity is therefore judged as **Medium**.

Open Pasture

9.87 The landscape value of this receptor is judged to be Low. This landscape element contributes to the character of the locality but is not distinctive in its own right. Furthermore, its highly managed nature diminishes its contribution further. However, it is susceptible to direct effects of proposed development and so judged as Medium in this regard. Following balanced assessment, the resultant landscape sensitivity is therefore judged as **Medium - Low**.

Lanes including PRowS

- 9.88 The landscape value of this receptor is judged to be Medium. Whilst there are numerous routes within the study area and the sustainable routeways are not of national significance those associated with the Site locality are critical for sustainable movement from surrounding urban areas providing doorstep to countryside connectivity. They are also a diminishing resource with others previously fragmented/subsumed by modern development. In terms of susceptibility, whilst routeways can be accommodated within new landscape types their cultural integrity (as distinct walking routes associated with landscape features and historic locations) are susceptible to change. Susceptibility is therefore considered to be medium. Overall sensitivity is therefore **Medium**.

Local Landscape Character

- 9.89 The landscape value is judged to be Low following balanced assessment. Whilst the condition of landscape elements are relatively good and reflect the key landscape characteristics of the regional landscape type/area, and the locality is valued for recreation and connectivity with the open countryside to the west and Tardy Gate, this value is local in nature. The susceptibility is considered to be Low because of the wooded, medium scaled nature of the landscape can (and does) accommodate the proposed development form effectively. The resultant landscape sensitivity is therefore judged as **Low**.

15b Longton-Bretherton Regional Landscape Character Area

- 9.90 The landscape value of this receptor is judged to be Medium. Whilst not designated at a national level this rural landscape is valued at a regional level for its recreational role in the context of adjacent settlement, provision of setting, and separating function between urban conurbations. Susceptibility to the proposed development form is judged as Low arising from its capability to effectively accommodate residential development arising from its wooded, low lying character. The resultant landscape sensitivity is judged as **Medium - Low**.

South Ribble Green Belt

- 9.91 The landscape value of this receptor is judged to be high; this landscape planning designation is essential to the permanent character of openness in the locality, and wider understanding and appreciation of the Ribble lowland landscape as well as a key recreational resource. However, the susceptibility to landscape change proposed is considered to be medium as the treed, low lying, medium scale landscape has the potential to accommodate settlement without undue harm to the baseline. The resultant landscape sensitivity is therefore judged as **High-Medium**.

Views, Visibility and Visual Character

Visual Baseline

- 9.92 The visual study area represents the area within which the views affected by the proposed development are expected to be of potential interest or concern. The approximate extent of the potential visibility of the proposed development was considered in the context of the nature of the proposed development and the receiving

landscape. At the scoping stage a study area covering a 1km radius from the Site boundary was determined. Therefore, the assessment considers potential visual receptors (the groups of people who may experience views of the development and the places where they will be affected) will predominantly be residents, users of the public highways, and those walking or riding along the footpaths and bridleways in the study area.

9.93 The photographic assessment was undertaken on 3rd and 4th January 2019. Photographs of views were taken from locations agreed at the scoping stage. A further site visit and review of photographic assessment was undertaken 7th June 2021, during which it was determined that no further photographic assessment was necessary.

Key visual receptors

9.94 Visual receptors include people who live in an area, people who work there, people who are passing through on road or other transport, people who are visiting promoted landscapes (if relevant) and people engaged in recreation.

9.95 The types of viewers who may be affected and the places where they will be potentially affected are identified below:

- The Site is located beyond the established settlement boundary and urban settlement of Penwortham, between Tardy Gate to the East and the wider Ribble Floodplain (and related Green Belt) to the west. As such there are a number of PRoW, within the study area as indicated on **Figure 9.2** identified as PRoW 1 -7;
- Local residents within the Site area namely on Bee Lane (R1 and R2) Balshaw locality (R3,) Moss Lane (R4 and R5) Flag Lane (R6 and R7) and Nib Lane (R8);
- To the north of the application site namely residents at Kingsfold Drive (R9) Bramble Court, Kingshaven Drive and Queens Court Avenue (R10) are likely to be receptors given their proximity and orientation with the Site. This may also be true of some residents at Kingsbridge, Braintree Avenue, Bilsborough Hey, Greaves Meadow (R11) and Chelford Close, Burwood Close and Rookery Drive (R12);
- To the east and south east of the application site namely residents of Leylands Road, Marks Close and Firtrees Avenue (R13) and Coote Lane (R14);
- To the south west of the application site namely residents of Coote Lane West (R15) and Chain House Lane (R16 & R17);
- To the north west of the application site namely residents of Fryer Close, Cloughfield and Copper Beeches (R18);
- Travellers on the strategic route of Penwortham Way (H4), users of the local road network of Moss Lane, Bee Lane, Lords Lane, Flag Lane and Nib Lane (H1,) the residential street of Kingsfold Drive (H2) and the rural lane of Coote Lane (H3); and
- Visitors to Kingsfold Community Centre (P1).

- 9.96 The location of these potential visual receptors are indicated on **Figure 9.2**.
- 9.97 Business concerns at Holme Farm Dairy and Claytons have been included within the residential assessments because of the nature of the businesses (small scale and limited potential of intervisibility relating to agricultural building form).

Key viewpoints

- 9.98 A number of viewpoints have been identified which represent typical views from which the proposed development may potentially be visible within the context of the identified visual receptors.
- 9.99 These viewpoints are restricted to public viewpoints and do not include private viewpoints or views from individual properties. The desktop studies and field surveys have identified viewpoints regarded as representative of the range of views and potential visual receptors within the study area. The selected viewpoints are not intended to cover every possible view, but rather are representative of a range of receptor types e.g. tourists and road users for various directions and distances from the Site boundary.
- 9.100 A visual analysis from the representative viewpoints has been carried out to determine how the proposed development might influence visual amenity for each receptor group. The assessment was carried out as part of the Site survey, with the photographic assessment recording the nature of the view and the existing visibility of the Site.
- 9.101 The analysis of visual effects for viewpoints is presented within a 'photoview sheet' in a tabular format, which summaries the information on which the assessment is based and concludes with an assessment of the Magnitude of Change.
- 9.102 The location of photoview sheets 1 – 10 are shown on **Figure 9.2** and the sheets included at **Appendix 9.1**.
- 9.103 Each photoview illustrates a 90° angle of view from a visual receptor.
- 9.104 The table within each Photoview describes:
- The location, classification and sensitivity of the receptor;
 - The components of the existing view; and
 - Analysis of magnitude and level of visual change against the Baseline Scenario.

