

wardell-armstrong.com

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE
ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY
INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES
LAND AND PROPERTY
MINING, QUARRYING AND MINERAL ESTATES
WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT



HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL

HIGH PEAK LOCAL PLAN

LANDSCAPE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

January 2014

your earth our world



Wardell Armstrong

Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke-on-Trent, ST1 5BD, United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 (0)845 111 7777 Facsimile: +44 (0)845 111 8888 www.wardell-armstrong.com



DATE ISSUED: January 2014

JOB NUMBER: ST13567

REPORT NUMBER: RPT-002

HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL

HIGH PEAK LOCAL PLAN

LANDSCAPE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

January 2014

This report has been prepared by Wardell Armstrong LLP with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, within the terms of the Contract with the Client. The report is confidential to the Client and Wardell Armstrong LLP accepts no responsibility of whatever nature to third parties to whom this report may be made known.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Wardell Armstrong LLP.



Wardell Armstrong is the trading name of Wardell Armstrong LLP, Registered in England No. OC307138.

Registered office: Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke-on-Trent, ST1 5BD, United Kingdom

UK Offices: Stoke-on-Trent, Birmingham, Cardiff, Carlisle, Edinburgh, Greater Manchester, London, Newcastle upon Tyne, Penryn, Sheffield, Truro, West Bromwich. International Offices: Almaty, Moscow

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE
ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY
INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES
LAND AND PROPERTY
MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING
MINERAL ESTATES AND QUARRYING
WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	METHODOLOGY	3
3	PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE	9
4	LANDSCAPE CHARACTER OF THE HIGH PEAK	38
5	LANDSCAPE MITIGATION	43
6	GENERAL ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH COMPLETION OF SITE ASSESSMENT SHEETS.....	48
7	RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS	52
8	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	86

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Review of AMES study

Appendix B: Relevant Planning Policies

Appendix C: Site Assessment Sheet

Appendix D: Additional Questions for Site Assessment Sheet for Green Wedge/Local Green Spaces/Strategic Gap

Appendix E: Excerpts from Countryside Character Volume 2: Northwest (1998, Countryside Commission) and Volume 5: West Midlands (1999, The Countryside Agency)

Appendix F: Excerpts from Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document (2006, High Peak Borough Council)

MAPS

ST13567/001 Glossopdale Sub-Area

ST13567/002 Central (North) Sub-Area

ST13567/003 Central (South) Sub-Area

ST13567/004 Central/Buxton Sub-Areas

ST13567/005 Buxton Sub-Area

ST13567/006 Glossop: Potential Green Belt Boundary Amendments

ST13567/007 Hayfield: Potential Green Belt Boundary Amendments

ST13567/008 Furness Vale: Potential Green Belt Boundary Amendments

ST13567/009 Whaley Bridge: Potential Green Belt Boundary Amendments

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context of the study

- 1.1.1 Wardell Armstrong has been commissioned by High Peak Borough Council (HPBC) to undertake a Landscape Impact Assessment (LIA) of settlements within the High Peak which will be used to inform the preparation of the Local Plan by the Council.
- 1.1.2 The overall aim of the project is to prepare a LIA which will provide a robust landscape evidence base for the Local Plan. It will inform the selection of sites for allocation in the Local Plan and provide support for other policies and proposals which protect landscape character or manage change in the landscape.
- 1.1.3 The Landscape Impact Assessment takes account of earlier landscape character studies including Derbyshire County Council's *The Landscape Character of Derbyshire* and High Peak Borough Council's *Landscape Character SPD5* adopted in March 2006.
- 1.1.4 The landscape of the High Peak is recognised as being of national and international importance. Its quality reflects that of the adjoining Peak District National Park. In preparing the Local Plan the High Peak Borough Council must assess the impact of its proposals on the setting of the Peak District National Park. The plan area includes parts of the Pennine Moors, The Peak District Dales and the Peak District Moors European designated sites. The North West Derbyshire Green Belt also extends across the northern and north central parts of the plan area.
- 1.1.5 The key focus of the study is to assess the potential landscape impacts of sites that have been identified for development by HPBC, and to assess the suitability of remaining land on the edge of the settlement for development in landscape terms which would not have adverse impacts on the Green Belt, the landscape character of the wider countryside in the study area and on the Peak District National Park.
- 1.1.6 The allocation of sites for the development of new homes and employment opportunities needs to be managed carefully as part of the Local Plan process to ensure that the important characteristics of the High Peak landscape are not unacceptably harmed.
- 1.1.7 Sites suitable for inclusion in the local designations of Strategic Gap, Green Wedge and Local Green Space were also assessed.
- 1.1.8 In addition the study reviewed the relevance of the Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity (AMES) study produced by Derbyshire County Council (DCC), in order to

determine its suitability as an evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. An initial review of the methodology for the AMES study was undertaken.

- 1.1.9 The AMES study considered that the appropriate spatial unit for undertaking an assessment of environmental sensitivity was the Land Description Unit (LDU); the fundamental building block of the Derbyshire Landscape Character Assessment.
- 1.1.10 The AMES study recognised that in general terms those landscapes of highest sensitivity to change will be areas where the landscape remains intact both visually and structurally, have strong historic and cultural identity, and contain many widespread semi-natural habitats with associated linkages appropriate to the character of the area.
- 1.1.11 Our review noted that the categorisation of environmental sensitivity of the Ecological and Historic Environment related to the density of environmental assets, with LDUs with an above medium average percentage coverage of assets being categorised as “sensitive”. For Visual sensitivity LDUs classified as “Unrefined” or “Coherent” within the Derbyshire Landscape Character Assessment were categorised as being significant.
- 1.1.12 Our review considered that the reliance on density of environmental assets, without any apparent weighting, may have the potential to skew sensitivity categorisations. Consequently the results of this Landscape Impact Assessment study have been assessed against the findings of the AMES study, to determine its relevance to the site selection process required as part of the Local Plan process. This assessment is set out in Appendix A.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1.1 This section outlines our methodology for the assessment of sites as it was developed during the course of the study. The study required the categorisation of data, the identification of key issues and the use of a GIS database relating to areas of search. GIS has the ability to store, manipulate and display geographically related data. Information can be presented in a user friendly format using ordnance survey data as a background with transparent layers on identified areas of search and constraints, as well as specific information relating to specific sites.

2.1.2 The methodology for this project was split into the following stages:-

- Define the Study Area.
- Desk Study and Mapping.
- Formulation of Site Assessment Sheets which would be used on site.
- Site Survey and analysis of potential landscape impacts of sites that have been identified for development by HPBC, and to assess the suitability of remaining land on the edge of the settlement in landscape terms for development or protection.

2.2 Extent of Study Area

2.2.1 Following the requirements of the study regarding the scope of the assessment, the following Study Area was assessed:-

- The allocated sites within the High Peak Preferred Options Local Plan, including sites expected to form part of the first 5 year land supply and sites identified as proposed green wedge, local green spaces and strategic gap. This included an overview of those sites noted as having current developer interest and which are at application or pre application stage.
- Other potential locations within Glossopdale and the Central Area which are within the Green Belt and Open Countryside where development would not adversely affect the integrity/openness of the Green Belt and/or the setting of the National Park within Glossopdale and the Central Area.

- Other potential locations within the Central Area and around Buxton within Open Countryside where development adjacent to existing settlements would not adversely affect the setting of the National Park.

2.2.2 The extent of this assessment did not include the full extent of the North West Derbyshire Green Belt or areas around settlements not identified as Market Towns or Larger Villages as listed in HPBC's Settlement Hierarchy (Policy S2 within HPBC's Local Plan Preferred Options, February 2013).

2.2.3 Areas of search were restricted to locations adjoining/surrounding these Market Towns and Larger Villages. The areas of search reflected the form of settlements. Where settlements are closely related the area of search extended around both settlements.

2.2.4 It should be noted that for the purposes of this study that currently allocated education sites have been categorised as being unsuitable for development.

2.2.5 The overall approach was to identify more land than would be required so that the optimum sites, in terms of landscape and environmental suitability (to be tested in the following stages); could be selected from a large number of locations. The definition of boundaries of areas of search and for potential sites was left to the field survey stage.

2.3 Desk Study and Mapping

2.3.1 The work undertaken in this stage acted as the first stage in the "sieving" process to identify detailed boundaries of land appropriate for potential development or protection. The boundaries of the areas of search were identified with reference to aerial photomontages, OS map and GIS data, with particular reference to landform and changes in landscape character.

2.3.2 The desktop study comprised researching available documentation relating to identified areas, including the identification of sensitive environmental receptors. The GIS database was used to locate clusters of environmental assets for field survey within and adjacent to defined sites and help identify the configuration of areas of search within the Green Belt and Open Countryside.

2.3.3 The assessment highlighted the following sensitive environmental receptors in or close to potential sites/the study area specifically in relation to the following GIS datasets: -

- High Peak Borough Boundary

- Peak Park Boundary
- Built Up Areas
- Green Belt
- Flood Zones
- Public Rights of Way
- Topography
- Landscape Character Areas
- Landscape Description Units
- Special Landscape Areas
- Agricultural Land Classification
- Tree Preservation Orders and Ancient Woodland
- Sites of Nature Conservation
- High Peak Wildlife Sites
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest
- Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- Archaeological Sites
- Conservation Areas
- Listed Buildings
- Regionally Important Geological Sites

2.3.4 OS maps and aerial photographs were also used to identify potential environmental constraints.

2.4 Site Assessment Sheets

2.4.1 This stage analysed the information gathered in the Desk Study for each of the sites/Areas of Search identified for field testing.

2.4.2 The output of this stage was the production of Site Assessment Sheets which list the constraints identified in the Desk Study. The format of the Site Assessment Sheet was agreed with the client team prior to use. The template Site Assessment Sheet is set out in Appendix C.

