

High Peak BC Planning Reference –	HPK/2024/0496		
Site Name –	Land to east of Brown Edge Road, Buxton		
Summary of proposals -	Residential Application – 5 units		
Consultation Note Subject –	Landscape and Visual Matters		
Planning Case Officer –	James Stannard		
Landscape Comments Prepared By –	Stuart Ryder of Ryder Landscape Consultants		
Date of site visit —	25/2/25	Date of notes — v1 v2	28/2/25 28/3/25
Summary of anticipated landscape and visual effects	There will be long-term Minor, Adverse landscape effect at the Site and Negligible wider landscape effect with the proposals being associated with the existing ribbon development of Brown Edge Road and the associated Brown Edge Close. There are public viewing opportunities from the nearby railway footbridges and from the A6 road corridor as it enters Buxton but the visual change is not considered extensive or dramatic after re-vegetation of the sloping landform.		

Dear James

LAND TO EAST OF BROWN EDGE ROAD, BUXTON – LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL CONSULTATION

Thank you once again for appointing us to review the landscape and visual aspects of the submitted planning application. They are set down under the following headings, an additional section numbered 6 provides summary comments on the submitted Application LVIA;

1. Methodology
2. Site and surrounding's landscape character
3. Proposals for the site
4. Landscape effects
5. Visual effects from surrounding areas
6. Review of submitted LVIA
7. Design and management observations
8. High Peak Council and NPPF landscape policy compliance & conflict
9. Suggested planning conditions

1. Methodology

High Peak Borough Council (HPBC) appointed Ryder Landscape Consultants (RLC) to consider the submitted scheme and supporting documents in January 2025. Stuart Ryder an experienced Chartered Landscape Architect has reviewed the Site Plan As Proposed (6412 (P) -Rev A) by ARN Architects, the Landscape Layout by Barnes Walker, aerial photography and Derbyshire County Council's Online PROW Map information before attending Site. At Site local paths were walked, including those that cross the railway line on the footbridges and along the side of the A6 set to the east of the Site on the other side of the valley.

2. Site and surrounding's landscape character

The Site appears as a single, rectangular shaped semi-improved pasture field not under active management at this moment in time. Its dimensions scale at approximately 85m east to west and 125m north to south equating to a size of just over 1 Hectare. Its primary distinctive feature is its steeply

sloping character with the land falling from west to east. The cross-field slope runs from an average 328m AOD on the higher west side to 318m AOD to the lower east side. These levels are averaged and before any ground form manipulation has taken place. The remainder of the Site field continues to fall away to the east to be bounded by the Manchester to Buxton Railway line set at approximately 308m AOD.

There is an apparent slight slackening of gradients near the upper west side of the Site where the housing is proposed and the field appears steeper to the east. There are currently only a handful of scrubby trees within the Site and more along the railway boundary that appear to have established without regular grazing or cutting of the field. None of the tree stock are protected by TPO's or by virtue of being within a Conservation Area.

Visually it appears as a sloping part of the western valley side that falls down to the railway and up the other side to meet the A6 road corridor.

Using the cardinal points of the compass the adjacent areas that form the context to the Site and with which it is judged are;

- **North** – Lies the residential properties of 1 & 2 Lowcroft that as their names suggest appear as former crofts, or workers cottages set lower down the slope, they are accessed off Brown Edge Road. Beyond these Lowcroft properties lie more sloping semi-improved pasture fields set between Brown Edge Road and the railway.
- **East** – Of the Site field lie two sets of railway lines, the older western lines is understood to be the passenger line to Manchester, the newer eastern line is the Hogshaw freight sidings. The construction of the newer lines between 2018 and 2020 have left a platform of made ground to the east that allow partially fenced appears to be used as publicly accessible land by dog walkers. Further to the east of the disturbed railway compound land are improved pasture fields and the Buxton and High Peak Golf Club (BHPGC) set to both sides of the A6 corridor.
- **South** – immediately south lies the 5 unit scheme of Brown Edge Grove built on the former site of a farm building sometime between 2006 and 2017. This scheme has a mix of 2 and 3 storey premises accessed off a narrow gap between houses on Brown Edge Road. Further to the south of these houses are the residential dwellings of Ladycroft road and further down the hill on land by the side of the railway are the houses of Hogshaw Drive built in 2006 and 2007.
- **West** – is where the semi-detached house of Brown Edge Road are set as a ribbon of development reaching up the local ridge that rises to the north. The semi's at this location appear as either inter-war or soon after WWII era housing, have a general consistency of form and spacing. There are similar houses to the west of the road and two football pitches to their rear before the land starts to climb again into rougher pasture fields.