View Value, Susceptibility & Sensitivity

- 9.105 Visual receptors are assessed in terms of their susceptibility to change in views and the value attached to the representative views.
- 9.106 The value of a view depends on:

- 'Recognition of the value attached to particular views, for example in relation to heritage assets, or through planning designations;
- Indicators of the value attached by visitors, for example through appearances in guidebooks or tourist maps, provision of facilities for their enjoyment; and references to them in literature or art' (GLVIA 3).

9.107 The susceptibility of a view is a function of:

"the occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and the extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focused on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations" (GLVIA 3).

9.108 Given the residents views are private the value attached to their views can only be **low**.

9.109 All recreational receptors have been assigned a **High** sensitivity because they are public routes (**High** value) and the purpose of the activity is the enjoyment of views and the rural landscape (**High** susceptibility).

9.110 Travelers on the strategic network and residential streets have been assigned **Low** sensitivity. Travelers on other local lanes have been assigned the intermediate category of **Medium** sensitivity.

Embedded Mitigation

Demolition and Construction

9.111 No embedded measures are foreseen during demolition and construction phases.

Completed Development

9.112 The Land Use Parameter Plans (**Figures 5.1 & 5.5**) indicate the extent of proposed development on the Site and where no development is proposed. This layout reflects the design intent of limiting development from the most sensitive interface of the Site in landscape and visual terms; that is the western boundary with the Green Belt.

9.113 To address existing properties within the Allocation Site in addition to those neighbouring the Site immediately to the north, proposed development heights are reduced to 2.5 storeys in close proximity to existing properties.

Secondary Mitigation Measures

9.114 Secondary mitigation will be undertaken to mitigate potential significant environmental effects with regards to landscape character. The following secondary mitigation is proposed during the Demolition and Construction phase, and for completed development:

Demolition and Construction

- 9.115 During this phase appropriate measures will be secured through planning condition to enable the retention in so far as is possible of high-quality trees and hedgerows.
- 9.116 Potential landscape and visual impacts arising from construction, will be managed as part of the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Measures include site hoarding/screening, noise reduction, measures to reduce lighting and avoidance of light spill on sensitive receptors, and controlled working hours.

Completed Development

- 9.117 Planning consent will secure the quality and quantum of public open space typologies and related features including new individuals and groups of trees, hedgerows, wildflower/species-rich grassland and shrubs.
- 9.118 The above typologies will be reflected within a landscape plan and habitat management plan, that will also be produced and implemented for the Site and secured through planning condition.

Assessment of Landscape Effects

Assessment during Construction of Likely Effects (no mitigation) and Residual Effects (with secondary mitigation)

- 9.119 This section addresses landscape effects during demolition and construction; for ease of reference the assessment includes likely effects without additional mitigation measures, followed by residual effects including secondary mitigation measures.
- 9.120 Due to the size of the development, a phased approach to construction will be undertaken. The sequencing of the delivery of the indicative phases is currently unknown. Should the application be approved, the Local Planning Authority is invited to impose a condition which requires a detailed phasing plan to be submitted to SRBC as part of the first reserved matters application. An indicative phasing plan for the outline residential-led application is presented at **Figure 5.9**. The landscape and visual assessment has assessed the full development (i.e., Application A and Application B). Phasing of the development is not anticipated to give rise to any other significant effects not already described below during the construction phase.
- 9.121 The nature of potential effects during the construction phases are primarily the presence of hoarding, plant equipment (including lighting), storage areas and associated construction traffic within the Site through the progression of the build out.
- 9.122 The building out of the proposed development is expected to occur over an 8-year period and will therefore result in landscape effects through this time.

Landscape Receptor: Tree Cover

- 9.123 Effects involve the removal of hedgerow and field trees owing to development constraints, resulting in a loss of existing tree cover. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **High adverse**. Medium sensitivity combined with High adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Major - moderate adverse** effect during demolition and construction phases. Secondary mitigation will ensure the retention of highest quality (Category A and B) trees however some loss in tree cover is still to be expected resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect.

Landscape Receptor: Hedgerows

- 9.124 Hedgerows are important landscape features within the Site which could be lost during demolition. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **High adverse** magnitude of change. Medium sensitivity combined with high adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Major - moderate adverse** effect during construction phases, considering the necessity for removal of hedgerow to accommodate new construction. Secondary mitigation will ensure retention of highest quality native hedgerows however some loss is still expected resulting in a **Moderate adverse** residual effect.

Landscape Receptor: Open Pasture

- 9.125 The construction period would see the direct loss of extensive areas of open, predominately pasture, ground in the Site area albeit predominately within the western locality of the Site, owing to soil stripping and mounding and the eventual presence of emerging new structures. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **High - medium adverse** magnitude of change. Low sensitivity combined with high-medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Moderate adverse** effect following assessment at construction. Secondary mitigation is not expected to address this effect, therefore the residual effect will remain **Moderate adverse**.

Landscape Receptor: Lanes including PRoW

- 9.126 Disturbance to the Lanes and PRoW network will be heightened during demolition and construction phasing with the temporary presence of site traffic, increased noise levels and consequent reduction in sense of tranquillity. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **High adverse** during the construction phase. The medium sensitivity of this receptor combined with a high adverse magnitude of change will result in **Major-moderate adverse** effects. Secondary mitigation arising from the CEMP is not expected to significantly address this effect, given the presence of uncharacteristic features – e.g. hoarding, plant - that will be experienced in close proximity; therefore the residual effect will remain **Major-moderate adverse**.

Landscape Receptor: Local Landscape Character

- 9.127 The construction phase could result in the direct and irreversible loss of characteristic landscape features, namely open pasture, trees and hedgerows as described above. The loss of tranquillity and presence of uncharacteristic elements and site traffic within the Site environs will also be clearly evident. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **Medium adverse**. Low sensitivity combined with Medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Moderate adverse** effect following balanced assessment during

construction phases. Secondary mitigation is not expected to significantly address this effect, therefore the residual effect will remain **Moderate adverse**.

Landscape Receptor: Landscape Character Area of 15b – Longton Bretherton

- 9.128 Effects of demolition and construction will entail the loss of key characteristics/features of the LCA namely open pasture, hedgerows and the resultant landscape pattern, as well as impacts to woodland arising from the access works. However, when the extent of change is considered in the context of the wider geographical area of the Longton and Bretherton character area and the character type of the Coastal Plain, it does not represent more than 5% of the character area, with effects during construction further localised to individual phasing parcels. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **Low adverse**. Medium - Low sensitivity combined with Low adverse magnitude of change would be judged to result in a **Minor adverse** effect during construction phase. Secondary mitigation is not expected to significantly address this effect, therefore the residual effect will remain **Minor adverse**.