2.4.3 The Site Assessment Sheets were then used during the field survey to determine in broad terms areas that needed to be protected and those that could accommodate development, based on:-

- Landscape character types/areas (LDUs);

- Landscape designations;
- Geology;
- Landscape and vegetation structure;
- Current land use/habitats;
- Biodiversity;
- Flood risk;
- Ground water protection zone;
- Historic assets and setting;
- Site context.

2.4.4 This information was then used to advise on the landscape impacts of individual sites and which areas of land within the Areas of Search should be safeguarded or where development could be accommodated without significant harm. The sheets also incorporated a written description of appropriate mitigation recommendations to improve the urban edge or to enable proposed development to be more readily absorbed within its setting.

2.4.5 A key stage in the assessment process was to identify what is present within each site/ Area of Search in terms of: -

- The landscape features present;
- The relationship to the cultural environment;
- Ecological and hydrologically important features;
- Nature of adjacent settlement edges;
- Compliance with to Green Belt Purpose; and
- Setting of the National Park.

2.4.6 For sites identified as proposed Green Wedge and Local Green Spaces the Site Assessment Sheet was amended to take account of the following questions:-

- Is the green space in proximity to the community it serves?
- Does the site have special community significance?
- Is the site local in character or is it an extensive tract of land?
- Are there significant views from the local area into the site?

- Does the site afford the public with significant views out into the wider countryside?
- Does the site provide the public with amenity value without providing public access?
- Does the site form a significant green break within the settlement?
- Does the site have ecological value?

2.4.7 This amended Assessment Sheet (see Appendix D) could be used by HPBC as a set of criteria to assess further applications for Local Green Space designations.

2.5 Field Survey

2.5.1 This stage applied the Site Assessment Sheets to each of the sites/Areas of Search identified.

2.5.2 The environmental assets within the sites and the relationship to the Green Belt/National Park/settlement edge were recorded on the Site Assessment Sheets providing the basis for a written description and recommendations for each site/Area of Search.

2.5.3 This stage identified whether sites had significant landscape impacts. It also identified land within the Areas of Search:-

- Which could potentially accommodate development with managed impact on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park.
- Which could not accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purpose of the Green Belt and National Park.

2.5.4 This led to:-

- Consequent recommendations on Green Belt boundary changes.
- Appropriate mitigation and design recommendations to improve the urban edge for land with potential to accommodate development.

2.5.5 The following section of this report (Section 3) set out the context of Planning Policy and Guidance. Section 4 describes the Landscape Character studies which are of

relevance to this study. Section 5 discusses appropriate mitigation. Section 6 discussed issues associated with completion of the Site Assessment Sheets. Section 7 presents the results of the survey for the Glossopdale, Central and Buxton Sub-Areas. Finally Section 8 sets out the conclusions to this study.

3 PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

NPPF

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out Government policies on planning. It is a material consideration to be taken into account by Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) when formulating planning policy and by decision takers when determining individual planning applications. The NPPF identifies the 3 dimensions of sustainable development as economic, social and environmental. The environmental role aims to protect and enhance the natural built and historic environment whilst improving biodiversity, prudent use of natural resources, minimising waste and pollution, mitigating and taking account of climate change.

3.1.2 The NPPF emphasises '*a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking*'. For plan-making this means that local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area unless '*any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.*'

3.1.3 NPPF policies are now material considerations to be taken into account in both decision taking and plan making.

3.1.4 The 12 core planning principles which should underpin plan-making and decision-making are listed in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. The following are of particular relevance:

- *Be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up to date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;...*

- *Always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;*
- *Take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it;...*
- *Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in the Framework;*
- *Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;*
- *Promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production);*
- *Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations; and*
- *Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable:....*

3.1.5 The following within the NPPF is also of relevance:

- Plan making should identify land where development would be inappropriate;

- Access to high quality open spaces/opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities; and
- Great weight is given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks.

3.1.6 It is stated within the NPPF that LPAs must prepare Local Plans positively. Local Plans must also be justified, effective and consistent with National Policy. It was therefore particularly important that the Landscape Impact Assessment of the High Peak is prepared in the context of the NPPF.

3.1.7 Using the NPPF as a baseline for the main policy considerations in relation to landscape these are detailed as follows (full policy details can be found in Appendix B of this report):

3.2 **Green Belt**

3.2.1 The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. Section 9 of the NPPF sets out the Governments view on the importance of the Green Belt confirming its fundamental aim as preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It is stated within the NPPF that LPAs should seek to positively enhance the benefits of the Green Belt. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF states that 'Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan'. Guidance is provided to the approach LPAs should take when defining Green Belt boundaries.

3.2.2 The NPPF does not refer to local characteristics, however for the purpose of this landscape impact assessment, it is considered that local issues and characteristics also need to be taken into account when applying national policy to the localities assessed within the high peak.

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

The national objective is "to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas".

Key Issues:

- Need to consider land in adjoining local authorities in order to establish the role played by Green Belt land in the High Peak Borough in restricting sprawl; and
- Sprawl is a radial, outward growth concept. This means that where parts of the Green Belt are surrounded (or largely surrounded) by urban development, such Green Belt land is not preventing sprawl. Also, there may be sites onto which development has previously encroached and which therefore are not restricting sprawl.

Hence, the local interpretation of this purpose is that the Green Belt should check sprawl into locally important open space.

2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

The national objective is “to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another”.

Key Issues:

- Given that the Green Belt within the High Peak is not within a major conurbation, the “towns” referred to within this assessment are the market towns and also the larger and smaller villages as listed in HPBC’s Settlement Hierarchy (Policy S2 within HPBC’s Local Plan Preferred Options, February 2013).

Therefore the local interpretation of this purpose is the Green Belt should prevent merging and coalescence of these settlements.

3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

The national objective is “to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”.

Key issues:

- Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment needs to be considered in relation to land uses in adjoining local authorities for example the Peak District National Park;
- Some of the High Peak countryside is considered to be open countryside and is not located within the Green Belt. This is land usually located on the settlement boundaries (urban fringe) and usually performs specific functions such as food growing, carbon sink, recreation and leisure.

The local interpretation of this purpose is that the Green Belt should safeguard locally important open space.

4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

The national objective is “to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”.

Key Issues:

- Some Conservation Areas are framed/within close proximity to Green Belt land. However these areas are afforded their own (separate) policy protection.

The local interpretation of this purpose is the Green Belt should preserve the setting and character of conservation areas.

Furthermore, it is stated within Paragraph 80 of the NPPF that once Green Belts have been defined, LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.

3.3 Open Space

- 3.3.1 It is stated in paragraph 73 of the NPPF that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.

3.3.2 Paragraphs 73-78 consider open space and the provision/designation of local green spaces. Here, specific guidelines for when a local green space designation should be used are listed:

- Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

3.4 Green Infrastructure

3.4.1 It is stated within the NPPF that LPAs should set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.

3.5 Landscape

3.5.1 At paragraph 109 of the NPPF it is stated that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

3.5.2 In terms of Heritage, it is stated within paragraph 170 of the NPPF that where appropriate, landscape character assessments should also be prepared, integrated with assessment of historic landscape character, and for areas where there are major expansion options assessments of landscape sensitivity.

3.6 Setting

3.6.1 The definition of setting within the NPPF is detailed as being:

‘Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.’

3.7 Previously Developed Land

- 3.7.1 It is stated in paragraph 111 of the NPPF that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.

3.8 National Parks

- 3.8.1 It is stated within paragraph 115 of the NPPF that great weight should be given to conserving 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 landscape and scenic beauty. Furthermore, the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.

3.9 Regional Planning Policy

- 3.9.1 The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands, the 'East Midlands Regional Plan' was published in March 2009. This document set out the long term strategic planning and transport policy framework for the region up to the year 2026.

This aspect of Planning Policy has not been considered as part of this assessment due to the Regional Strategy for the East Midlands (Revocation) Order, 2013 being made on 14th March 2013 and came into force on 12th April 2013 after being laid before Parliament.

3.10 The Derby and Derbyshire Joint Structure Plan

- 3.10.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, abolished structure plans along with Regional Planning Guidance (RPGs) and Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) along with the High Peak Local Plan, 2005 became the main Planning considerations for the High Peak. Some policies of the Structure Plan were saved as part of the transitional provisions under Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (d). These saved policies of the structure plan, have subsequently been revoked under

Section 109 of the Localism Act 2011. Furthermore, The Regional Strategy for the East Midlands (Revocation) Order 2013 states:

'This Order makes use of those powers to revoke the Regional Strategy for the East Midlands, and all directions preserving policies contained in structure plans in the corresponding area.'

3.11 Derbyshire County Council Landscape Character Assessment, 2003

3.11.1 Derbyshire County Council (DCC) work with district and borough councils and the Peak District National Planning Authority on their Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks. The district and borough councils and the National Park Authority deal with local planning policy and most planning applications for housing, commercial, industrial, retail and leisure development.

3.11.2 DCC work closely with the district and borough councils and the National Park Authority, providing expert advice on issues such as ecology, highways, landscape, design, infrastructure and other county-wide planning matters when required. One such document is the Derbyshire County Council Landscape Character Assessment, 2003 and this information pertaining to this is detailed below.

3.11.3 This Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) is a document produced to act as a tool to identify what makes a place unique and provides a framework for decision making that respects local distinctiveness.

3.11.4 'The Landscape Character of Derbyshire', 2003 publication is intended to inform planning policy at the regional, county and local level, development control and countryside management.

3.11.5 The work within this publication built upon the national characterisation work undertaken by the Countryside Commission (now the Countryside Agency) throughout the 1990's, culminating in the publication of the Character of England map in 1996. This approach was recognised in Government Policy (Planning Policy Guidance Note 7) and became an important tool in the planning process to aid the assessment of landscape impact.

3.11.6 As such, this document is still used as planning policy evidence base within Derbyshire. However with the Structure Plan and saved policies now having been revoked, this document carries less weight in planning terms than it may have done previously but is still used as baseline information i.e. a substantial evidence base. Therefore, the information contained within this document been used in support of this assessment. More detailed information relating to landscape character can be found in Chapter 4 of this report.