The Site is part of a transitional landscape set at the edge of Buxton with both the urban influence of housing to two sides (west and south), part rural housing to the north and railway land to the east. It appears as a remnant and isolated field that has lost its primary use as pasture and its rural qualities are in decline due to the lack of active agricultural management.

I would not class the Site or the surrounding area as a 'valued landscape' as per NPPF Para 187 a) but it is part of a wider landscape that allows longer cross valley views to and from the A6 corridor into Buxton. It is not part of the Peak District National Park, nor plays any part in its setting.

3. Proposals for the Site

Construction access is proposed using the same private road access from Brown Edge Road that currently services Brown Edge Grove. The road continues into the Site field to service five single storey properties each with a detached garage.

Returning to the junction of the private road with Brown Edge Road it appears to be widened and a new footway put to its southern side. The net result of this is the houses are set immediately adjacent to the new access.

The levels on the development platforms indicate that the first three bungalows would be set at 324.05m AOD and the two northern properties would step up a metre each to have platform levels of 325.05m and 326.05m respectively. Ramps up from the access road onto each plot are indicated and steps are also indicated on three of the five units.

To achieve suitable flat development platforms there has to be significant earthworks undertaken on Site, according to the Barnes Walker section A-A on Dwg M3753-PA-02-V3 they consist of:

- A 1 to 3m high gabion built retaining wall to the western boundary following the rear garden boundary of the Brown Edge Road properties;
- Cutting out the rear portion of the platform and using the won material to build up the front portion of the platform and access road;
- Sloping from the edge of the road using reinforced ground construction to achieve a further 3m change in level, before;
- A 2m high retaining wall in Flex MSE to loose further height; and
- Final general raising of ground levels by an average 1.5m most probably to minimise the exportation of excess cut material from Site.

The Barnes Walker section drawing is quite informative but would benefit from having the railway position and levels marked upon it for a fuller understanding of the proposed scheme.

The FLEX MSE is defined on the company's website¹ as '*a sustainable vegetated wall system designed to outlast its hardscape predecessors, including concrete and steel. Its simple geobag and interlocking plate facing adapts and moves with the land, enduring events that destroy traditional wall systems.*'

The finished article initially appear as a series of dark coloured sandbags stacked on each other and then as a vegetated bank subject to plant establishment;



¹ [Sustainable vegetated wall system - Flex MSE](#)

There is a mix of tree and scrub planting down the bank where surplus material is to be deposited. Domestic style and scale planting is indicated nearer to the Bungalows with raised planters proposed to manage the immediate level changes to the front of the properties.

There is no Landscape and Visual Appraisal submitted with the proposals to better understand the effects on character and appearance. It is not mandatory for developments of this side but it would be helpful to understand how such considerations have shaped the proposals.

4. Landscape effects

The landscape at the Site and in its setting is not included in any national or local landscape designations, nor does it form the immediate setting to the Peak District National Park. It is outside of Built-up Area limits for Buxton and is therefore classed as Countryside and subject to Policies EQ2, EQ3 and E1 of the High Peak Local Plan – April 2016 as well as NPPF directions regarding the consideration of its intrinsic qualities.

The proposals will effectively turn the upper third of the field into ribbon of residential development. The lower eastern two-thirds of the field will initially appear modified from the extensive earthworks required to create developable land and then green over and become a mixed area of scrub and rougher grass. This will appear similar to its current state.