Landscape Receptor: South Ribble Green Belt

- 9.129 The proposals will not result in direct effects on this landscape receptor. However indirect effects will result from changes in landscape character within Green Belt locations. The increased activity arising from construction of Western and Central phases, including increased noise and presence of lighting, will impact the sense of tranquillity associated with the adjoining green belt, although these effects will be temporary, localised and minimised by the existing embankment and tree planting along Penwortham Way. The magnitude of change is therefore judged as **Negligible Adverse**. High sensitivity combined with Negligible adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Minor adverse** effect during construction of western and central phases, reducing to Negligible adverse in all other phases. Secondary mitigation measures to reduce the presence of uncharacteristic features, noise and light pollution would result in a **Negligible adverse** residual effect.

Assessment at Completion Including Potential Effects (with Embedded Mitigation Only) and Residual Effects (including Secondary Mitigation)

- 9.130 This section considers the magnitude of effects of the completed proposal on the identified landscape receptors. For ease of reference it assesses effects at Completion Year 1 with Embedded Mitigation only - assuming completion of final construction phase in 2031 - and in Year 15 (2046) assuming Secondary Mitigation and therefore representing the significance of the Residual Effects.

Landscape Receptor: Tree Cover

- 9.131 The Site includes many high-quality trees within hedgerows and as groups which could be required to be lost as a direct result of proposed development without secondary mitigation in place. These category A or B trees or groups are valued for their amenity and aesthetic value. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **High adverse** magnitude of change. Medium sensitivity combined with High adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Major - moderate adverse effect** at Year 1. However, with secondary mitigation in place, in terms of both tree

retention measures, and tree planting as part of enhancement proposals, the expected effects will be effectively managed to result in effects that are **Minor beneficial** at Year 15.

Landscape Receptor: Hedgerows

- 9.132 Hedgerows are important landscape features within the Site which could be lost as a direct effect. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **High adverse** magnitude of change. Medium sensitivity combined with high adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Major – moderate adverse** effect at Year 1. With secondary mitigation in place including extensive hedgerow retention as well as new planting the effects are expected to be **Minor beneficial** at Year 15.

Landscape Receptor: Open Pasture

- 9.133 The proposals would result in the direct loss of extensive areas of open, predominately pasture, ground in the Site area albeit predominately within the western locality of the Site. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **High – medium adverse** magnitude of change. Low sensitivity combined with high-medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Moderate adverse** effect following assessment at Year 1. Secondary mitigation is not expected to address effects at Year 15 and as such **Moderate adverse** effects will remain.

Landscape Receptor: Lanes including PRoW

- 9.134 The proposals will largely preserve the existing lane and PRoW infrastructure. In addition to this the development proposals include significantly increased public access through provision of an expanded (and enhanced) Green Infrastructure network throughout the Site, with routeways being incorporated into a range of POS typologies as well as part of linear paths. Following balanced judgement, the magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **Medium Beneficial**. Medium sensitivity combined with medium magnitude of change would result in a **Moderate Beneficial** effect at Year 1. As secondary mitigation, in terms of landscape infrastructure including new hedgerow matures the beneficial effects of this landscape feature is expected to strengthen to **Major Beneficial** effect at Year 15.

Landscape Receptor: Local Landscape Character

- 9.1 The proposals could result in the direct and irreversible loss of characteristic landscape features, namely open pasture, trees and hedgerows; however secondary mitigation will see the retention of a large majority of existing trees, hedgerows and the associated lanes as well as the expansion of these landscape features which together will form a strong, distinctive landscape structure as an integral component of the proposed development. However, the openness of the landscape, and its pattern of elements will be permanently lost to proposed development, with the expansion of residential development and associated infrastructure becoming dominant features. The loss of tranquillity and increase in traffic in the Site environs will also be clearly evident. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **Medium adverse** magnitude of change. Low sensitivity combined with Medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Moderate adverse** effect

following balanced assessment at Year 1. As proposed secondary mitigation, in terms of landscape infrastructure, matures the effects are expected to diminish to **Moderate - minor adverse** at Year 15.

Landscape Receptor: Landscape Character Area of 15b – Longton Bretherton

9.135 The proposals are anticipated to result in direct effects as well as indirect effects on this landscape receptor. Direct effects will entail the loss of key characteristics/features of the LCA namely open pasture, hedgerows and landscape pattern, the assimilation of vernacular settlement and rural lanes into modern neighbourhood as well as impacts to woodland arising from the access works. However, when the extent of change is considered in the context of the wider geographical area of the Longton and Bretherton character area and the character type of the Coastal Plain, it does not represent more than 5% of the character area albeit a permanent change. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **Low adverse** magnitude of change. Medium - Low sensitivity combined with Low adverse magnitude of change would be judged to result in a **Minor adverse** effect at Year 1 following balanced judgment. Once secondary mitigation, in terms of retention, enhancement and extension of landscape characteristics/features establish and mature the effects are expected to diminish to **Negligible adverse** at Year 15.

Landscape Receptor: South Ribble Green Belt

9.136 The proposals will not result in direct effects on this landscape receptor. However indirect effects will result from changes in landscape character within Green Belt locations. The roofscape and outline of suburban development will be perceived both in front of and beyond the pylon corridor from locations immediately west of Penwortham Way in winter. That said existing suburban development at Kingsfold is evident and therefore this change is not incongruous. The magnitude of change is therefore judged as **Negligible Adverse**. High sensitivity combined with Negligible adverse magnitude of change would result in a **Minor adverse** effect at Year 1. Once secondary mitigation, in terms of retention, enhancement and extension of landscape features establishes and matures the effects are expected to diminish to **No determinable** effect at Year 15.