3.12 **AMES Study**

3.12.1 This study is a methodology to identify '*Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity*' (AMES) for the historic environment, ecology and landscape. This methodology was produced by Derbyshire County Council's Conservation and Design team to help inform targeted Environmental Funding, the identification of key strategic Green Infrastructure assets and the potential for housing growth. This approach has been developed because of a need to improve the ability to manage and deliver the most appropriate environmental objective in geographical areas where environmental outcomes across the stated disciplines above are likely to be greatest as part of a sustainable approach. Please refer to Appendix A of this report for a discussion on this study.

3.13 **Local Planning Policy**

Local Plan

3.13.1 Previously, the High Peak Borough Council initially worked to an approved Structure Plan, adopted in January 2001 of which the High Peak Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2005) formed part of, however as stated above, the Derbyshire and Derby Joint Structure Plan has now been revoked and as such the High Peak Local Plan is now the main Policy considerations for this area.

3.13.2 Under the provision of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, policies in the High Peak Local Plan (adopted 31 March 2005) were valid for a period of three years (Local Planning Authorities were invited by the Department for Communities

and Local Government (DCLG) to make an application to the Secretary of State to issue a direction to save selected Local Plan policies beyond this 3-year period).

3.13.3 Subsequently a Saved Local Plan Policies document was produced (30 March 2008). This document contains only those policies that continue to form part of the development plan. All other policies have been deleted and will cease to be considered during the determination of planning applications and as such this document is referred to within this assessment as current Local Plan policy.

3.13.4 In time, the emerging Local Plan and SPDs will replace most of the current Local Plan policies.

3.13.5 The Saved Local Plan Policies that are most relevant and have been taken into consideration within this assessment are detailed below (full policy details can be found in Appendix B of this report):

3.13.6 Conserving and enhancing the quality of the environment is a major theme of the Local Plan and as such, sensitive design, siting and layout of new development, respecting the traditions and character of the High Peak, is considered to be crucial to achieving this.

General Development Policies

- Saved Policy 1, **GD2 – Built Up Area Boundaries**. Within this section of the saved policies document, it is stated that the Council has, for many years, successfully pursued a policy of restricting development outside the existing built-up areas i.e. by directing new development, where possible, to locations within the framework of existing settlements. For example In the Central and Glossop Sub-Areas of the borough there are some examples of small settlements which have not been delineated by a built up area boundary. This is because they are washed over by Green Belt designation and such as they are considered part of the countryside.
- Saved Policy 2, **GD3 – Improvement Corridors**. It is stated here, that the Council seek high standards of design, layout and landscaping for all new development within the Improvement Corridors and additional screening will

be sought with suitable boundary walls, fences, mounds or landscaping should be provided where appropriate.

- Saved Policy 3, **GD4 – Character, Form and Design**. It is stated within the description of this policy that the hilly nature of the High Peak means that development is often seen from above, and at a distance, as well as close to. Therefore it is important for new development to relate well to the existing settlement pattern and traditions, and to maintain or improve the relationship with the landscape and townscape setting. Also for developments to consider in the importance of views of, and from, the site and that these should be retained, and also the existing site features (e.g. trees, ponds) respected.
- Saved Policy 4, **GD5 – Amenity**. It is stated that acceptable scale, siting and design for particular areas may need to be adjusted in order to protect amenity and that it is equally important that new development does not suffer from unacceptable levels of amenity from nearby existing or planned development, which could lead to problems for occupiers.
- Saved Policy 5, **GD6 – Landscaping**. It is stated that the appearance and treatment of spaces between and around buildings can often be as important as the design of the buildings themselves. Good quality hard and/or soft landscaping should be an integral part of all but the most minor developments, and not be treated as an afterthought. Subsequently, landscaping is seen as being likely to make beneficial contributions to the environment, and help blend new developments into their surroundings.
- Saved Policy 8, **GD13 – Buxton Mineral Water**. It is stated within this policy that Buxton Mineral Water, because of its long association with the Spa, plays an increasingly important role in the Council's plans to develop Buxton, not only as a tourist area, but as an important local centre. Therefore, the protection of the Mineral Water catchment area is necessary if the national reputation, quality and existing volume of the water is to be maintained. In

particular, soakaways and underground discharges as a means of disposal of effluents will not be permitted.

Conservation and Enhancement of the Open Environment Policies

- Saved Policy 9, **OC1 – Countryside Development**. It is stated here, that countryside development should generally be limited to that which is necessary in such a location. HPBC consider that this approach will continue to ensure that the countryside is protected for its own sake - its beauty, character and diversity of landscape, historic heritage, natural resources, ecological, agricultural and recreational value, limiting the problems created by heavy flows of vehicles on unsuitable rural roads; and making the most efficient use of facilities and services which are already provided within the towns and villages, i.e. making a major contribution to achieving the aims of sustainable development and growth.

However, in all cases particular care will be necessary to ensure that development is assimilated into the landscape in order to minimise its impact. Where development in the countryside is acceptable it should contribute towards the principles of sustainability. This suggests that development should preferably be located adjacent to, or very close to, existing settlements and should be served by public transport routes.

- Saved Policy 10, **OC2 – Green Belt Development**. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the most important attribute of Green Belts being their openness. Five principal purposes of including land in Green Belts is stated within this policy as detailed below:
 - To restrict urban sprawl on a permanent basis;
 - To safeguard the countryside from further encroachment;
 - To maintain the separate identity of settlements;
 - To assist in the regeneration of nearby urban areas; and

- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Furthermore Green Belt boundaries require a high degree of permanence. It is therefore of considerable importance that sufficient land is left outside the boundaries to allow for development in the longer term.

- Saved Policy 11, **OC3 – Special Landscape Area Development**. Much of the countryside within the Local Plan area previously defined as "Special Landscape Area" in the Derbyshire Special Landscape Areas Local Plan, adopted in June 1988 is considered to have a very high intrinsic quality because of the strength and variety of its scenery, with its steep slopes, undulation, woodland, patterns of hedgerow or boundary walls, areas of water and heritage features, and freedom from despoliation such as quarries and electricity pylons that detract from its quality. As such, the siting, design and landscaping of new development in the Special Landscape Area must have special regard to its landscape quality and character and new development or major extensions to existing development is normally resisted unless it can be shown to be essential in its proposed location or would enhance the character of the area.
- Saved Policy 12, **OC4 – Landscape Character and Design**. There are 9 landscape character types identified in High Peak Plan area by the Derbyshire Landscape Character Assessment and these are split between the Regional Character Areas, the White Peak and Dark Peak (including Southwest Peak and Manchester Pennine Fringe). Many of the landscape types cut across local authority boundaries and as such this policy states that guidance on each of the landscape types will be written to indicate the design principles that are appropriate to each one which will include such things as characteristic building materials, local building styles and details, grouping and siting of buildings, enclosure and other landscaping details.
- Saved Policy 13, **OC5 – Development Conspicuous from the Peak District National Park**. It is considered within this policy that much of the upland area

adjoining the National Park falls within the Special Landscape Area and is of a similarly fine quality. If the special qualities of the Peak District are to be protected careful controls need to be exercised. The hilly nature of the High Peak means that many developments are seen from above, and from long as well as short distance viewpoints. Planning permission should not be granted for development considered to be harmful to the valued characteristics of the National Park.

- Saved Policy 15, **OC8 – Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation**. The Council is a partner in the Peak District Biodiversity Action Plan, and will assess development proposals in relation to their effects on flora and fauna, and wildlife habitats. The need to allow relatively unhindered movement of wildlife between the countryside and the towns and villages is addressed by several provisions of the Plan. These include the protection of strategic areas of open land which surround, separate and penetrate settlements by the Built-up Area Boundaries and Green Belt and Special Landscape Area designations.

Furthermore, it is stated that the Council is also mindful of the indirect effects of development on nearby recognised nature conservation sites, but it believes that much new development can be successfully designed around nature to achieve attractive and stimulating environments which will benefit humans and wildlife alike.

- Saved Policy 16, **OC10 – Trees and Woodlands**. Whether solitary, in small groups or in woodlands and forests, trees are very important. In both urban and rural areas they make a significant contribution to the character and attractiveness of places, and they often provide a resource for quiet recreation and a haven for wildlife. They can also help the rate of CO2 'fixing', since trees lock up carbon as they grow, and so it is considered that a progressive increase in tree cover as appropriate (especially broad-leaved trees) is desirable.

Conservation and Enhancement of the Built Environment Policies

- Saved Policy 17, **BC1 – External Materials**. It is stated that in designing extensions and alterations to buildings, or ancillary buildings within their curtilage, it is essential that they are not considered in isolation and that the completed work blends in with the original.
- Saved Policy 20, **BC5 – Conservation Areas and their Settings**. Conservation Area status does not rule out new development. The policy stated that where a high standard of development can be assimilated without adversely affecting the character or appearance of the area it will often be welcomed, since this is considered to help sustain communities and attract fresh investment into the area. Therefore, this policy aims to direct any changes so that the existing architectural and historic character is respected, so that the new can sit sympathetically alongside the old.
- Saved Policy 23, **BC8 – Settings of Listed Buildings**. It is stated here that the setting of a Listed Building is an essential part of its character. Historic buildings can lose much of their interest and townscape value if they become isolated from their surroundings, for example by a new road, car park or other development. Often the setting of a Listed Building owes much to its place in a group of buildings and the spaces between them in the overall street scene.
- Saved Policy 25, **BC10 – Archaeological and Other Heritage Features**. The Plan area is rich in archaeological and other heritage features. Specifically Buxton's Area of Archaeological Interest is that in which Roman remains and artefacts have come to light, and indicates the likely extent of the Roman settlement. Archaeological remains could survive anywhere within this area. Consequently, their possible existence should be taken into account in considering any development proposals which involve below-ground disturbance.

- Saved Policy 26, **BC11 – Historic Parks and Gardens**. There are three entries within the Plan area, Pavilion Gardens in Buxton (Grade II*) and the Slopes, also in Buxton (Grade II), and Howard park (Grade II) in Glossop. It is stated within this policy that the effects of any proposed development on an historic park or garden are taken into account. The Council will aim to ensure that an historic park or garden is protected or, where they cannot be protected fully, the impact of any development on the site is minimised.