The five dwellings will by and large be perceived as a similar built form to the adjacent houses to the west and south. They will not be perceived as extending the sense of development northwards up the Brown Edge Road ridge. There will be a slight sense of moving down the slope of the field but the road does not extend further eastwards than the extents of the Brown Edge Grove development. In this regard the line of 5 units will appear ‘book-ended’ by the houses of Brown Edge Grove to the south and Lowcroft to the north. They will reduce the sense of separation that the Lowcroft properties currently display.

The greatest landscape effect will be to the levels of the Site with the combination of gabions, grading and bagged retaining structures as well as ground level raising to the lower slope permanently altering the current, more natural topographic fall and appearance as part of the valley side. Building on the side of slopes is not unusual in Buxton given its steep sided valley form, it is the sensitivity of how it is achieved that is more critical. The gabions at the rear of proposed properties will be screened by the houses and the Flex MSE bagged retaining structure will largely blend into the surroundings depending on the proposed planting species for it. The steep slope that runs from the access road to the top of the Flex MSE will appear precipitous next to the road.

The planting associated with the properties will appear domestic in nature and the scrub down the bank will appear more natural in form. Questions are however raised about its care and upkeep in Section 6 – Design Considerations.

Overall I consider the landscape effects for the Site to be **Moderate, Adverse and Temporary** at the time of construction reducing with time and greening of the slope to **Minor, Adverse and Permanent**.

5. Visual effects from surrounding areas

Six sets of visual receptors have been considered that have actual or possible views back to the Site from publicly accessible areas, views from the nearest two residential receptors have also been included to make eight possible visual receptor groups:

- Brown Edge Road residents that back onto the west side of the proposed development;
- Brown Edge Grive residents that abut the south side of the proposed development;

- Users of Footpath Buxton 1 (FP1) that crosses the railway footbridges;
- Users of the former Hogshaw Railway development compound;
- Users of the BHP Golf Course; and
- A6 road users travelling south into Buxton.

The visual change experienced by each group is discussed below.

Brown Edge Road residents will be able to look out over the proposed Site from the back of their properties including their rear gardens. They will largely look over the top of the bungalow properties to the opposite side of the valley but the sense of an open view to the immediate field to the back of their houses will be lost. This immediate screening by built form may also block sight to the railways at the bottom of the Site field but this has not been confirmed. Given the size of the proposed detached garages the row of built form will appear more substantial than just five single properties. This change to their view has been judged as a **Moderate, Adverse and Permanent** effect.

Brown Edge Grove residents do not have such an immediate visual relationship with the proposed dwellings. It is the very northern house in this block of five that has a visual relationship with the proposals but the others generally do not and will not have their residential views changed. The end house will experience a change from its side elevation, rear and side garden but will not be able to look directly on the proposed development from its front elevation. More tree planting has been indicated between the existing and new houses to mitigate this visual proximity but the ability to see the new house on the neighbouring plot will remain. This change to their view has been judged as a **Moderate/Minor, Adverse and Permanent** effect.

Footpath Buxton FP 1 users will see the Site clearly when crossing the railway bridges and judge the proposals against the ribbon of houses on Brown Edge Road/Grove. There will be a sense of visual change but not an extensive one given the scale of the development and the immediate visual precedent of the existing houses. The extensive earthworks to the field's slope will also initially appear dramatic and substantial in scale but this change will become less notable with the greening of the bagged retaining wall and scrub vegetation on the re-profiled slope. This change to the view is initially assessed as **Moderate, Adverse and Temporary** reducing to a **Minor, Adverse and Permanent** effect.

Hogshaw Railway Compound users may be trespassing but given this area's designation as a future housing allocation has been included as a visual receptor group. They look directly at 90 degrees across the railway lines to the Site sloping up to the houses of Brown Edge Road. Like the users of FP1 initially the earthworks on Site will appear dramatic and extensive but these will 'green-up' and will look like other parts of the slope to the west side of the valley. They too would experience similar levels of visual change to the users of FP1 - **Moderate, Adverse and Temporary** reducing to a **Minor, Adverse and Permanent** effect.

