

High Peak BC Planning Reference –	HPK/2025/0447		
Site Name –	Land at Crossings Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith (Chapel)		
Summary of proposals -	Outline application for up to 180 dwellings, public open space and associated works (all matters reserved except access)		
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 —	26/8/25	Date of note(s) No.1 Previous notes supplied under a Pre-Application Process	24/2/26
Summary of overall findings	• The LVIA is methodologically sound but contains minor inconsistencies and some under-reporting of longer-term landscape and localised visual effects. • There is landscape and visual harm, particularly at Site level and for receptors immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary. • While mitigation planting and public open space will soften effects over time, the permanent urbanisation of greenfield land results in enduring adverse change. • The acceptability of these effects is ultimately a matter for the planning balance.		

Dear James

CROSSINGS ROAD, CHAPEL - REVIEW OF APPLICATION LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Thank you for appointing Ryder Landscape Consultants to review the proposed housing scheme at Crossings Road. I have reviewed the Landscape and Visual Appraisal produced by Tyler Grange and with reference 17556 R04a dated 23rd October 2025.

Landscape Assessment Methodological Review

Produced to a recognisable GLVIA3 compliant methodology with judgements transparent and following a systematic framework.

The landscape assessment considers three landscape receptors:

- The landscape character of the Site;
- The Settled Valley Pastures Landscape Character Type (LCT) within the 2km study area; and
- Enclosed Moorland LCT within the 2km study area.

There is no finer grain of landscape characterisation done in terms of:

- Either generating finer grain landscape character areas on and around the Site to test the proposals against; or
- Looking at individual landscape components on Site that build up to form the overall landscape character of the Site.

A finer grain review can sometimes assist in understanding the effects of change on Site and particularly at its interfaces with the surrounding landscapes both urban and rural. I do not consider that all the fields on the Site should be classed as settlement fringe with the ones to the west more rural in character and set some distance from urban elements.

It should also be noted that the LVIA is an iterative reporting and design process and should make clear recommendations as to mitigation of landscape and visual effects that design alone cannot address.

The assessment of the three identified landscape receptors follows a recognisable definition of landscape sensitivity (from value and susceptibility analysis) and combining this with magnitude of landscape change to arrive at an overall judgement on the significance of landscape effects. However there is no separate discussion within the LVIA of susceptibility which is useful to understand how final judgements of sensitivity are arrived at.

Appendix 3 in the LVIA is where a TGN 2/21 Landscape value assessment for the Site is undertaken and it also provides a description of the Site's characteristics at this location.

There is no narrative of what the final assessment of effects judgements means in Appendix 2 which is the main Methodology Section for the LVIA. I am aware that some Planning Officers like to have these to hand as they prepare their Officer's Reports to allow a written explanation of what each significance of effect rating means.

Review Comments on Landscape Appraisal

Taking the three landscape receptors in the same order as they are presented in the LVIA I can first state that I agree with the value judgement placed against each:

- The Site – Medium Value
- Settled Valley Pasture LCT – Medium/High
- Enclosed Moorland LCT – High.

I think it is worth highlighting that the value judgement for the LCT's is for the parts of the LCT in the study area and is not a blanket value rating for the whole LCT as certain areas of each will be higher or lower in value terms depending on the specific circumstances of the area.

LVA Section 8.11 on Page 27 defines the landscape sensitivity of receptors as follows.

Landscape Receptors

- High Sensitivity:
 - Enclosed Moorlands LCT
- Medium / High Sensitivity:
 - Settled Valley Pastures LCT
- Medium Sensitivity:
 - The Site-specific landscape elements and features

I agree with this assessment but also take the opportunity to point out that certain receptors on the Site have a higher sensitivity rating such as trees and field boundaries. However when amalgamated to produce an overall sensitivity rating for the Site's landscape Medium is considered appropriate.

A summary of the predicted landscape effects is set at 9.1 of the LVA as reproduced below as a digital extract. This is based on the fuller table in LVA Appendix 4.