Population and Housing Policies

- Saved Policy 47, **H12 – Public Local Open Space**. It is stated under this policy that where new local open space is required it should be designed and located to be convenient, attractive and safe for users. For example, open space should be located within 400 metres of the homes it serves, and be a minimum of 0.2 ha in area. In addition, children should not have to cross a busy road to reach play space, and dwellings may need to be orientated to overlook the area so that children have the benefit of natural surveillance from residents. It is equally important that the space does not cause undue nuisance to existing or new residents.

Leisure and Tourism Policies

- Saved Policy 62, **LT3 – Protection of Recreational Land and Facilities**. The Council recognises that many open spaces have more than a purely recreational value, being integral to the heritage, visual amenity and wildlife value of an area, and providing a valuable 'breathing space' in the more heavily built-up areas. Of particular importance are those major parks which provide a facility and a centre of activity for significant numbers of people.

It is also stated here that special protection will be given to those parks which are of importance by reason of their location, landscape quality, historical association or community value. Development will only be permitted in these parks if it is intended to improve their use for public enjoyment or to preserve or enhance their visual quality.

3.13.7 Other Saved Local Plan Policies that have been taken into consideration are listed below:

General Development Policies

- Saved Policy 6, GD7 – Crime Prevention

Town Centres and Retailing Policies

- Saved Policy 27, TC1 – Town Centres
- Saved Policy 28, TC2 – Town Centre Environment
- Saved Policy 35, TC11 – Regeneration Areas in Glossop
- Saved Policy 37, TC13 – Torr Vale Mill Regeneration Area
- Saved Policy 38, TC14 – Regeneration Area at Hogs Yard, Whaley Bridge
- Saved Policy 39, TC15 – Regeneration Areas in Buxton

Population and Housing Policies

- Saved Policy 40, H1 – Principles of Housing Provision
- Saved Policy 41, H2 – Housing and Infrastructure in Glossopdale
- Saved Policy 42, H4 – Housing in Buxton
- Saved Policy 43, H5 – Housing within the Built Up Area Boundaries
- Saved Policy 46, H11 – Layout and Design of Residential Development

Employment and Business

- Saved Policy 53, EMP1 – Industry and Business Allocations in the Glossop Area
- Saved Policy 54, EMP2 – Industry and Business Allocations in the Central Area
- Saved Policy 55, EMP3 – Industry and Business Allocations in the Buxton Area
- Saved Policy 56, EMP4 – Primary Employment Zones
- Saved Policy 59, EMP7 – Industry and Business in the Countryside

- Saved Policy 60, EMP8 – Infilling / Redevelopment at Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt

Leisure and Tourism Policies

- Saved Policy 63, LT4 – New Recreational Facilities
- Saved Policy 66, LT7 – Intensive Outdoor Recreation
- Saved Policy 69, LT11 – Canals and Canal Basins

Community Facilities and Utility Services Policies

- Saved Policy 72 – School and College Facilities

Transport and Access Policies

- Saved Policy 79, TR2 – A57/A628 (T) Mottram-Tintwistle By-Pass & A57 Glossop Spur
- Saved Policy 80, TR3 – Local Road Schemes
- Saved Policy 84, Tr9 – Disused Railway Lines
- Saved Policy 85, TR11 – Footpaths, Bridleways and Byways
- Saved Policy 86, TR13 – Long Distance and Local Trails
- Saved Policy 87, TR14 – The Protection and Construction of Trails

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

3.13.8 SPDs form part of the current local plan and are Local Development Documents that give additional guidance on matters covered by Development Plan Documents, similar to the former Supplementary Planning Guidance. They do not form part of the Development Plan but are a material consideration in determination of planning applications.

3.13.9 The current adopted Supplementary Planning Documents for High Peak Borough Council which have been taken into consideration as part of this assessment are listed below:

- Buxton Design and Place Making Strategy SPD 2010;
- Buxton Station Road SPD 2007;
- Glossop Design and Place Making Strategy SPD 2012;
- Glossop Conservation Area Character Appraisal SPD 2006;
- Old Glossop Conservation Area Character Appraisal SPD 2006;
- Landscape Character SPD 2006;
- Housing Needs in the High Peak SPD 2007;
- Housing Restraint SPD 2006;
- Residential Design Guide SPD 2005; and
- Planning Obligations SPD 2005.

3.13.10 Of particular relevance to this assessment is the High Peak Landscape Character SPD, 2006. This document provides guidance for the design and location of new development in the countryside to ensure that new development respects and where practicable contributes towards enhancing the local character and sense of place of the landscape.

3.13.11 The Landscape Character SPD identifies key landscape characteristics and their implications for the siting, design and appearance of new development. This SPD specifically refers to key local plan policy, these being:

- OC1: Countryside Development; and
- OC4: Landscape Character and Design.

3.13.12 Other documents that form part of the evidence base for the local plan but do not form planning policy which have been taken into consideration within this assessment are listed below:

- Affordable Housing Viability Assessment;
- Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment March 2010;

- Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study;
- Peak Sub Region Climate Change Study;
- Peak Sub Region Employment Land Review;
- Peak Sub Region Retail and Town Centre Study;
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment;
- Strategic Housing Needs Survey;
- Strategic Housing Market Assessment;
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1); and
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2).

3.14 Emerging Local Plan

3.14.1 A new Local Plan for the High Peak is now being prepared which will shape the future development of the Borough up to 2028.

3.14.2 The new Local Plan will contain policies and identify sites for development or protection and these will be used to help the council to determine planning applications.

3.14.3 In line with the preparation of a new local plan, a Preferred Options document has been prepared, February 2013. This document is accompanied by an Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, a draft Habitats Regulations Assessment Report and a Maps document illustrating the location of the preferred options proposals.

3.14.4 The Preferred Options document is supported by a number of other documents that have helped shape the options and they include:

- Derbyshire Dales and High Peak Housing Target Options Paper;
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA);
- Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report;

- Infrastructure appraisals;
- Household and population forecasts;
- Peak Sub-Region Employment Land Review; and
- Peak Sub-Region Retail and Town Centre Study.

3.14.5 It is stated within the NPPF that policies in emerging plans such as this Preferred Options document will be a material consideration in planning decisions as the more closely a policy accords with the NPPF, the greater the weight should be accorded to it.

3.14.6 Detailed below are the most relevant Preferred Option Policies which have been taken into consideration within this assessment (full policy details can be found in Appendix B of this report):

3.14.7 It is stated within the High Peak Preferred Options (February 2013), paragraph 1.28 that a landscape impact appraisal (this assessment) is to be undertaken to help inform the final version of the Local Plan and to consider the sensitivity and capacity of the Borough's countryside (including its Green Belt) to housing development and to consider the impact of proposed levels of High Peak housing supply and distribution on the Peak District National Park and its purposes.

3.14.8 This study has been undertaken assessing Market Towns and Larger Villages as identified within Policy S2 detailed below:

Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies

- **Policy S1 – Sustainable Development Principles.** This policy refers to the NPPF in that at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which gives rise to the need for planning to perform a number of roles – economic, social and environmental and it is stated that for the High Peak this means ensuring the managed release of sufficient land to meet assessed needs which can realistically be delivered over the plan period, having regard to landscape and

infrastructure capacity constraints across the plan area and making the best use of resources now and in the future.

- **Policy S2 – Settlement Hierarchy**

Market Towns - Buxton, Glossop, Chapel-en-le-Frith, New Mills and Whaley Bridge are defined as 'Market Towns' and will be the main focus for housing, employment and service growth, consistent with maintaining and where possible enhancing their role, distinctive character vitality and appearance.

It is described at paragraph 4.39 of the Preferred Options that the Market Towns are the largest settlements in High Peak and these accommodate the majority of the Borough's population, services and facilities. The spatial strategy seeks to focus future growth in these settlements and to strengthen their role as service centres. These settlements will be defined by a Settlement Boundary within which development of an appropriate scale and nature will be allowed.

Larger Villages - Charlesworth, Chinley, Dove Holes, Furness Vale, Hadfield, Hayfield, Peak Dale and Tintwistle are defined as 'Larger Villages' where a moderate scale of development may be acceptable, consistent with meeting local rural needs and maintaining or enhancing their role, distinctive character or appearance whilst also maintaining existing facilities and services.

It is described at paragraph 4.40 of the Preferred Options that the Larger Villages are the most sustainable villages in the rural areas which generally have a good local social infrastructure, some local employment opportunities and good accessibility to the towns and larger centres. These villages also have an important role in terms of serving and supporting their immediate surrounding rural areas and smaller villages. The spatial strategy focuses the bulk of the rural development in these settlements and seeks to ensure that they are sustained and promoted as service centres. These settlements will be defined by a Settlement Boundary within which development of an appropriate scale and nature will be allowed. It is recognised that there is a

significant range amongst these villages in terms of their size and facilities and it is proposed therefore that the scale of development in each area should be relative to their current size and infrastructure.

- **Policy S5 - Glossopdale Sub-Area Strategy.** Within this policy it is stated that the Council will seek to promote the sustainable growth of Glossopdale whilst promoting and maintaining the distinct identity of its settlements, provide an increasing range of employment opportunities, promote the growth of a sustainable tourist economy and meet the housing needs of the local community.

The options consultations suggested that some growth on the edges of Glossop and in the Gamesley area could also be the best location for any modest greenfield development. The consultation also revealed very clearly the desire to see any housing in Glossopdale matched by improvements in transport infrastructure and the most appropriate locations for future development, following the consultation exercises have been identified as:

- Land within the urban area;
- Mixed-use redevelopment of poor quality employment areas such as Charlestown Works;
- Woods Mill, Hawkshead Mill; and
- Small urban extensions.

Within central Glossop for example, Woods Mill is a large area of underused land which has potential for a mixed use scheme to include leisure, retail, employment and housing. The Glossop Design and Place Making Strategy adopted as an SPD in March 2012 includes a design brief for the Woods Mill area. The retail study indicates that there is capacity within Glossop for an additional convenience (food) store to increase the competition within the town.