BHP Golf Course users – Playing to the east side of the A6 road corridor will have occasional views to the development site just as they currently do to the ribbon of housing along Brown Edge Road and further south at Ladycroft and Hogshaw. The Site is not a key part of their view and their attention will generally be on the golf course. The visual change is assessed as **Minor, Adverse and Permanent**.

A6 Road users – including pedestrians walking the footpath to the east of the road experience fleeting glimpses of the proposed development Site when they journey into Buxton. The Brown Edge Road housing ribbon is visible stretching up the local ridge to the west and the Site is glimpsed between tree blocks on the BHP Golf Course. The Site is more evident in winter when these trees are without their canopies. The presence of five houses, associated with the existing housing ribbon will not appear out of keeping on the approach to a town. The construction works will be more notable than the completed

built form given their scale and from being set on a valley side. After the valley side has 'greened-up' the visual change has been assessed as **Negligible, Adverse and Permanent** for the road and footpath users.

Taken as a whole the visual effects will be noticeable by local people and particularly the residents of Brown Edge Road and Brown Edge Grove but not reach such a level of intrusion or dominance that they can be classed as causing significant visual harm.

6. Review of submitted LVIA

The application was accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) produced by Barnes Walker with report reference M3753 -LVIA-24.07-V4. This LVIA was reviewed prior to attending Site for background information and to understand which landscape and visual receptors had been considered by the Applicant's professional advisors.

There are no concerns to express about the general methodological approach used to produce the LVIA as it is considered to follow the Landscape Institute's Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition (GLVIA3). However, there is one observation to make about the reporting later effects e.g. Year 15 when the mitigation has established and is reaching a state of semi-maturity which is largely absent from the LVIA and which would be helpful to clearly understand the assessed long-term effects and show how effective the mitigation proposals are in reducing the landscape and visual effects of the proposals.

The LVIA identifies the following receptors;

- 4 No. Landscape receptors;
- 8 No. Visual receptors from publicly accessible locations - including local footpaths and the A6 road into Buxton;
- 6 No. Visual receptors from private locations – made up of residential properties near the Site.

I consider the number of receptors identified and the location of the visual receptors appropriate for this type of development at this location.

Looking to the visual receptors first. I consider the sensitivity assigned to them appropriate and of the magnitude of visual effects for each groups to be understandable as well. This leads to the visual effects as summarised in LVIA Table 5 to be considered a fair and reasonable assessment. The visual receptors experience a Moderate/Minor, Adverse to Negligible, Adverse levels of effect.

I consider there to be a slight under assessment of the sensitivity of two of the landscape receptors namely the Site within its context and the features of the Site. I judge there to be a greater magnitude of effect at Year 1 with a larger degree of landscape change, particularly through the ground form modelling on the Site and down the valley side to the east. My assessment would be that these two receptors have a Medium level of sensitivity to this type of proposal, the magnitude of effects would also be Medium leading to a Moderate, Adverse landscape effect at Year 1. This effect level, although greater than the LVIA assessed effect would reduce with the passage of time and establishment of the mitigation proposals to a point where at Year 15 that it would be a Minor, Adverse and Permanent effect. These levels of effect on the landscape character of Site and its context and on the landscape features of the Site are not considered significant in your determination of the application as a whole.

Overall I consider the LVIA to be fair and reasonable with the exception of the temporary Year 1 landscape effects which will diminish to a final Minor, Adverse and Permanent landscape effect at Year 15.