Table 9.1: Likely effects upon Landscape Receptors

Landscape Resource	Sensitivity of the Receptor (from baseline review)	Magnitude of Change		Level of Effect	
		Year 1	Year 15	Year 1	Year 15
The Site-specific landscape elements and features	Medium	Major / Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Moderate Adverse	Minor to Adverse
Settled Valley Pastures LCT	Medium / High	Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Moderate Adverse	Moderate to Minor Adverse
Enclosed Moorlands LCT	High	Minor	Moderate Adverse	Minor to Negligible	Moderate to Minor Adverse

Taking each of the landscape receptors in turn I have the following judgements:

- The Site (Year 1) – I agree with the Medium sensitivity and Major / Moderate magnitude of change and the resulting Moderate, Adverse level of effect.
- The Site (Year 15) – I again agree with the Medium sensitivity but consider the mitigation measures will only be able to reduce the magnitude of change to Moderate which in turn will lead to a Moderate, Adverse and Permanent level of effect which is a grade above that reported in the LVIA.
- Settled Valley Pastures LCT (Years 1 & 15) – I agree with the Medium/High sensitivity and the reported magnitudes of change leading to the Moderate Adverse and Moderate/Minor Adverse and Permanent assessments at Years 1 & 15 respectively.
- Enclosed Moorlands (Year 1) – I agree that it has a High sensitivity and the magnitude of change is Minor which results in a Moderate, Adverse landscape effect. However I think the two highlighted cells in the summary table have been transcribed which makes it appear that the effect is Minor to Negligible.
- Enclosed Moorlands (Year 15) – Again agreement with the High sensitivity and a magnitude of change of Minor to Negligible which returns a Moderate/Minor, Adverse and Permanent level of effect at Year 15. Again this has been transcribed in Table 9.1 but is reported at this level in Appendix 4.

Taken as a whole there is general agreement with the reported levels of landscape effects. The only point of disagreement is the long term (Year 15) landscape effects reported for the Site which I grade at a level higher than the Applicant's advisor at Moderate, Adverse and Permanent instead of the reported Minor, Adverse level.

This difference arises as the landscape character of the Site changes from rural / urban fringe to one that is urban in form and even with the established mitigation is still urban in nature. This adverse landscape change would occur for any greenfield Site and should be taken into account in your planning balance exercise.

Visual Assessment Methodological Review

The viewpoints and approach to the production of the visual assessment was previously discussed and agreed with the Applicant and their landscape advisors Tyler Grange at a Pre-Application meeting in September 2025. I can confirm that:

- The identified viewpoints have been included in the suite of representative viewpoints in the visual assessment;

- That the viewpoints as presented appear to be fair and reasonable as far as I can tell from my own attendance to Site and the surrounding area;
- That visual clarity on the photographs is good and the Site can be made out in the viewpoints where it is visible;
- That the photographs that date from March 2025 show a 'worse case' scenario with the trees and hedges out of leaf; and
- That residential receptors have been included as a separate group within the assessment with the various houses split into different compass directions around the Site.

Review comments on specific viewpoints

20 No submitted representative photographs as presented (please see Tyler Grange Plan 4 appended to this note for their location). They are held at the end of Appendix 7 and are blurry in part I suspect due to the need to downgrade their resolution to create a manageable sized document for submission to HPBC. I have instead used my own photography from near these locations to consider visual effects but suggest that a standalone file of VP's 1 to 20 are submitted to the Authority at a higher resolution. The Accurate Visual Representations (AVR's) in Appendix 7 remain sharp and more legible.

Viewpoints 5, 6, 7, 15 & 20 have all been scoped out of the visual assessment given the lack of visibility to Site. However some of them are still referred to in the more detailed assessment of effects.

I have looked at each of the agreed viewpoints and can confirm the following with regards to the assessment of change presented by the Applicant.

Viewpoints 1 to 2 – Crossings Road and Viewpoint 3 – Heath Lane/Orchid Drive on the Site's eastern boundary

I consider that there has been an under-reporting of the visual effects for road users close to the Site at both Year 1 and Year 15. With reference to Appendix 3 Table 2 and Appendix 5 the LVIA reports the following visual ratings to arrive at the end effects at Year 1 and 15.

Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Significance
<i>Tyler Grange</i>				
Low	Medium	Medium/Low	Year 1 Moderate/Major	Moderate, Adverse
Low	Medium	Medium/Low	Year 15 Moderate	Moderate to Minor, Adverse
<i>My Assessment</i>				
Medium	Medium	Medium	Year 1 Large	Major/Moderate, Adverse
Medium	Medium	Medium	Year 15 Medium/Large	Moderate, Adverse

The reason for this difference of judgement stems from the different value rating given to the existing view at the start of the assessment chain. I consider classifying the value of the view as Low is under assessing its scenic qualities. The LVIA comment in the value judgement in Appendix 3 – Table 2 explains that the landscape is not designated but this is not relevant to the value and visual amenity it provides to road users. With a higher value the assessed visual sensitivity increases to Medium and when this is combined with the Large or Medium/Large magnitude of change returns an increased significance of effect rating.