- **Policy S6 – Central Sub-Area Strategy.** Within this policy it is stated that the Council will seek to promote the sustainable growth of the Central Area such that it reflects the historic character of the settlements, provides increasing range of employment opportunities, promotes the growth of a sustainable tourist economy and meets the housing needs of the local community.
- **Policy S7 – Buxton Sub-Area Strategy.** It is stated that the relative self-containment of Buxton and the provision of accessible services and facilities within the town, make it a sustainable location for accommodating a proportion of the Local Plan housing growth. There are substantial areas of land within the town which can accommodate new development and contribute to sustainable economic growth within the town and support the regeneration of certain areas.

Development Management Policies

- **Policy EQ2 – Landscape Character.** It is stated here that the Council has adopted a Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document. It is a material planning consideration and provides guidance on how measures to ensure the protection and enhancement of the landscape should be included as part of proposals for new development. Furthermore, it should be noted that where the Peak District National Park's landscape setting is impacted by a proposal in the plan area, the Park Authority's Landscape Strategy and Action Plan 2009 will be taken into account when determining an application.
- **Policy EQ3 – Countryside Development.** Wherever development is permitted in the countryside, particular care will be needed to ensure that it is integrated sympathetically into the landscape and that its impact on landscape quality and the setting of the Peak District National Park is minimised.
- **Policy EQ7 – Green Infrastructure.** Although there is an existing Green Infrastructure network across the Local Plan area, gaps have been identified that if addressed, could strengthen the current network.

- **Policy CF4 – Provision of Open Space and Recreation Facilities.** It is stated here that the High Peak will support local communities - through this Local Plan and any Neighbourhood Development Plans prepared - to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Therefore, land designated as Local Green Space in this way, will receive the level of protection consistent with that for Green Belts.

3.14.9 Other Preferred Option Policies that have been taken into consideration are listed below:

Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies

- Policy S3 – Strategic Housing Development

Development Management Policies

- Policy EQ4 – Biodiversity
- Policy EQ5 – Design and Place Making
- Policy EQ6 – Built and Historic Environment
- Policy EQ8 – Trees, woodland and hedgerows
- Policy EQ9 – Pollution and Flood Risk
- Policy E1 – New Employment Development
- Policy E2 – Employment Land Allocations
- Policy E3 – Primary Employment Zones
- Policy H1 – Location of Housing Development
- Policy H3 – Housing Allocations
- Policy H4 – New Housing Development
- Policy CF1 – Retail and Town Centres
- Policy CF6 – Accessibility and Transport

3.14.10 In terms of specific landscape considerations that have been included within this assessment, these are detailed below and they follow four of the Strategic Objectives set out within the Preferred Options document (Protecting Peak District Character). These are:

- SO1: To protect and enhance the Green Infrastructure Network;
- SO2: To maintain, enhance and conserve the Borough's distinct landscape characteristics, biodiversity, and cultural and historic environment;
- SO3: To ensure new development is well designed, promotes local distinctiveness and integrates effectively with its setting; and
- SO4: To protect and enhance the character, appearance and setting of the towns and villages.

Green Belt and Open Countryside

3.14.11 *Within Policy S2, it is stated that the Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map, will be protected from inappropriate development and proposals will be considered in accordance with the provisions of national planning policy and in the light of other policies in this Local Plan.*

3.14.12 *The general extent of the Green Belt and the area defined as Open Countryside will be protected and maintained for the plan period but some land will be released from the Green Belt and Open Countryside in some locations on the edge of the Market Towns and Larger Villages to deliver the proposed development strategy and enable the sustainable growth of these settlements....'*

3.14.13 It is stated at paragraph 4.91 of the Preferred Options that within the Central Sub-Area new development is to a large extent constrained by existing land designations and topography, and the potential for large scale new development in New Mills and Whaley Bridge is restricted. Both New Mills and Whaley Bridge are heavily constrained by the Green Belt, location of flood plains and potential high visual impact of development.

3.14.14 Furthermore at paragraph 4.94 of the Preferred Options, it is stated that the Employment Land Review found that High Peak had a surplus of poor quality industrial sites with the majority of these being located in the central area. These industrial sites have the potential to form part of the housing supply and can be reused for mixed use development without adversely affecting the employment opportunities in the plan area.

3.14.15 Subsequently, the preferred approach is to develop land in the built up area boundaries, enable the redevelopment of constrained employment sites for housing, employment and other potential uses and to allocate greenfield sites in sustainable locations to meet housing needs.

3.15 **Strategic Gap**

3.15.1 It is mentioned at paragraph 4.74 of the Preferred Options that between Glossop and Hadfield, where there is no green belt, the definition of a strategic gap is necessary to maintain in the long term the separation between the two settlements.

3.16 **Green Wedge**

3.16.1 In Policy S6, it is stated that maintaining the open character of the green wedges in New Mills as identified on the proposals map is required.

3.17 **National Park**

3.17.1 It is stated that within paragraph 4.87 of the Preferred Options that the proximity of the Peak District National Park gives certain locations, particularly Whaley Bridge and Hayfield, important roles in supporting the tourist industry as they offer good access into the National Park and areas designated as recreation zones within the Peak District. The historic character of the towns in the central area make them attractive tourist destinations in their own right.

3.18 **Peak District National Park Authority**

3.18.1 Due to the close proximity of the Peak District National Park, another aspect of Local Planning Policy that we have taken into consideration within this assessment is the Peak District National Park Authorities Planning Policy.

Core Strategy

3.18.2 The Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD, 2011 sets out the vision, objectives and spatial strategy for the National Park, and core policies to guide development and change in the National Park to 2026.

3.18.3 The Core Strategy was formally adopted by the National Park Authority on 7 October 2011.

3.18.4 The Core Strategy Policies that are most relevant and which have been taken into consideration within this assessment are detailed below (full policy details can be found in Appendix B of this report):

- ***L1 – Landscape Character and Valued Characteristics.*** This policy raises the profile of Landscape Character Assessment, and requires all development to conserve and enhance the valued characteristics and landscape character of the National Park. The National Park Authority's adopted Landscape Strategy and Action Plan support this policy and make it clear what should be conserved and enhanced.

3.18.5 One of the key characteristics of this policy is that the flow of landscape character across and beyond the National Park boundary should be maintained, providing a continuity of landscape and valued setting for the National Park.

Peak District National Character Assessment, 2008

3.18.6 This document forms part of the evidence base to the Core Strategy which is of relevance to this assessment. This report shows how the landscapes of the National Park and its surrounding area have been divided into a series of Regional Character Areas representing broad tracts of landscape which share common characteristics. Within each Regional Character Area a number of Landscape Character Types have been defined based upon the pattern of natural and cultural characteristics.

Peak District National Park Landscape Strategy and Action Plan 2009 – 2019

3.18.7 The Landscape Strategy and Action Plan for the Peak District National Park also forms part of the evidence base to the Core Strategy and sits alongside the National Character Assessment, 2008. The Strategy and Action Plan was published on 21 September 2009 and together they provide an evidence base to the development plan and underpin the policy basis for all planning decisions.

3.18.8 The Strategy and Action Plan is underpinned by Peak District Historic Landscape Characterisation.

3.18.9 Together the Strategy and Action Plan provide a broad framework to guide future landscape change. It helps to fulfil the National Park Management Plan and works alongside a wide range of the Authority's plans and strategies.

3.18.10 The Strategy was produced under the guidance of a Steering Group comprising representatives from the following organisations: Peak District National Park Authority, The University of Sheffield, Natural England, Derbyshire County Council and Friends of the Peak District.

Peak District Local Plan

3.18.11 The Local Plan (2001) is in the process of being replaced by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy. However, the Local Plan still contains a number of detailed operational policies that are still valid. These saved policies will continue to be valid until the Local Plan has been fully replaced.

3.18.12 The Local Plan Policies that are most relevant and which have been taken into consideration within this assessment are detailed below (full policy details can be found in Appendix B of this report):

- **Policy LC2: Designated Local Plan Settlements** - this states that Tintwistle, Hayfield and Little Hayfield could accommodate residential development necessary for the relocation of non-conforming uses or which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted.

4 LANDSCAPE CHARACTER OF THE HIGH PEAK

4.1 National Character Areas

4.1.1 Joint Character Area (JCAs) and Countryside Character Area descriptions were published in 1998-1999 by the then Countryside Commission. They made up the Character Map of England. These are still used as part of the overall body of evidence behind National Character Area (NCAs) profiles that are currently provided by Natural England. There are four different NCAs within the High Peak Borough. Maps of these NCAs are included in Appendix E.

National Character Area 54: Manchester Pennine Fringe

4.1.2 The north-west of the High Peak falls within National Character Area 54: Manchester Pennine Fringe. This NCA occupies the transitional zone between the open moorlands of the Dark Peak and the densely populated urban conurbation of Manchester, running along the edge of the Millstone Grit of the Pennine uplands and underlain by Carboniferous Millstone Grit and the Pennine Coal Measures. The area owes much of its character to its proximity to the adjacent Pennine moors, and the deeply incised, steep valleys that characterise the transition from moorland to urban area. The settlements of Glossop and Hadfield lie to the east of this Area, adjacent to the boundary with NCA 51. A small portion of the settlement of New Mills also falls within NCA 54.

National Character Area 51: Dark Peak

4.1.3 The centre of the High Peak falls within National Character Area 51: Dark Peak. The Dark Peak is a landscape of large-scale sweeping moorlands, in-by-pastures enclosed by drystone walls, and gritstone settlements, within the Pennine chain. It falls almost entirely within, and forms a large part of, the Peak District National Park. A large portion of the NCA has been designated as a Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The range of different SSSIs demonstrates the variation of important characteristics and landscapes within the NCA. The settlement of Hayfield lies within this NCA along with the majority of New Mills and the eastern half of Chapel-en-le-Frith. The settlements of Glossop and Hadfield border the NCA to the north-west.