Table 9.4: Landscape Effects Summary Table

Construction				
Landscape Receptor	Value/Susceptibility <i>Sensitivity</i>	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect (Without Mitigation)	Residual Effect (With secondary Mitigation)
Tree Cover	Medium/Medium <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Major-Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
Hedgerows	Medium/Medium <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Major - Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse

Open Pasture	Low/Low <i>Low</i>	High-medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
PRoW	Medium/Medium <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Major-moderate Adverse	Major-moderate Adverse
Local Landscape Character	Low/Low <i>Low</i>	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
Longton Bretherton Regional Landscape Character Area	Medium/Low <i>Medium-Low</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse
Green Belt	High/Medium <i>High - Medium</i>	Negligible Adverse	Minor Adverse	Negligible Adverse
Completed Development				
Landscape Receptor	Value/Susceptibility <i>Sensitivity</i>	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect (Completion Year 1 /2031 with Embedded Mitigation only)	Residual Effect (Completion Year 15/2046 with Secondary Mitigation if applicable)
Tree Cover	Medium/Medium <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Major-Moderate Adverse	Minor Beneficial
Hedgerows	Medium/Medium <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Major - Moderate Adverse	Minor Beneficial
Open Pasture	Low/Low <i>Low</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
PRoW	Medium/Medium <i>Medium - Medium</i>	Medium Beneficial	Moderate Beneficial	Major Beneficial
Local Landscape Character	Low/Low <i>Low</i>	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate - Minor Adverse

Longton Bretherton Regional Landscape Character Area	Medium/Low <i>Medium-Low</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Negligible Adverse
Green Belt	High/Medium <i>High - Medium</i>	Negligible Adverse	Minor Adverse	No determinable effect

Assessment of Visual Effects

Assessment during Construction of Likely Effects (no mitigation) and Residual Effects (with secondary mitigation)

- 9.137 This section considers the effects of the proposal on the identified visual receptors during construction phases (2023-2031), for ease of reference describing likely effects on views without mitigation measures, followed by residual effects including secondary mitigation.
- 9.138 The nature of potential visual effects during the construction phases are primarily the presence uncharacteristic elements in the view including hoarding, plant equipment (including lighting), storage areas and associated construction traffic within the Site.
- 9.139 R1: Residents of Bee Lane. (North side) One - two storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floors rear, side and front elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the near - middle distance. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. The close proximity of residences to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.
- 9.140 R2: Residents of Bee Lane. (South side) One-two storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the near - middle distance. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during

construction. The close proximity of residences to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.

- 9.141 R3: Residents of Balshaw locality. One-two storey detached properties including farms are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor front, side and rear elevation windows to varying degrees. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the near - middle distance. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. The close proximity of residences to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.
- 9.142 R4: Residents of Moss Lane (South) Including Holme Farm Dairies. Two storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the near - middle distance, although some views are filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with Moss Lane. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. The close proximity of residences to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.
- 9.143 R5: Residents of Lords Lane. One - three storey detached, and semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor front, side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the near - middle distance, although some views are filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with Moss Lane. Views of construction from front elevations will be more distant and oblique, and views are filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with Lords and Flag Lane. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. The close proximity of residences to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.
- 9.144 R6: Residents of Flag Lane including Claytons and Livery Yard. One - two storey detached, semi-detached and bungalow properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor front, side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g.

hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the near - middle distance, although some views are filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with Flag Lane. Following balanced assessment the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. The close proximity of residences to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.

- 9.145 R7: Residents of Nib Lane. Predominately One storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground front, side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the near - middle distance; occupying a large proportion of it in the near to middle distance. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. The close proximity of residences to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.
- 9.146 R8: Residents of Kingsfold Drive. One - two storey terraced, semi-detached and detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from upper floor front and side elevation windows. The change would be the partial loss of filtered views to open farmland in the far distance, that is beyond Kingsfold Sports Field, and the presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Minor adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor-negligible adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage.
- 9.147 R9: Residents at cul-de-sac end of Bramble Court, Kingshaven Drive, Queens Court Avenue. One - two storey semi-detached and detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor rear and side elevation windows. The change would be the loss of direct and open views to farmland in the near to far distance and the presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Moderate-Minor adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage.
- 9.148 R10: Residents at cul-de-sac end of Kingsbridge, Braintree Avenue, Bilsborough Hey, Greaves Meadow. Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience minimal changes in views from ground and upper floor side elevation windows. The change would be the presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic in the far distance, beyond Bee Lane. Following balanced

assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Minor adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor-negligible adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage.

- 9.149 R11: Residents at cul-de-sac end of Chelford Close, Burwood Close, Rookery Drive. Two storey detached – semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from predominately upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of direct views to farmland in the middle – far distance and the presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic beyond the existing farm. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium-low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate-minor adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage.
- 9.150 R12: Residents of Leylands Road, Marks Close, Werneth Close Firtrees Avenue. Two storey detached – semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from predominately upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to farmland in the middle – far distance beyond the railway corridor and the intervening landscape structure. The presence of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic will be evident albeit filtered by existing landscape structure. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium - low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate - minor adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor-negligible adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage, in conjunction with the filtering effect of existing landscape structure.
- 9.151 R13: Residents of Coote Lane. Two storey detached – semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to farmland in the far distance beyond Mill Brook and the intervening landscape structure. The introduction of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic will be evident albeit filtered by established landscape structure. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium – low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate - Minor adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage, in conjunction with the filtering effect of existing landscape structure.
- 9.152 R14: Residents of Chain House Lane (East). Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to farmland in the middle-far distance beyond Mill Brook. The introduction of uncharacteristic elements in the view associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant - and site traffic will be visible albeit filtered by established landscape

structure. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium-low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate – minor adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage, in conjunction with the filtering effect of existing landscape structure.

- 9.153 R15: Residents of Chain House Lane (West). One-two storey semi-detached and detached properties with upper floor rear elevation windows northwards. These properties are not expected to experience perceptible changes in views even in winter arising from the distance from the proposed development, the prevalence of intervening vegetation and earthworks, and associated infrastructure at Penwortham Way. The magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **No change**.
- 9.154 R16: Residents of Fryer Close, Cloughfield, Copper Beeches. Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience limited changes in views from ground or upper floor rear elevation windows arising from the prevalence of mature tree cover within gardens of properties making up the hamlet of Balshaw. Minor changes may include filtered views of uncharacteristic elements associated with construction – e.g. hoarding, plant. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Negligible adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Negligible adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Given the limited magnitude of visual change regardless of mitigation measures, residual effects are expected to remain **Negligible adverse**.
- 9.155 R17: Residents of Pope Lane, Green Lane. Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience limited changes in views from ground or upper floor front elevation windows arising from the combination of distance from the Site and prevalence of mature landscape structure and woodland vegetation associated with intervening farmland and the Penwortham Way road corridor. The magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **No change**.
- 9.156 H1: Moss Lane, Bee Lane, Lords Lane, Flag Lane, Nib Lane. Existing predominately single, surfaced tracks with ditch and hedgerow boundaries with intermittent small-scale residential properties and filtered views to open farmland. The change would be clearly perceived along the movement corridor with uncharacteristic elements in the near - middle distance and loss of vegetation and filtered views of open ground, albeit sections of Bee Lane, Lords Lane and Flag Lane will remain unaffected. The magnitude of visual change to user group H1, has therefore been assessed as **High-medium adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the medium sensitivity of users, following balanced assessment, results in a **Moderate adverse** effect during construction. The close proximity of lanes to construction development during several phases limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.
- 9.157 H2: Kingsfold Drive. Existing surfaced residential street defined by residential estates and amenity grassland verges with intermittent distant views towards open farmland. The change would be perceived along the

movement corridor however views would be distant and experienced in the context of the existing residential neighbourhood. The magnitude of visual change to user group H2, has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in a **Minor adverse** effect during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor-negligible adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage, in conjunction with the filtering effect of existing landscape structure.