The increase in significance is not extensive but I consider the ***Moderate, Adverse and Permanent*** visual effect at Year 15 to be a more accurate reflection of the visual effect from public areas to the immediate east of the Site.

Viewpoint 4 - Footpath users on Chapel en-le Frith FP 135 beyond the northern Site boundary

This viewpoint is also the subject of one of the three Accurate Visual Representations (AVR's) set in the LVIA's Appendix 7.

I agree that the visual sensitivity of these footpath walkers is Medium/High given they are walking a scenic country path but there is some presence of the edge of Chapel in the view. I also agree that the magnitude of change would also be Minor, even at Year 1 when mitigation planting is still to take any effect. This returns an initial **Moderate/Minor, Adverse** effect at Year 1 which I concur with. However I disagree that the effect at Year 15 will be Negligible as stated in the LVIA and consider a **Minor, Adverse and Permanent** visual effect would remain at this stage. By whichever judgement this remains and insignificant visual effect.

Viewpoints 5, 6 & 7 – Elevated viewpoints to the north and east of the Site

Scoped out of the assessment due to a lack of intervisibility to the Site. However Viewpoint 7 is also included in the assessment of visual effects from the south of the Site.

Viewpoints 7 to 11, plus Viewpoints 14, 15 & 19 – Elevated viewpoints to the east and south of the Site.

I agree with the assessment that these footpath users have a Medium/High level of visual sensitivity given that the viewpoints are typically from scenic, elevated walking routes but with the context of some built form from Chapel in the view. I also agree that the magnitude of change should be assessed as Minor as the scale and location of the additional built form is such that it appears as an appropriate extension to the built form in the area rather than an encroachment or breach over a ridge line. Views to Eccles Pike which is the notable land mark to the west are uninterrupted and its visual setting remains fundamentally unchanged with the small area of new development visually associated with the more treed housing line.

The Medium/High visual sensitivity combined with a Minor magnitude of change returns a **Moderate, Adverse** rating at Year 1 and a **Moderate/Minor, Adverse** rating at Year 15. I consider this assessment of visual effects from this collection of higher, more naturalistic viewpoints as a fair and reasonable.

As an aside VP15 has been stated as being 'scoped out' at Paragraph 6.18 but has been included in this clutch of viewpoints to the south of the Site.

Viewpoints 12, 16, 17 & 18 – Elevated viewpoints to the west of the Site

I agree with the assessment that these footpath users have a Medium/High level of visual sensitivity given that the viewpoints are typically from scenic, elevated walking routes but with the context of some built form from Chapel in the view. I also agree that the magnitude of change should be assessed as Minor as the scale and location of the additional built form is such that it appears as an appropriate extension to Chapel.

The Medium/High visual sensitivity combined with a Minor magnitude of change returns a **Moderate, Adverse** rating at Year 1 and a **Moderate/Minor, Adverse** rating at Year 15. I consider this assessment of visual effects from this collection of higher, more naturalistic viewpoints as a fair and reasonable.

VP18 is included in this group but is also the subject to a separate line in the visual assessment table as it represents the view from Eccles Pike.

Viewpoint 18 – Eccles Pike (also subject to an AVR in Appendix 7)

I agree that visual receptors walking at this local landmark and promoted panoramic view should have a High level of visual sensitivity. Similarly the magnitude of visual change is Minor at both Year 1 and Year 15. The

Moderate, Adverse rating at Year 1 and a **Moderate/Minor, Adverse** rating at Year 15 appear fair and reasonable.

Even though the proposed housing would be visible from Eccles Pike the scenic composition and impressive nature of the panoramic view would not be unduly affected.

Residential Visual Receptors

A summary table of the visual effects on the visual amenity of residential receptors is presented at 9.3 as reproduced below. The assessment to arrive at this summary is set in Appendix 5.

Table 9.3: Residential visual amenity summary

Receptor	Magnitude of Change	
	Year 1	Year 15
Dwellings to the north at Higher Crossing Barn on the northern Site boundary, and Thorn Bank, Briar Bank and Hillside to northern side of Eccles Road beyond the northern Site boundary	Major	Moderate
Dwellings to the immediate north-west of the Site ('Dezaire', 'Redseats', 'Wycroft' and 'Pyke House')	Moderate	Minor
Dwellings in the vicinity of the Site's eastern boundary, overlooking the Site from Crossings Road, Twayblade Crescent, Orchid Drive and Heath Lane	Major	Moderate
Dwellings in the vicinity of the Site's southern boundary at Manchester Road	Moderate	Minor

It should be noted that this assessment is predicted and that no level of effects are presented because they are private views and the LVA's author in line with GLVIA3 recommendations has not taken access to private land to assess them.

