

Land to the west of Bridgemont, Whaley Bridge, Derbyshire, SK23 7PB

Outline planning application for affordable housing with access considered and all other matters reserved (resubmission of HPK/2020/0180)

NPPF para 176 states *'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while **development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas**'*

The study area only includes a small section of the Park and, for example, doesn't extend up to Chinley Churn. How has this study area been determined – has a ZTV been produced?

In the baseline section of the LVA, the character of the relevant Peak District LCTs is described. The value of these is considered high, which I would agree with.

Landscape receptors are only defined as the features within the site and the wider LCTs – there is no consideration of the study area local character assessment (considering how the site / proposed development fits into its immediate landscape context) as a potential receptor, which is an omission.

Given the scale of the development and the size of the LCTs, effects on the LCTs will be limited – however, this does not consider the potential effects on local landscape areas within the park. I do not therefore consider the landscape assessment accurately considers the range of potential landscape effects on the setting of the Park.

In terms of susceptibility, while the site is within a wider urban area, its immediate setting is somewhat isolated from the main urban areas to the south – the development has the potential to increase the visibility of urban development and extend its influence north. I would not therefore necessarily agree that susceptibility is low – my view is that resulting sensitivity is slightly under-estimated ('medium' rather than 'medium-low').

However, I would agree that magnitude of effect would likely be negligible (with a medium sensitivity) on the landscape setting of the Park.

In terms of visual receptors, only receptors within the study area have been considered – and, as previously stated, I have doubts about the extent of the study area – for example, can the site be seen from Chinley Churn? I therefore don't think the LVIA necessarily identifies all potential visual receptors.

Visual receptors within the Park have been defined as having a high sensitivity, which I would agree with.

In terms of visual effects, I would again agree that magnitude of effect is likely to be negligible. However, in this case I think **significance of effect has been under-estimated** (see attached IEMA effect significance matrix below) – given the high sensitivity of the visual receptors within the Park, even a limited magnitude of adverse effect has the potential to result in significant effects.

(The applicants Table 7 is too linear and does not adequately describe the interaction of receptor and effect)

Given this, I think that (a) the supplied LVIA does not adequately define all potential effects of the application scheme and (b) the outline scheme design should include more sensitive and responsive design elements that incorporate greater screening (to break up the extent of the development in views).