- 9.158 H3: Coote Lane/Chain House Lane. Existing two-way carriageway with residential development on north side. The proposed development would be glimpsed on the horizon at very limited locations. The magnitude of visual change to user group H3, has therefore been assessed as **Negligible adverse – No change**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in a **Negligible adverse** effect during construction. Given the limited magnitude of visual change regardless of mitigation measures, residual effects are expected to remain **Negligible adverse**.
- 9.159 H4: Penwortham Way. Existing carriageway with grass verges and tree belts and strongly filtered views (in winter) towards open farmland with pylons and lighting also clearly evident. The proposed development would include site access and associated tree loss to accommodate reconfigured earthworks and lighting. Change would be perceived along a localised section of the movement corridor only. The magnitude of visual change to user group H4, has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in a **Minor adverse** effect during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Minor-negligible adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage, in conjunction with the filtering effect of existing landscape structure.
- 9.160 PR1: Kingsfold Drive to Penwortham Way via Balshaw: Northern section unsurfaced, relatively well used. Southern section, beyond Balshaw Farm, unsurfaced, little used. Whilst the nature of the routeway will remain for the section through the existing hamlet suburban development (two storey), the construction of the Western and Northwestern phases will have a transformative effect on the rural character of the lane along the section from Kingsfold Community Centre to Moss Lane (West) and from the lane to Penwortham Way via the pylon corridor. The change will be experienced in close view. A **High adverse magnitude** of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Major adverse** effect during construction. The close proximity of the receptor to construction development limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Major adverse**.
- 9.161 PR2: Kingsfold Drive to Chain House Lane: PRoW running along Moss Lane. Northern section surfaced, well used routeway. Existing rural routeway defined by hedgerows along the lane and along the boundary line of open fields beyond the farm. The change would be clearly perceived with uncharacteristic features associated with construction introduced across the view in the near - middle distance between existing properties. Some filtering effect of existing boundaries. A **High adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Major adverse** effect during construction.

The close proximity of the receptor to construction development limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Major adverse**.

- 9.162 PR3: Queenscourt Avenue to Bee Lane: Unsurfaced routeway. Existing routeway defined by hedgerow along the boundary line with open farmland in eastern, western and southern directions. The change would be perceived as uncharacteristic features associated with construction introduced in the near – middle distance. A **High adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor, and following balanced assessment, this results in a **Major adverse** effect during construction. The close proximity of the receptor to construction development limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Major adverse**.
- 9.163 PR4: Sumpter Court to Flag Lane: Well used surfaced and then unsurfaced routeway. Existing routeway defined by hedgerows and close board fencing along the boundary line with residential housing in close proximity, as well as open farmland in some sections. The change would be clearly perceived as uncharacteristic features associated with construction introduced across the view in the near - middle distance along the northern section, south of Bee Lane, although this change would be perceived during the North Eastern phase of development only. A **Medium adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor, and following balanced assessment, this results in a **Moderate adverse** effect during construction. The close proximity of the receptor to construction development limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Moderate adverse**.
- 9.164 PR5: Flag Lane to Chain House Lane: Poorly used, unsurfaced routeway along railway embankment. Existing routeway defined by post and wire fencing with the railway corridor and residential edge of Lostock Hall in middle to far distance. No views of farmland to west due to localised embankment. There would therefore be no change in view. A **No change** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **No determinable** effect at construction.
- 9.165 PR6: Holme Farm to Penwortham Way: Poorly used, unsurfaced routeway from farm to Nib Lane then Penwortham Way following hedge boundaries/Mill Brook. Rural route influenced by proximity and filtered views of residential properties, roadway, embankment, lighting and pylons particularly in winter. Also, existing proximity of properties on Chain House Lane apparent in views. The change would be clearly perceived as uncharacteristic features associated with construction introduced across the view in the near - middle distance. A **High adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Major adverse** effect during construction. The close proximity of the receptor to construction development limits the impact of secondary mitigation, therefore residual effects are considered to remain **Major adverse**.
- 9.166 PR7: Penwortham Way to Pope Lane: Poorly used, unsurfaced routeway from Penwortham Way following Mill Brook/hedge boundary to meet Green Lane. Existing routeway defined by hedgerow boundaries. Rural route influenced by proximity and filtered views of roadway, embankment, lighting and pylons particularly in winter.

Also, existing proximity of properties on Chain House Lane and at Kingsfold. Perception of infrastructure gives sense of a settled landscape. The change would be limited to filtered (in winter only) distant views of uncharacteristic features associated with construction in the middle-far distance. A **Negligible adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Negligible adverse** effect during construction. Given the limited magnitude of visual change regardless of mitigation measures, residual effects are expected to remain **Negligible adverse**.

- 9.167 P1: Kingsfold Community Centre and grounds. One - two storey community centre and associated amenity grassland expected to experience changes in views from ground floor rear and side elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views of open farmland in the middle to far distance and the introduction of uncharacteristic features associated with construction. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium - low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors during construction. Secondary mitigation measures will reduce residual effects to **Moderate-minor adverse** through the appropriate management of lighting, hoarding, plant and storage.

Assessment at Completion Including Potential Effects (with Embedded Mitigation Only) and Residual Effects (including Secondary Mitigation)

- 9.168 The evaluation of visual effects at completion is considered at Day 1 of Year 2031 (with embedded mitigation only in place) and Year 2046 (with secondary mitigation, once landscape proposals have matured). This therefore considers the effects of the maturity of the proposed secondary mitigation associated with the proposed development.
- 9.169 R1: Residents of Bee Lane. (North side) One - two storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floors rear, side and front elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views of adjacent surrounding farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries and the introduction of suburban development (two storey) including increased traffic volumes (albeit characteristic features in the far distance from rear view windows) across the view and occupying a large proportion of it in the near - middle distance. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation.
- 9.170 R2: Residents of Bee Lane. (South side) One-two storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries and the introduction of suburban (2 storey) and infrastructure development including increased traffic volumes (albeit characteristic features in the far distance at Kingsfold, from front elevation windows) across the views, and occupying a large proportion of it in the near to middle distance. Although some views may be filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with adjacent properties and Bee Lane. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore

been assessed as **Medium adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation.