National Character Area 53: South West Peak

- 4.1.4 The south-west of the High Peak falls within National Character Area 53: South West Peak. The South West Peak is an area of upland and associated foothills in the south-west region of the Pennines and 65% of the NCA falls within the Peak District National Park. It is characterised by Carboniferous age Millstone Grit and Coal Measures and is often scenically and distinctly diverse. The area has an open moorland core, the fringes of which fall away to gentle slopes dissected by steep wooded cloughs. Fast-flowing streams are found at lower elevations which open out to form wider upland river valleys. The settlement of Whaley Bridge lies within this NCA along with the western half of Chapel-en-le-Frith. The settlements of Doveholes and Buxton border the NCA to the east.

National Character Area 52: White Peak

- 4.1.5 The south-east of the High Peak falls within National Character Area 52: White Peak. The White Peak is comprised of an elevated limestone plateau, dissected by steeply cut dales and gorges with rock outcrops, screes and cave systems. There is a mosaic of herb rich grassland, woodland and scrub along dales, which vary markedly in character. Some contain meandering rivers and streams whilst others are 'dry' or seasonal in nature. The majority of the settlement of Buxton lies within this NCA, with Dove Holes lying on the north-west boundary, adjacent to NCA 53.

4.2 Regional Character Areas

- 4.2.1 The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage's 'Landscape Character Assessment – Guidance for England and Scotland' (The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002) suggests that an appropriate level of hierarchy of landscape character assessment should be selected to provide the right scale and level of detail of information when assessing landscape character. Accordingly the landscape character areas which provide the most information of the key characteristics of a particular area have been used in the following assessment, i.e. the regional character areas, rather than the NCAs.
- 4.2.2 The regional character areas are provided by DCC and HPBC. According to the designations assigned within 'The Landscape Character of Derbyshire' document (Derbyshire County Council, 2003) the High Peak is divided into two landscape areas, the Dark Peak and the White Peak. These are subsequently broken down into smaller Landscape Character Types (LCT). HPBC provides additional detail on the

landscape character and guidance on appropriate development within each LCT in their 'Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document' (High Peak Borough Council, 2006). HPBC based their Landscape Character Types and Areas on those provided by DCC, and so they are described together below. A map of these LCTs is included in Appendix F.

4.3 **Dark Peak**

- 4.3.1 The majority of the High Peak is located within the Dark Peak, which covers the entire northern and central portions as well as the south-west. The Dark Peak is an upland landscape of high moors and settled valleys characterised by gritstone, and five different LCTs have been identified within the assessment area.

Open Moors

- 4.3.2 An upland landscape of hill summits and moorland plateaux on hard upstanding millstone grit characterised by extensive semi-natural vegetation the form of heather moorland. The gritstone is overlain by acidic peat and blanket bog so has little agricultural value and is used for sheep grazing or grouse rearing. The lack of trees makes for a very open landscape with expansive and long distance views. This is an unsettled landscape, although there is evidence of prehistoric use.

Moorland Fringe

- 4.3.3 An unsettled landscape on the upper slopes and edges of upland valleys shaped by the underlying gritstone. There are some distinct rocky edges and outcrops. Due to the altitude, climate and poor soils the main land use is extensive sheep grazing and the landscape is largely treeless allowing for open, expansive views. Fields are large scale, regular and enclosed by dry stone walls. Farmsteads built when the landscape was first divided are sparsely scattered across the area.

Enclosed Moorland

- 4.3.4 An open, upland-farming landscape on broad rolling hill summits formed by upstanding sandstone of the Millstone Grit Series. Patches of remnant moorland remain and some fields are reverting back to moorland. The field pattern is regular and enclosed with dry gritstone walls. The lack of trees makes for a very open landscape with expansive views over the settled valleys. Settlement is confined to isolated farmsteads, sheltered by small groups of trees.

Settled Valley Pastures

- 4.3.5 A settled, pastoral farming landscape on gently sloping lower valley sides, dissected by stream valleys. The landscape has a strong network of winding lanes and roads and railways along the lower slopes above the floodplain. There are scattered farmsteads outside the compact settlements. The permanent improved pasture gives way higher up the slopes to poorer grazing where the ecological value is higher. Dense watercourse trees, scattered boundary trees and tree groups around settlements contribute to a strongly wooded character. This is the dominant LCT in the Dark Peak.

Riverside Meadows

- 4.3.6 Meandering rivers dissect carboniferous sandstones and shales to create gentle valley floors with narrow floodplains with heavy clay soils that are prone to seasonal waterlogging. The traditional land use has been meadowland cattle grazing in medium sized fields enclosed with either dry stone walls or hedges with occasional hedgerow trees. The river corridors are enclosed due to steep valley sides and extensive woodland. As this landscape is at risk from flooding it is largely unsettled with farmsteads located on the valley sides, there are some old mills located adjacent to the river in order to harness the water power.

4.4 White Peak

- 4.4.1 The south-east of the High Peak is located within the White Peak, a gently rolling upland limestone plateau punctuated by steep sided dales, scattered villages and isolated farmsteads within a pastoral setting. Three different LCTs have been identified within the assessment area. These are mostly or entirely unsettled, allowing for very limited development that would likely have a significant effect on the character of the landscape.

Plateau Pastures

- 4.4.2 A simple yet distinctive pastoral landscape strongly influenced by the underlying geology of Carboniferous Limestone, which has given rise to an elevated and predominantly gently rolling upland plateau. This elevation, allied to the general lack of tree cover, allows for long distance and panoramic views. The landscape is characterised by these expansive views, as well as nucleated limestone villages, dry stone walls and a pastoral land use.

Limestone Moorland

- 4.4.3 An undulating highland landscape used for rough grazing and stock rearing, with prominent limestone outcrops. The landscape is comprised of open areas bounded by dry stone walls and is essentially treeless except for plantation blocks in and around the edges of development, allowing for expansive views. It is mainly unsettled with only occasional farmsteads and small hamlets.

Limestone Dales

- 4.4.4 An unsettled landscape of narrow, deeply incised and steeply sloping valleys carved through the Carboniferous Limestone by the headwaters of minor streams. Many dales are used as transport corridors with roads and railways running alongside watercourses. The valley sides are characterised by steep, rocky cliffs and scree slopes, making them inaccessible for most uses other than rough grazing by sheep.

4.5 **Summary**

- 4.5.1 The High Peak is an extremely varied landscape, particularly in terms of topography. It is characterised by valley-bottom settlements and the sharp contrast between the gritstone of the Dark Peak and the limestone of the White Peak. All but one of the LCTs allow for limited development only, due to their unsettled nature, high visual sensitivity, difficult topography or geology. The only LCT which allows for extensive development is Settled Valley Pastures, which dominates the northern and central regions of the High Peak. It is important that all development should contribute to and not erode landscape character.
- 4.5.2 When considering the effect of development on landscape character it should be remembered that the distribution of typical landscape features will vary throughout individual character types. All the key characteristics of a character type are unlikely to be always present in each part of the area. In areas where the landscape structure is weak and eroded, areas of the original landscape can still be found intact. It is important that the landscape character descriptions are used as a guide to help identify the features and character of relevance to the landscape.
- 4.5.3 Areas of Search around towns and villages generally are of a scale and contain features that are characteristic of the original traditional agricultural landscape for that area. Towns and villages may be situated on the edge of more than one landscape character area. This may mean that the characteristics of areas of important landscape setting around the settlement are likely to differ.

5 LANDSCAPE MITIGATION

5.1 Landscape Character of the High Peak

- 5.1.1 The High Peak Borough is located mainly within the Dark Peak Regional Character Area and the part of the Borough to the south of Buxton is located within the White Peak Regional Character Area.
- 5.1.2 Within the Dark Peak the settlements are largely found in the valley bottoms of the Settled Valley Pastures and the Riverside Meadows landscape character types (LCTs). The more open upland LCTs of the Moorland Fringe and Enclosed Moorland are found on higher land generally abutting the Peak District National Park.
- 5.1.3 Buxton in the south of the Borough is located at the boundary between the Dark Peak and the White Peak Regional Character Areas. The White Peak is located to the south and west of Buxton and includes Plateau Pastures and Limestone Moorland LCTs.

5.2 Landscape Setting

- 5.2.1 An understanding and appreciation of the interrelationship between a settlement and its landscape setting informs opportunities for new development and determines the natural limits to the settlement as defined by landscape character.
- 5.2.2 The landscape element of a development proposal should pay due regard to the setting of the site as well as its own specific characteristics. It is important to observe the character of the local environment, to consider its scale and spatial relationships, to identify the features which create its landscape character and analyse their visual importance.
- 5.2.3 The features and characteristics which give the area its local distinctiveness should be incorporated into the design of new development to carry through the established 'sense of place'.

5.3 The Character of a Site

- 5.3.1 Having recognised the distinctive characteristics of the locality, the individual features and characteristics of the site need to be identified. Site analysis should identify changes in level, natural drainage pattern, the main aspect of the site, the planting structure, form of enclosure, important views in and out of the site, the age and condition of site features and their visual importance.

5.3.2 This careful analysis of the site and its setting should identify features which should be retained, re-established and created within the new development. Consideration must also be given to how these features will be managed or maintained.

5.4 Landscape Framework

5.4.1 Where new development sites are identified, an appropriate landscape framework should be created as part of the development. The characteristics of the landscape framework will assist in mitigating the impact of the new development on its wider landscape setting.

5.4.2 The landscape framework of a new development should generally comprise three main elements of vegetation:

- Retained vegetation (trees and hedges);
- New blocks of native tree and shrub planting and individual or groups of larger tree species (generally within public open space); and
- Domestic sized trees (within property boundaries).

5.4.3 The framework planting within a development should reflect the setting of the site. The retention of existing established trees and planting features will give new development a sense of maturity and place. Where there are existing trees and woodland both on and off site which contribute to landscape structure of a site, consideration should be given to their long term protection by use of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), by conditions or through off site planning obligations.