7. Design and Management Observations

The following summary of potential design and management observations are given as a way of improving the landscape, visual and maintainability aspect of the proposals. Their inclusion should be sought if you are minded recommending consent for the proposals. Their provision by the Applicant should not be seen as a route for automatic approval of the scheme but rather as way of bettering the landscape and visual effects it brings about;

1. The house footprints are large, particularly when compared to the semi-detached properties of Brown Edge Road, this largeness stems from their single storey height and providing sufficient floorspace for the dwellings. However the scale of bungalow properties is compounded by the size of the detached garages, particularly the two double garages that are of a similar size to the individual semi-detached properties on Brown Edge Road. Possibly reducing the scale of the garages and changing their spatial arrangement with their associated houses may assist in limiting the effect of having ten individual buildings in a row along the Site;
2. There is a uniformity of size and arrangement to the proposed dwellings that could be modified to reduce their repetitious nature and improve the visual amenity of the proposals. It is recognised that the creation of a developable platform restricts the layout form but more variation could be introduced to the house shape and relationship to the associated garages;
3. The turning head is queried as it appears that a private drive is proposed to be used to allow vehicles to reverse to leave the new road, it is presumed that the road would remain private and not be offered up for adoption.
4. There appears to be no inclusions of SuDS features on the layout. Again the difficulty of creating flat space for surface water attenuation ponds is recognised so are other techniques such as crates under the road being proposed?;
5. Materials management on Site will be difficult to achieve given the limited flat working space and the stripping and storage of topsoil for future restoration of the slope is of paramount importance;
6. First of two fencing points is that the drop to the side of the access road is such that you would expect to see some delineation fencing or rail along the eastern side of the road to deter drivers from manoeuvring onto or over that part of the bank;
7. Second fencing point is that Network Rail may require the provision of palisade fencing to the railway line if they perceive an increase of recreational activity of the land to the side of their asset;
8. The final observation is on management of the slope and the scrubby, meadow finish that is proposed upon it. It is presumed that its long term management will fall to the residents of the five new properties or remain with the existing landowner. Whomever is responsible they will need to evidence how they will maintain the slope to achieve the proposed long-term landscape form. This management could be linked to the provision of Bio-diversity Net Gain arrangements but should be understood and taken into account now to gain sufficient reassurance that it will be actively managed rather than become an eyesore or a problem for the future residents.
9. In addition, the submission of a long-term Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan (LMMP) for the duration of the development's operation will be required to cover the initial establishment and ongoing upkeep of the various landscape features and ecological habitats outside of the private residential garden spaces.

8. High Peak Borough Council and NPPF Landscape Planning Policy

High Peak Landscape Policies

The following local plan policies are considered to apply from the Adopted Local Plan 2016. The emerging policies from developing local plan have not been considered and there is not a Neighbourhood Plan in place for this part of Buxton.

EQ2 – Landscape Character – of the four strands that seek to ‘*protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty and economic benefit..*’, the following areas of compliance and conflict are found.

- Requiring that development has particular regard to maintaining the aesthetic and biodiversity qualities of natural and man-made features within the landscape, such as trees and woodlands, hedgerows, walls, streams, ponds, rivers, ecological networks or other topographical features

Bullet 1 – All of the listed features are generally lacking from Site so are not affected except for the last element – topographic features. The Site’s slope could be argued as a topographic feature and it will receive significant modification by the proposals. However it should also be recognised that the valley side is an extensive area and into a feature found at this Site alone. The earthworks at the Site will not alter the character of the wider valley side and the lower valley side will be returned to a state that it resembles today in terms of land levels and land cover. In looking at the requirement to maintain aesthetic and bio-diversity qualities if this is widened out to the whole Site the aesthetic qualities are not unduly affected given the matching nature of the built form assimilating with the other housing nearby and biodiversity wise there will be a small improvement from the scrub and any meadow seeding. There is found to be general **compliance** with this first bullet when the site is judged as a whole.

- Requiring that development proposals are informed by, and are sympathetic to the distinctive landscape character areas as identified in the Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document and also take into account other evidence of historic landscape characterisation, landscape sensitivity, landscape impact and the setting of the Peak District National Park and where appropriate incorporate landscape mitigation measures.