I am generally in agreement with the visual amenity summary other than the third row for the dwellings in the vicinity of the Site's eastern boundary. I consider the magnitude of change at Year 15 would be higher than that reported and mitigation will only reduce the magnitude of change to Moderate/Major. The change in residential visual amenity from looking over pasture fields to urban built form would remain at Year 15. The properties to the east side of the Site are closer and will experience the greatest visual change at both Year 1 and Year 15.

Remarks on LVIA Conclusions

In looking at the Conclusions of the LVIA there is reference to enhancing the natural environment (see §10.9) but this should be recognised as only part of the natural environment and the wider effect is still one of harm as defined at both Site and LCT level by the LVIA.

The §10.10 reference to the effects, presumed to be the previously discussed landscape and visual effects, *'are on balance in planning terms acceptable'*. The acceptability of effects is obviously your role as a Planner to decide and this opinion is from a Landscape Architect who is expressing their judgement rather than conducting a Planning Balance exercise

In §10.11 there is a statement that I found confusing with regards to *'loss of some rear inter-visibility'*. I am not sure if this conclusion is related to there only being rear views, or a typographic reference to *'near inter-*

visibility'. I have searched inter-visibility in the rest of the LVIA and it is mentioned four times and is associated with residential receptors. It is typically used to explain the ability to see between viewpoints. Is this the context here?

Suggested planning conditions

There is clear landscape and visual harm to be put in the planning balance at the Site and in the contextual area but this is offset to some extent by the long term landscape planting proposals and public open space to the north end of the scheme. Should you be minded to grant planning consent and notwithstanding the already submitted landscape proposals the following Reserved Matters/Planning Conditions are suggested;

- A. That a detailed hard and soft landscape mitigation scheme, including plant and material schedules are submitted for consideration. This is to include building and hard surfacing colour and finishes schedules for fencing and ancillary built form on the Site to deliver a mix of recessive colours within this Dark Peak landscape area. *Reason – to ensure that the proposals maintain the boundary character and respect the neighbouring landscape.*
- B. The soft landscape proposals should be implemented in the first planting season after construction has commenced and replacement of dead, diseased or dying stock should be undertaken in accordance with a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan for a minimum period of 5 years. *Reason – to ensure the quality of the soft landscape mitigation measures and appropriate maintenance until they become effective.*
- C. That no tree felling or hedgerow removal is undertaken, or excavation within their root protection areas, without the express written agreement of HPBC'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.*
- D. That street tree planting is subject to a separate condition that confirms the specific details of planting pits, adoption in Highway land, details of watering and aeration equipment and a schedule of root zone volume to allow the trees to reach their ultimate size. Adoption and ownership of the trees would remain with the owners of the public realm areas as would the replacement of any failed stock. – *Reason – to ensure the long term success and maturation of the street trees to assist in the creation of an attractive street scene and assimilation of the built form in longer views.*
- E. That a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan (LMMP) is prepared for the development and that a legal arrangement for continuation of the LMMP by future owners is entered into. The LMMP is to seek the inclusion of voluntary organisations either existing or new to assist in the upkeep and long term decision making about the care of communal spaces and the Site's boundary with the adjacent agricultural land. The LMMP is to include a mechanism for local resident involvement in decision making and oversight of landscape management.– *Reason – to reflect the importance of the soft landscape mitigation proposals for the local landscape character.*
- F. Low light level scheme with limitation of spill to the open landscape to the north and west and to keep dark corridors associated with the Green Infrastructure on the Site – *Reason – to reduce the intrusive nature of permanent lighting in the adjacent rural landscape and to minimise nocturnal disturbance to Green Infrastructure corridors on the Site.*
- G. SuDS detail design with explanation of the drainage proposals, their ongoing maintenance to ensure effectiveness taking into account climate change projections and potential as primary parts / corridors of the Green Infrastructure system on Site – *Reason – to ensure the effectiveness of the surface water management reduction measures.*

I recognise that the suggested conditions could possibly 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 these comments are helpful as you look to reach your recommendation for this set of residential proposals. Please come back to me should you wish to discuss any of the comments.

Yours sincerely

Stuart Ryder

Director – Ryder Landscape Consultants

24/2/26