5.4.4 New planting should take account of landform, landscape scale and size of field pattern. Consideration should be given to the spatial relationship between woodland blocks and open areas so that the scale of the landscape is not disrupted. New broadleaved woodland associated with green infrastructure improvements can be used effectively to counteract the effects of fragmentation and isolation of ancient woodland. This must consider the context and form of existing woodland. In areas of small scale landscape the introduction of large scale woodland blocks used for screening new development can have an adverse impact on the local landscape character.

5.4.5 Main tree species introduced into the site should include those which are indigenous to the area and are found in the locality. Plant material should where possible

contribute towards local habitats following guidelines identified for the relevant landscape character type. Oak is the predominant species in the Settled Valley Pasture landscape areas. However the incidence of Ash is significant. Sycamores predominate in the Plateau Pastures of the White Peak and are supported by secondary species of Beech and Ash. The spread of Ash Die Back Disease (*Hymenoscyphus pseudoalbidus*) is likely to have a significant adverse affect on the vegetational structure particularly in the Dark Peak. In time, disease resistant Ash may be available but, given the current uncertainty, it is not appropriate to plant Ash trees at the present time within a development area.

- 5.4.6 Selection of plant species should take into account the ground and soil conditions, the vulnerability of the location and the likely level of future maintenance. Choice of shrubs should concentrate on species which are vigorous, hardy and readily available.
- 5.4.7 Field boundaries should be retained, maintained and, in places, replaced to maintain the scale of the landscape. Stone walls or native hedgerows should be used as a means of enclosure dependent upon local character. Replacement of hedges and drystone walls by fencing should be discouraged.
- 5.4.8 Hedges often form the boundary to a site development and can enclose compartments within larger sites which are made up of a number of fields. Hedgerows can also break up the scale of a site and can give protection and shelter to new planting. Ancient hedgerows are extremely important for nature conservation.
- 5.4.9 Hedgerows are notoriously difficult to retain as rear garden boundaries. Householders understandably want their property to be secure and 'pet and small children' proof. Even if the developer does not erect a close boarded fence, the likelihood is that the owner will do so under permitted development rights and the hedge then cannot be adequately maintained. As a consequence hedgerows are best retained within areas of open space where they can be adopted and managed by the local authority or by third party management.
- 5.4.10 Views of the site from the surrounding area may require appropriate screen planting to reinforce boundaries and enable the development to be more readily absorbed into its setting. Planting can also be used effectively to frame views into a site. Careful consideration should be given to boundary treatments ensuring that the vegetation structure of the existing site and its environs are either strengthened or

protected and that any new planting carried out as part of the proposals is sympathetic with the local landscape. Where the existing landscape structure is eroded and in a poor condition, new development can provide the opportunity for creating a strong new landscape structure and 'vegetated edge' to the settlement. Appropriate tree and shrub planting can act as a buffer between development and the adjacent countryside and create a strong new defensible boundary to a settlement.

5.5 Open Space

5.5.1 Open space can be used to create views out to the surrounding countryside. Within settlements, areas of open space with associated vegetational framework can provide important breaks within built up areas. These spaces can act as green corridors, visually connecting new development on the edge of settlements with the surrounding countryside.

5.5.2 The planting on open space areas within a residential area should contribute significantly to the framework planting of the site. Public open space should ideally be located in the parts of the site where existing mature trees are to be retained. These areas also offer the opportunity to plant native species that need space to establish and which will grow into large mature specimens or groups. Where existing hedgerows are to be retained this is best achieved by incorporating them within or bounding areas of public open space, so that the hedge can then be maintained as part of the open space. This should secure its continued existence and allow a consistent approach to maintenance to be achieved.

5.5.3 Creation of footpaths and cycleways running through open space within new development should aim to maximise links with existing Open Space, Public Rights of Way, cycleways and bridlepaths in the locality to enhance accessibility and linkages for the local community.

5.6 Built development

5.6.1 The grouping and form of new building should reflect the juxtaposition, scale, form, enclosure and materials of traditional buildings characteristic of the locality.

5.6.2 The colour of prefabricated industrial/commercial buildings should be determined taking careful account of position, predominant tones of adjacent vegetation or sky, as well as local materials, so as to minimise the visual effect of the development.

5.6.3 Care should be taken not to introduce unnecessary urban features into the rural scene particularly where new development sites are in proximity to open countryside or the National Park boundary.

5.7 Design Briefs

5.7.1 The preparation of design briefs, taking account of landscape character type and the setting and character of settlements, can encourage development that is sympathetic and contributes to the local scene. This is particularly important for larger sites where the scale of the development can be reduced by the establishment of a vegetational framework which reinforces the existing landscape structure and retains existing trees and hedges.

6 GENERAL ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH COMPLETION OF SITE ASSESSMENT SHEETS

6.1.1 The site assessment was undertaken between the 26th and the 2nd October 2013. Several sites in Buxton were revisited on the 15th October due to poor visibility on the original site visit. The following text sets out the issues encountered when completing each section of the Site Assessment Record Sheet. The term “site” in the following text refers to both the Preferred Option sites and areas of land with the potential to accommodate development identified in this assessment.

6.1.2 **Character Areas:** - These were determined prior to the site survey following the results of the desk survey. A written description of the character of the site and surrounding area was completed during the site visit.

6.1.3 **Existing Landscape Designations:** - These were identified prior to the site visit through the desk study.

6.1.4 **Geology:** - The presence of any Important Geological Sites, Geological SSSI's or Safeguarded Mineral Resources was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study.

6.1.5 **Topography:** - Information on the topography of the site and surrounding area was recorded during the site visit. Topography was often complex or varied due to the nature of the High Peak and was often a major factor in determining the visual prominence and the appropriate boundaries of the site.

6.1.6 **Landscape and Vegetation Structure:** - The degree of openness or enclosure of the site resulting from the nature of the vegetation structure was recorded during the site visit. The presence and condition of landscape elements within the site (such as hedgerows, dry stone walls, scrub, or woodland) was recorded providing important pointers towards appropriate mitigation and management opportunities. Field size and pattern were recorded, providing the opportunity to note differences both within and between sites. Such differences in pattern may also relate to the historic classification of the landscape. The presence of Tree Preservation Orders within or adjacent to the site was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study.

6.1.7 **Current Land Use/Habitats:** - Classification of land use and habitat types was undertaken during the site visit. A visual assessment of condition again helped to provide pointers towards future management requirements. The presence of Public Rights of Way and Long Distance and Local Trails within or adjacent to the site was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study.

- 6.1.8 **Biodiversity:** - The presence of statutory designations (SPA, SAC, SSSI, NNR, LNR), local designations (Local Wildlife Site) and ancient woodland within or adjacent to the site was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study. The presence of water bodies within or adjacent to site was identified during the desk study and the site visit, as the presence of water bodies could contribute to the value of the site in terms of biodiversity.
- 6.1.9 **Flood Risk:** - The flood risk associated with the sites was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study.
- 6.1.10 **Ground Water Protection Zone:** - The presence of the Buxton Mineral Water Catchment Area within or adjacent to the site was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study.
- 6.1.11 **Historic Assets and Setting:** - The presence of historic assets (Conservation Area, Archaeological Sites, Buxton Area of Archaeological Interest, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Parks and Gardens) within or adjacent to the site was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study. The potential impact on the setting of these assets was established during the site visit.
- 6.1.12 **Site Context:** - The proximity of the site to the National Park boundary was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study. The potential impact on the setting of the National Park was established during the site visit. The presence of Strategic Gaps, Local Green Space and Green Wedges adjacent to the site was identified prior to the site visit through the desk study. The adjoining settlement edge, the adjacent building type and density and the visual prominence of the site was determined during the site visit.
- 6.1.13 In assessing the nature of the adjoining settlement edge, the degree of vegetation (e.g. trees in gardens) on the edge was noted. The presence or absence of vegetation (i.e. an urbanised edge) was not taken as being necessarily a positive or a negative attribute but merely a component contributing to the character of the edge. Similarly the nature of the definition of the edge, i.e. whether weakly or strongly defined, was not taken as either a positive or a negative attribute but was dependent upon the perception of these characteristics on the site. For example there may be a well defined historic urban edge which strongly contributes to the character of the settlement. At the other extreme there may be a well defined urbanised edge which is marred by inappropriate development.

- 6.1.14 The site visit was also used to determine if development of the site would contribute to visual coalescence of existing settlements, or create the potential for improvement of the settlement edge.
- 6.1.15 **Summary and Recommendations:** - If the site was within the Green Belt the fulfilment of Green Belt purposes were assessed. The comments and the tick box layout of the form, arranged according to each issue, helped to form a logical progression of summarised points to the end of the form. The recommendation for each site was developed from this logical progression of analysis against the criteria set out in the NPPF and Local Plan. Thus the answers provided by the summaries directly informed whether development of the whole or part of the site would have significant landscape impacts. Where this was the case then recommendations were presented for potential mitigation measures that could be implemented in order to allow development.
- 6.1.16 **Other Issues:** - There were several issues tackled during the site assessment which were not outlined on the site assessment sheets.
- 6.1.17 Site boundaries for the Preferred Options were provided by the High Peak Borough Council. However the final definition of these boundaries could only be determined on site. Logical cut off points which define boundaries are often only apparent on site. Such boundaries may relate to subtle changes in topography, habitat and vegetation type or screening elements which alter the extent of visibility out of or into the site.
- 6.1.18 All sites were checked on the field survey to establish logical boundaries. Where sites adjoined settlements the boundary generally corresponded with the edge of the existing settlement. Often the site boundary was determined by a distinct change in topography or vegetation type, existing field boundaries, or transport infrastructure (e.g. roads, railways or canal). Consequently some of the site boundaries were suggested for amendment to better reflect these logical boundaries.
- 6.1.19 The Site Assessment Sheets were also used to assess the suitability of land within the Areas of Search (not included in the Preferred Options) to accommodate development in landscape terms. The areas of land identified have been presented as areas of land with the potential to accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park.