Bullet 2 – There is no Landscape and Visual Appraisal of the proposed works where the nature of the landscape character area in which it is located would typically be discussed. For the record it is part of the Dark Peak Landscape Character Area (LCA) as defined in The Landscapes of Derbyshire and in the Moorland Fringe Landscape Character Type. The SPD explains that ‘*This is an open landscape with expansive views and very limited development. In such an unsettled landscape, any new development is likely to have a significant effect on the open character.*’ However at the Site the open character of the wider LCT has changed to an urban fringe setting, rather than the edge of the open moorland. As stated above the Site is not part of the PDNP, nor part of its setting so this part of Bullet 2 is not applicable. The SPD contains useful design commentary on the detailing of buildings in small developments and this should ideally be followed if consent is granted. To date there has been no information supplied to demonstrate **compliance or conflict** with this bullet. However it is noted that this Site is not typical of the wider Moorland Fringe LCT given the existing influence exerted on it by adjacent housing.

- Requiring that development proposals protect and/or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape and landscape setting of the Peak District National Park

Bullet 3 – the third bullet requires development proposals to protect and/or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape and the landscape setting of the Peak District National Park. It does not achieve the former with my own assessment recording **Minor, adverse and Permanent** effects on the landscape character of the Site. However if the question of assimilation is asked then the proposals will assimilate with the adjacent housing and not look out of keeping. A larger development would however be problematic to set within the Site field without changing the wider housing or landscape character of the adjacent areas. The landscape setting to the National Park is not applicable. There is therefore a small **conflict** at a local landscape level with the Site's baseline character of a natural field set within the Moorland Edge character area.

- Resisting development which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape or the setting of a settlement as identified in the Landscape Impact Assessment.

Bullet 4 – The proposals would be marginally detrimental to the immediate local landscape character but not the wider area of Brown Edge Road valley side or to the A6 approach to Buxton. The Site field contributes in a marginal way to the entrance of Buxton on the A6 or railway and no notable way to the wider setting of the town. This leads to a policy **conflict** for the immediate contextual landscape but **compliance** regarding the wider landscape.

Overall there is more **compliance** than **conflict** with the four bulleted parts of EQ2. The conflict that has been found has been small in scale and is not considered significant in landscape character terms and not substantial enough to warrant refusal of the proposals on the grounds of landscape effects.

EQ3 – Rural Development explains that outside the settlement boundaries and sites allocated for development (as defined on the Policies Map), including the Green Belt which is not applicable to this location, the Council will seek to ensure that *'new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness, including the character, appearance and integrity of the historic and cultural environment'*. With regards to residential development eight bullets are listed for the types of development allowed in a rural area. The proposals do not fit into any of the eight development types and appear in **conflict** with this policy.

EQ6 – Design & Place Making – The overarching aim of this policy is stated as *'All development should be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place.'* After this statement there are 11No. bullet points with Bullets 1 to 5 & 11 appearing applicable in part to the proposals.

Looking at the identified bullet points in EQ6, my comments are:

- *Bullet 1 - respect the character, identity and context* – largely achieved with the proposals having the potential to largely match the landscape character of the adjacent housing and by virtue of not extending housing into more sensitive parts of the landscape, or setting to Buxton;
- *Bullet 2 - development on the edge of settlement is of high quality* –applicable but high quality of proposals is not yet demonstrated;
- *Bullet 3 - contributes positively to an area's character ...and landscape features* – the proposals are neutral with regards to the area's wider character as a residential ribbon and will lead to an increase in scrub cover on the re-profiled bank.
- *Bullet 4 - achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and does not cause unacceptable effects by reason of ... noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity* – the single storey nature of the bungalows minimises but does not

remove their effects on adjacent residential development, there will be an adverse effect but it is not considered at such a level as to make it unacceptable. Into this category the effects on the existing properties on Brown Edge Road that have their side gardens removed to form the widened site access must also be considered.

- *Bullet 5 - private spaces are well-designed, safe, attractive, complement the built form and provide for the retention of significant landscape features such as mature trees* – the proposals are able to achieve a flat, useable garden to the rear of the properties and a more sloped and stepped garden to the front. They are not as substantial as the Brown Edge Road gardens but appear appropriate to the scale of the properties.
- *Bullet 11 - takes account of ... Supplementary Planning Documents* in this case High Peak Design Guide SPD. Within the design guide Section 3 – Designing in Context and Section 7 – Details & Materials appear the most applicable to the proposals and its greater and obvious application would make the scheme more acceptable within the local landscape.