- 9.171 R3: Residents of Balshaw locality. One-two storey detached properties including farms are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor front, side and rear elevation windows to varying degrees. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries and the introduction of suburban development (two storey) including increased traffic volumes, across the view and occupying a large proportion of it in the near to middle distance. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation.
- 9.172 R4: Residents of Moss Lane (South) Including Holme Farm Dairies. Two storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, and the introduction of suburban (two storey) and infrastructure development including increased local traffic circulation (uncharacteristic features) in the view and occupying a large proportion of it in the near to middle distance. Although some views are filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with Moss Lane. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation.
- 9.173 R5: Residents of Lords Lane. One - three storey detached, and semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor front, side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries and the introduction of suburban development (two storey) and including increased local traffic circulation (uncharacteristic features) in views; occupying a large proportion of it in the near to middle distance. Views of proposed development from front elevations will be more distant and oblique, and views are filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with Lords and Flag Lane. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation.
- 9.174 R6: Residents of Flag Lane including Claytons and Livery Yard. One - two storey detached, semi-detached and bungalow properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor front, and side elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, and the introduction of suburban development (two storey) including local traffic circulation (uncharacteristic features) in the view; occupying a large proportion of it in the near to middle distance, although

some views are filtered by mature tree and hedgerow vegetation associated with Flag Lane. Following balanced assessment the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation.

- 9.175 R7: Residents of Nib Lane. Predominately One storey detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground front, side and rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to the adjacent open farmland, associated hedgerow boundaries, and the introduction of suburban (two storey) and infrastructure development including increased local traffic circulation (uncharacteristic features) in the view; occupying a large proportion of it in the near to middle distance. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation.
- 9.176 R8: Residents of Kingsfold Drive. One - two storey terraced, semi-detached and detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from upper floor front and side elevation windows. The change would be the partial loss of filtered views to open farmland in the far distance, that is beyond Kingsfold Sports Field, and the introduction of suburban development (two storey) albeit characteristic features. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Minor adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Minor-negligible adverse** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.177 R9: Residents at cul-de-sac end of Bramble Court, Kingshaven Drive, Queens Court Avenue. One - two storey semi-detached and detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from ground and upper floor rear and side elevation windows. The change would be the loss of direct and open views to farmland in the near to far distance and the introduction of suburban development albeit characteristic features to some degree arising from proposed development on Bee Lane. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **High adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse effect** on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate - minor adverse** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.178 R10: Residents at cul-de-sac end of Kingsbridge, Braintree Avenue, Bilsborough Hey, Greaves Meadow. Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience minimal changes in views from ground and upper floor side elevation windows. The change would be the introduction of suburban (two storey) and infrastructure in the far distance, beyond Bee Lane. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Minor adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Minor-negligible adverse** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.

- 9.179 R11: Residents at cul-de-sac end of Chelford Close, Burwood Close, Rookery Drive. Two storey detached – semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from predominately upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of direct views to farmland in the middle – far distance and the introduction of suburban (two storey) and infrastructure development beyond the existing farm. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium-low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate-minor adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate - minor adverse effect** at Year 15 in the relative absence of potential for secondary mitigation.
- 9.180 R12: Residents of Leylands Road, Marks Close, Werneth Close Firtrees Avenue. Two storey detached – semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from predominately upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to farmland in the middle – far distance beyond the railway corridor and the intervening landscape structure. The introduction of suburban (two – three storey) development within existing farmland will be evident across the view albeit filtered by existing landscape structure. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium - low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate – minor** adverse effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Minor-negligible adverse** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.181 R13: Residents of Coote Lane. Two storey detached – semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to farmland in the far distance beyond Mill Brook and the intervening landscape structure. The introduction of suburban development (three storey) will be evident above established landscape structure. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium – low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate – minor adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate – minor adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation of building height.
- 9.182 R14: Residents of Chain House Lane (East). Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience changes in views from upper floor rear elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views to farmland in the middle-far distance beyond Mill Brook. The introduction of suburban development (three storey) will be evident above established landscape structure. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium-low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate – minor adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Moderate - minor adverse** effect at Year 15 due to the limited potential for secondary mitigation of building height.
- 9.183 R15: Residents of Chain House Lane (West). One-two storey semi-detached and detached properties with upper floor rear elevation windows northwards. These properties are not expected to experience perceptible changes in views even in winter arising from the distance from the proposed development, the prevalence of intervening

- vegetation and earthworks, and associated infrastructure at Penwortham Way. The magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **No change**.
- 9.184 R16: Residents of Fryer Close, Cloughfield, Copper Beeches. Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience limited changes in views from ground or upper floor rear elevation windows arising from the prevalence of mature tree cover within gardens of properties making up the hamlet of Balshaw. Minor changes may include filtered views to new suburban properties. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Negligible adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Negligible adverse** effect on visual receptors at Year 1 and **No determinable** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.185 R17: Residents of Pope Lane, Green Lane. Two storey semi-detached properties are expected to experience limited changes in views from ground or upper floor front elevation windows arising from the combination of distance from the Site and prevalence of mature landscape structure and woodland vegetation associated with intervening farmland and the Penwortham Way road corridor. The magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **No change**.
- 9.186 H1: Moss Lane, Bee Lane, Lords Lane, Flag Lane, Nib Lane. Existing predominately single, surfaced tracks with ditch and hedgerow boundaries with intermittent small-scale residential properties and filtered views to open farmland. The change would be clearly perceived along the movement corridor with additional 'infill' suburban development in the near - middle distance and loss of vegetation and filtered views of open ground, albeit the change is not entirely uncharacteristic, and sections of Bee Lane, Lords Lane and Flag Lane will remain unaffected. The magnitude of visual change to user group H1, has therefore been assessed as **High-medium adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the medium sensitivity of users, following balanced assessment, results in a **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Moderate-minor adverse** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.187 H2: Kingsfold Drive. Existing surfaced residential street defined by residential estates and amenity grassland verges with intermittent distant views towards open farmland. The change would be perceived along the movement corridor however views would be distant and experienced in the context of the existing residential neighbourhood. The magnitude of visual change to user group H2, has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in a **Minor adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Negligible** adverse effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.188 H3: Coote Lane/Chain House Lane. Existing two-way carriageway with residential development on north side. The proposed development would be glimpsed on the horizon at very limited locations. The magnitude of visual change to user group H3, has therefore been assessed as **Negligible adverse - No change**. Combining this

magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in a **Negligible adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Negligible adverse** effect at Year 15 given the limited potential for landscape mitigation of building heights.