There is more compliance than conflict with these selected bullets but I recognise that EQ6 has to be read as a whole with consideration of whether the other strands are applicable.

EQ8 – Green Infrastructure (GI) – The provision of the proposed planting to the re-profiled bank would appear to give good opportunity to improve GI and deliver Bio-diversity Net Gain (BNG). I am not qualified to assess the percentage improvements if any occur and would recommend consultation with a suitably qualified Ecologist to confirm this matter.

EQ9 – Trees, Woodlands & Hedgerows – The Moorland Fringe LCT is quite tree-less given the thin soils and historic farming of sheep. There are few trees to retain but they are indicated to be kept by the proposals including the single open field tree towards the bottom of the Site field. The retention of this open field trees requires the modification of the Site's new contours. The proposed planting of scrub with few trees combined with the ability to retain the boundary trees means that there is apparent **compliance** with this policy. If granted consent the protection of retained stock should be conditioned with suitably robust planning conditions.

National Planning Policy Framework Landscape Policies

- NPPF §187 a) – The Site is not considered a 'valued landscape' as per this NPPF paragraph so this part of NPPF 187 is not engaged.
- NPPF §187 b) – The intrinsic quality of countryside is however engaged because the Site displays rural character and is set within a wider area of countryside, its intrinsic qualities are reduced but not totally removed with the lower part of the slope remaining more naturally vegetated.
- NPPF 192 – National landscapes paragraph is not deemed engaged.
- NPPF 135 – Street tree planting is partially delivered with trees in private gardens. I am however unsure with these proposals set off an unadopted road whether this part of the Framework is engaged. There is also the factor of considering the tree-less nature of the Moorland Fringe landscape. In looking at the Barnes Walker Landscape Layout an ability to provide trees is demonstrated and the species choices suggested are considered reasonable.

9. Suggested planning conditions

As explained above there is minor landscape and visual harm to be put in the planning balance at the Site. Should you be minded to recommend planning consent and notwithstanding the already submitted landscape proposals the following Planning Conditions are suggested;

- A. Confirmation of all earthworks through the provision of an earth modelling plans and sections are provided to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority along with a Materials

Management Plan produced by a suitably qualified Geotechnical Engineer including the source of material to ensure that the bunding associated with the upper development platform is assimilated into the local landform, is structurally stable set on its valley side location and can receive tree and scrub planting. Reason – *To ensure stability of earthworks and assimilation of the feature into the local landscape.*

- B. That a detailed hard and soft landscape mitigation scheme, including plant and material schedules are submitted for consideration. Reason – *to ensure that the proposals maintain the urban – rural edge character and respect the neighbouring landscape and residential properties.*
- C. The soft landscape proposals should be implemented in the first growing season after the project has commenced and replacement of dead, diseased or dying stock should be undertaken in accordance with a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan for a minimum period of 5 years. Reason – *to ensure the quality of the landscape mitigation measures and appropriate maintenance until they become effective.*
- D. That no tree felling is undertaken on , or excavation within root protection areas, without the express written agreement of High Peak Borough Council’s Arboricultural Officer and after consideration of tree sensitive construction processes – Reason *to protect the mature tree and hedge stock that contributes to the local landscape.*
- E. That a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP) is prepared for implementation by the site owners / tenants / operators in perpetuity and that an arrangement for continuation of the LMMP by any future owners is entered into – Reason – *to reflect the importance of the soft landscape mitigation proposals for the local landscape character.*
- F. Low light level scheme – Reason – *to reduce the intrusive nature of lighting in the rural edge landscape in the hours of darkness.*

I recognise that the suggested conditions could be combined with others that you may be considering and will require careful wording to be enforceable but wished to explain the reasoning behind them. I trust you find these comments useful as you consider the determination of this application. Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Stuart Ryder – 28/3/25