- 9.189 H4: Penwortham Way. Existing carriageway with grass verges and tree belts and strongly filtered views (in winter) towards open farmland with pylons and lighting also clearly evident. The proposed development would include site access (signalised junction) and associated tree loss to accommodate reconfigured earthworks and lighting. Change would be perceived along a localised section of the movement corridor, and so briefly, and experienced in the context of the existing junctions at Chain House Lane and Pope Lane. The magnitude of visual change to user group H4, has therefore been assessed as **Low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in a **Minor adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Negligible** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.190 PR1: Kingsfold Drive to Penwortham Way via Balshaw: Northern section unsurfaced, relatively well used. Southern section, beyond Balshaw Farm, unsurfaced, little used. Whilst the nature of the routeway will remain for the section through the existing hamlet suburban development (two storey) will have a transformative effect on the rural character of the lane along the section from Kingsfold Community Centre to Moss Lane (West) and from the lane to Penwortham Way via the pylon corridor. The change will be experienced in close view. A **High adverse magnitude** of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Major adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse effect** at Year 15 as boundary/interfaces treatments establish.
- 9.191 PR2: Kingsfold Drive to Chain House Lane: PRoW running along Moss Lane. Northern section surfaced, well used routeway. Existing rural routeway defined by hedgerows along the lane and along the boundary line of open fields beyond the farm. The change would be clearly perceived from open landscape to suburban development (two-three storey) across the view in the near - middle distance between existing properties. Some filtering effect of existing boundaries. A **High adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Major adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse effect** at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.192 PR3: Queenscourt Avenue to Bee Lane: Unsurfaced routeway. Existing routeway defined by hedgerow along the boundary line with open farmland in eastern, western and southern directions. The change would be perceived beyond the hedge line from open landscape to suburban development on the western side of the track (two-three storey) in the near - middle distance, although not entirely uncharacteristic given properties on Lords Lane and Bee Lane. A **Medium adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor, and following balanced assessment, this results in a **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Moderate - minor adverse** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.

- 9.193 PR4: Sumpter Court to Flag Lane: Well used surfaced and then unsurfaced routeway. Existing routeway defined by hedgerows and close board fencing along the boundary line with residential housing in close proximity, as well as open farmland in some sections. The change would be clearly perceived from open landscape to infrastructure and suburban development (two storey) across the view in the near - middle distance along the northern section, south of Bee Lane. However, the change is not uncharacteristic. A **Medium adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor, and following balanced assessment, this results in a **Moderate adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Minor adverse effect** at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.194 PR5: Flag Lane to Chain House Lane: Poorly used, unsurfaced routeway along railway embankment. Existing routeway defined by post and wire fencing with the railway corridor and residential edge of Lostock Hall in middle to far distance. No views of farmland to west due to localised embankment. There would therefore be no change in view. A **No change** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **No determinable** effect at Year 1 and at Year 15.
- 9.195 PR6: Holme Farm to Penwortham Way: Poorly used, unsurfaced routeway from farm to Nib Lane then Penwortham Way following hedge boundaries/Mill Brook. Rural route influenced by proximity and filtered views of residential properties, roadway, embankment, lighting and pylons particularly in winter. Also, existing proximity of properties on Chain House Lane apparent in views. The change would be clearly perceived from open landscape to suburban development (two - three storey) across the view in the near - middle distance although not entirely uncharacteristic. A **High adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Major adverse effect** at Year 1 and **Moderate adverse effect** at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.196 PR7: Penwortham Way to Pope Lane: Poorly used, unsurfaced routeway from Penwortham Way following Mill Brook/hedge boundary to meet Green Lane. Existing routeway defined by hedgerow boundaries. Rural route influenced by proximity and filtered views of roadway, embankment, lighting and pylons particularly in winter. Also, existing proximity of properties on Chain House Lane and at Kingsfold. Perception of infrastructure gives sense of a settled landscape. The change would be limited to filtered (in winter only) distant views of rooflines associated with the proposed development (three storey) in the middle-far distance, and in front of the pylon corridor, which is not entirely uncharacteristic. A **Negligible adverse** magnitude of change is therefore anticipated. Combining this magnitude of change with the high sensitivity of receptor results in a **Minor adverse** effect at Year 1 and **Negligible adverse** effect as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.
- 9.197 P1: Kingsfold Community Centre and grounds. One - two storey community centre and associated amenity grassland expected to experience changes in views from ground floor rear and side elevation windows. The change would be the loss of views of open farmland in the middle to far distance and the introduction of suburban

development (two - three storey) including site access across the existing car park in the view albeit an extension of the existing character associated with Kingsfold. Following balanced assessment, the magnitude of visual change has therefore been assessed as **Medium - low adverse**. Combining this magnitude with the low sensitivity of users results in **Moderate adverse effect** on visual receptors at Year 1 and **Minor adverse** effect at Year 15 as the landscape components associated with the proposed development (secondary mitigation) mature.

Table 9.5: Visual Effects Summary Table

Construction					
Visual Receptor	Name	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect (without Mitigation)	Residual Effect (with Secondary Mitigation)
R1	Residents of Bee Lane (north side)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R2	Residents of Bee Lane (south side)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R3	Residents of Balshaw locality	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R4	Residents of Moss Lane (south)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R5	Residents of Lords Lane (west)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R6	Residents of Flag Lane (north & south side)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R7	Residents of Nib Lane (west end)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R8	Residents of Kingsfold Drive	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor-Negligible Adverse

R9	Residents of Bramble Court, Kingshaven Drive, Queens Court Avenue	Low/High <i>Medium-Low</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse
R10	Residents at cul-de-sac end of Kingsbridge, Braintree Avenue, Bilsborough Hey, Greaves Meadow	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor-Negligible Adverse
R11	Residents of Chelford Close, Burwood Close Rookery Drive	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium-Low Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse
R12	Residents of Leylands Road, Marks Close, Firtrees Avenue	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium – Low Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse	Minor-Negligible Adverse
R13	Residents of Coote Lane	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium-Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse
R14	Residents of Chain House Lane (East)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium-Low Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse
R15	Residents of Chain House Lane (West)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	No Change	No Determinable Effect	No Determinable Effect
R16	Residents of Fryer Close, Cloughfield, Copper Beeches	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse
R17	Residents of Pope Lane, Green Lane	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	No Change	No Determinable Effect	No Determinable Effect

H1	Moss Lane, Bee Lane, Lords Lane, Flag Lane, Nib Lane	<i>Medium</i>	High-Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
H2	Kingsfold Drive	<i>Low</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor - negligible Adverse
H3	Coote Lane	<i>Low</i>	Negligible Adverse - No Change	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse
H4	Penwortham Way	<i>Low</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor - Negligible Adverse
PR1	Kingsfold Drive to Penwortham Way via Balshaw	High/High <i>High</i>	High Adverse	Major Adverse	Major Adverse
PR2	Kingsfold Drive to Chain House Lane (7-9-FP46)	High/High <i>High</i>	High Adverse	Major Adverse	Major Adverse
PR3	Queenscourt Avenue to Bee Lane	High/High <i>High</i>	High Adverse	Major Adverse	Major Adverse
PR4	Sumpter Court to Flag Lane (7-9-FP52/3)	High/High <i>High</i>	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
PR5	Flag Lane to Chain House Lane	High/High <i>High</i>	No Change	No Determinable Effect	No Determinable Effect
PR6	Holme Farm to Penwortham Way	High/High <i>High</i>	High Adverse	Major Adverse	Major Adverse
PR7	Penwortham Way to Pope Lane	High/High <i>High</i>	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse

P1	Kingsfold Community Centre	Medium/Medium <i>Medium</i>	Medium – Low Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate - Minor Adverse
----	----------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

Completed Development					
Visual Receptor	Name	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect (Completion Year 1/2031 Embedded Mitigation Only)	Residual Effect (Completion Year 15/2046 Assuming Secondary Mitigation)
R1	Residents of Bee Lane (north side)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R2	Residents of Bee Lane (south side)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R3	Residents of Balshaw locality	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R4	Residents of Moss Lane (south)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R5	Residents of Lords Lane (west)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R6	Residents of Flag Lane (north & south side)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R7	Residents of Nib Lane (west end)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
R8	Residents of Kingsfold Drive	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor-Negligible Adverse
R9	Residents of Bramble Court, Kingshaven Drive, Queens Court Avenue	Low/High <i>Medium-Low</i>	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse
R10	Residents of Kingsbridge, Braintree Avenue,	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor - Negligible Adverse

	Bilsborough Hey, Greaves Meadow				
R11	Residents of Chelford Close, Burwood Close Rookery Drive	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium-Low Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse
R12	Residents of Leylands Road, Marks Close, Firtrees Avenue	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium – Low Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse	Minor-Negligible Adverse
R13	Residents of Coote Lane	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium-Low Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse
R14	Residents of Chain House Lane (East)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Medium-Low Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse	Moderate-minor Adverse
R15	Residents of Chain House Lane (West)	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	No Change	No Determinable Effect	No Determinable Effect
R16	Residents of Fryer Close, Cloughfield, Copper Beeches	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	Negligible Adverse	Negligible adverse	No Determinable Effect
R17	Residents of Pope Lane, Green Lane	Low/High <i>Medium</i>	No Change	No Determinable Effect	No Determinable Effect
H1	Moss Lane, Bee Lane, Lords Lane, Flag Lane, Nib Lane	<i>Medium</i>	High-Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse
H2	Kingsfold Drive	<i>Low</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Negligible Adverse
H3	Coote Lane	<i>Low</i>	Negligible Adverse – No Change	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse
H4	Penwortham Way	<i>Low</i>	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse	Negligible Adverse

PR1	Kingsfold Drive to Penwortham Way via Balshaw (7-9-FP42/50/43)	High/High <i>High</i>	High Adverse	Major Adverse	Moderate Adverse
PR2	Kingsfold Drive to Chain House Lane (7-9-FP46)	High/High <i>High</i>	High Adverse	Major Adverse	Moderate Adverse
PR3	Queenscourt Avenue to Bee Lane	High/High <i>High</i>	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate-Minor Adverse
PR4	Sumpter Court to Flag Lane (7-9-FP52/3)	High/High <i>High</i>	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Minor Adverse
PR5	Flag Lane to Chain House Lane	High/High <i>High</i>	No Change	No Determinable Effect	No Determinable Effect
PR6	Holme Farm to Penwortham Way	High/High <i>High</i>	High Adverse	Major Adverse	Moderate Adverse
PR7	Penwortham Way to Pope Lane	High/High <i>High</i>	Negligible Adverse	Minor Adverse	Negligible Adverse
P1	Kingsfold Community Centre	Medium/Medium <i>Medium</i>	Medium – Low Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Minor Adverse

Conclusions

Landscape Effects

9.198 This assessment has reviewed the effects on the principal landscape receptors in the Site, namely tree cover, hedgerows, open pasture and PRoW and has found that whilst residual effects on open pasture are of Moderate Adverse significance, representing irreversible loss of open ground at a local level, when secondary mitigation is

considered with regards to tree cover, hedgerow and PRow the proposed development has the potential to deliver Major – Minor Beneficial effects arising from the substantial improvement of these landscape features in terms of residual effects in the long term. When considered ‘in the round’ the residual effects of the proposed development on Local Landscape Character are therefore, following balanced assessment, considered to be Moderate to Minor Adverse. Due to the relatively limited extent of the proposed development area, in the context of the wider Regional Landscape Character Area, and the proposed secondary mitigation the residual effects of the proposed development on this receptor is judged as Negligible Adverse with No Determinable effect on the Green Belt.

Visual Effects

- 9.199 The assessment of visual effects considered the visual change relating to the proposed development in terms of PRow, residential amenity, community facilities and the highway network. The assessment found that visual effects on PRow were significant (Major Adverse) however this is in respect of PR1, PR2 and PR6 only, and with secondary mitigation residual effects were reduced to Moderate Adverse. Residual effects on the highway network ranged from Moderate Adverse on site to Negligible Adverse on Kingsfold Drive, Coote Lane and Penwortham Way.
- 9.200 In terms of the residential amenity of existing residents on the Site (R1 – R7) experienced Moderate Adverse effects, essentially arising from the limited potential of secondary mitigation. Residual effects on residential amenity outwith the Site ranged from Moderate-Minor Adverse (at R9 and R11) to No Determinable Change at Pope Lane/Green Lane with the large majority of residents experiencing effects in the order of Minor Adverse.

References

MHCLG. (2019) *National Planning Policy Framework*. MHCLG, UK.

Swanwick, Prof C. (2013) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment*. Routledge, Oxon.

South Ribble Borough Council Local Plan 2012 – 2026 (Adopted Version July 2015)

A Landscape Strategy for Lancashire, Landscape Character Assessment, Dec 2000, Lancashire County Council

Websites

Magic Map, Datasets on Conservation Areas, URL: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx> [accessed on 5th January 2019]

Historic England, The National Heritage List for England, URL: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/process/national-heritage-list-for-england/>