6.1.20 The assessment of land within the Areas of Search was undertaken at a strategic level. It should be noted that within the Areas of Search categorised as being unsuitable for development there will inevitably be variations in the level of landscape impacts. Such variations could be determined by further more detailed survey at the field level.

7 RESULTS OF THE SURVEYS

- 7.1.1 The following tables set out the summaries and recommendations for each of the Preferred Options and for land within the Areas of Search which could potentially accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park. Where specific policies apply to the Preferred Options these are identified and further recommendations are provided where appropriate.
- 7.1.2 In addition details are provided of land within the Areas of Search which could not accommodate development without significant harm to visual amenity, landscape character, and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park. Consequent recommendations have been made on Green Belt boundary changes and appropriate mitigation and design recommendations have been set out, including recommendations to improve the urban edge.
- 7.1.3 Brief details of potential landscape frameworks specific to each site are provided in the table. For a more detailed discussion of an appropriate landscape framework see Section 5.4.
- 7.1.4 Maps ST13567/001-005 show the Preferred Options, the areas of land with the potential to accommodate development, and the Areas of Search which could not accommodate development without significant harm.

7.2 GLOSSOPDALE

- 7.2.1 Table 1 presents the summary and recommendations for each of the Preferred Options within the Glossopdale Sub-Area.

Table 1. Preferred Options in the Glossopdale Sub-Area

PREFERRED OPTIONS HOUSING		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Paradise Street, Hadfield	G2	Sloping, enclosed, ruderal grassland adjacent to residential properties within the settlement boundary. Medium visual prominence, visible from The National Park. However the site would have a low impact on the setting of the National Park due to the prominence of adjacent built development and partial screening by woodland to the north-west. Development should be in keeping with the character of the

		surrounding area. Vegetation to the north-west should be retained in order to reduce visual prominence and strengthen settlement edge. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
North Road, Glossop	G6	Open, semi-improved grassland/woodland in an elevated position adjacent to existing residential properties on the edge of the settlement. High visual prominence and development could impact on the setting of the National Park. If the site is developed a detailed landscape masterplanning exercise must be undertaken to address these issues. TPOs should be placed upon existing trees within and surrounding the site. Extensive tree and shrub planting should be used within the site in order to reduce its visual prominence and ensure development is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. Site has significant landscape impacts and detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning as set out above would be required to address the issues of visibility, loss of vegetation and the impact on the National Park, the character of the surrounding development and the nearby Howard Park Conservation Area.
Land off Woodhead Road, Glossop	G8/ G9/ G10	Sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland adjacent to existing residential properties on the edge of the settlement. Elevated land in the north of the site (G8 and north-west of G9) has long distance views from the National Park. Development here could have an adverse impact on the setting of The National Park. Lower lying land in the southern part of the site (remainder of G9 and G8) is screened by topography and adjacent existing properties. This part of the site is more suitable for development subject to vegetation within and on the periphery of the site being retained and strengthened in order to reduce visual prominence, particularly on the northern boundary. Development must be in keeping with the character of the adjacent Conservation Area. Site has significant landscape impacts and detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning as set out above would

		be required to address the issues of visibility, loss of vegetation and the impact on the National Park, the character of the surrounding development and the nearby Old Glossop Conservation Area.
Hawkshead Mill, Old Glossop	G13	Mill buildings and brewery on sloping land at the settlement edge. Views of the site from The National Park. Existing development within the site has medium visual prominence and an impact on the setting of the National Park. Development would not adversely alter this impact subject to being in keeping with the character of the nearby Conservation Area. Tree and shrub planting should be used on the northern and eastern boundaries to screen development from the National Park and reduce visual prominence. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Woods Mill, High St East, Glossop (Policy DS1)	G16	Flat, enclosed site containing a derelict mill and associated buildings within the existing urban area. Well screened by topography and surrounding properties with low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. Opportunities for improvement of town centre. Development should be in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area. No further recommendations for Policy DS1.
Bank Street, Glossop	G18	Steeply sloping, enclosed site comprising a mix of ruderal grassland and woodland. Well screened by topography and existing properties with low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. Development should be in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area. Existing vegetation within and on the periphery of the site should be retained where possible in order to maintain low visual prominence.
Dinting Road/Dinting Lane, Glossop	G19	Sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland. Long distance views from the National Park with medium visual prominence. However, the impact on the setting of the National Park is limited due to the proximity and location of the surrounding development. Vegetation on the periphery and in the east of the site should be retained and

		strengthened in order to reduce visual prominence. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Dinting Lane, Glossop	G20	Sloping, semi-enclosed, improved grassland. Partial screening by vegetation, medium visual prominence from the south. Impact on the setting of the National Park is limited due to the proximity and location of the surrounding development. Vegetation on the periphery of the site should be retained and strengthened in order to reduce visual prominence. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Land off Dinting Road, Glossop	G21	Sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland. Partial screening by vegetation surrounding the site, medium visual prominence from the south. Impact on the setting of the National Park is limited due to the proximity and location of the surrounding development. Vegetation on the periphery of the site should be retained and strengthened in order to reduce visual prominence. Trees and shrubs should be planted on the southern boundary to screen views from the National Park. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Former railway museum, Glossop (Policy DS2)	G23	Semi-enclosed, woodland with ruderal vegetation and varied topography. Well screened by vegetation and topography which limits visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park and the adjacent Green Belt. The following recommendations are made for inclusion in Policy DS2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing vegetation on the perimeter should be retained and strengthened in order to maintain the low visual prominence of the site and prevent coalescence between the settlements of Hadfield and Glossop. Historical features within the site should be retained and restored. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created which would include the strengthening of woodland on the perimeter and retention of historical features.
Adderley	N/A	Sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland and

Place, Glossop (Policy DS4)		woodland adjacent to existing residential properties and woodland. Well screened by existing properties and woodland, low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. Woodland surrounding the site should be retained in order to maintain low visual prominence. No further recommendations for Policy DS4.
Land off Melandra Castle Road, Glossop	G25	Flat, enclosed, improved grassland including informal open space adjacent to and surrounded by existing residential properties. Well screened by vegetation and existing properties, low visual prominence and impact on the setting of The National Park. Site could be extended to include all Open Countryside to the west which is enclosed by vegetation (P5).
Land at Gamesley Sidings, Glossop	G26	Flat, semi-enclosed, improved grassland adjacent to existing residential properties on the settlement edge. Medium visual prominence when seen from the National Park to the south. However, the development would have a low impact on the setting of the National Park due to background of residential development and presence of adjacent derelict factory. Existing vegetation on the southern boundary should be retained and strengthened in order to reduce visual prominence and strengthen the settlement edge. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
PREFERRED OPTIONS EMPLOYMENT AND REGENERATION		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Charlestown Works, Glossop (Policy DS3)	G31	Flat/sloping, enclosed industrial area. Well enclosed by vegetation with low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. Woodland within and adjacent to the site should be retained in order to maintain low visual prominence. Opportunities to improve the setting of the area and the approach into the settlement from the south could be explored. No further recommendations for Policy DS3.
Former Ferro Alloys site, Glossop	N/A	Flat, enclosed brownfield site containing a demolished factory and disused chimney within the existing urban area. Low visual prominence of the site. However the disused chimney

(Policy DS5)		has an adverse impact on the setting of the National Park and the town centre. Development of the site would provide opportunities to improve the setting of both the National Park and the town centre. No further recommendations for Policy DS5.
Land off Wren Nest Road	N/A	Sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved and ruderal grassland adjacent to existing commercial and industrial properties. Generally screened by adjacent properties, vegetation and topography. Low visual prominence from the National Park. Impact on the setting of the National Park is limited due to the proximity and location of the surrounding development. Vegetation on the periphery of the site and to the west should be retained in order to maintain low visual prominence.
Waterside, Hadfield	N/A	Predominantly flat and enclosed, previously developed land adjacent to settlement edge and existing industrial estate and residential properties. Screened by vegetation and surrounding topography with low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. Vegetation within and surrounding the site should be retained and strengthened in order to maintain low visual prominence, particularly on the northern boundary in order to prevent visual coalescence between the settlements of Tintwistle and Hadfield. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created which would include the strengthening of woodland on the perimeter.
PREFERRED OPTIONS GREEN SPACES		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
George Street Local Green Space	N/A	The site is of local ecological importance, creating a break between commercial and residential development with external and internal views to the adjacent parkland. The site has the potential to be included within Harehills Park. Environmental improvements and/or development along George Street could be used to further increase its significance to the community, encouraging its use as a

		pedestrian route and open up access to the town centre. The proposed boundary is considered to be suitable for categorisation as Green Space. Suitable as a Local Green Space.
Padfield Local Green Space	N/A	The site provides openness between the surrounding residential properties in the centre of the settlement. It has little identified ecological value but does offer significant external and internal views between the site and higher land to the south. The grassland adjacent to the site also fulfils these criteria. Thus the LGS designation could be extended to include this adjacent grassland. The trees between the site and the adjacent grassland could be taken down to reinforce its status as a single site subject to planting elsewhere within the site. Suitable as a Local Green Space.
PREFERRED OPTIONS STRATEGIC GAP		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Strategic gap between Hadfield and Glossop	N/A	Large site comprising a mix of grasslands and woodland. The parts of the site to the south of Dinting Road have high visual prominence when seen from the National Park and surrounding area. Development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park. These parts are of high ecological importance, prevent visual and physical coalescence between Glossop and Hadfield and provide significant external and internal views. The majority of the site is accessible by the public, and inaccessible areas still provide amenity value. It thus fulfils the purposes of a Strategic Gap. The part of the site to the north of Dinting Road is assessed below as P3. Suitable as Strategic Gap.

7.2.2 Table 2 presents the summary and recommendations for land within the Areas of Search in the Glossopdale Sub-Area where development could be accommodated without significant harm. The table includes appropriate mitigation recommendations to improve the urban edge or to enable proposed development to be more readily absorbed within its setting.

Table 2. Land with potential to accommodate development in the Glossopdale Sub-Area

WITHIN OPEN COUNTRYSIDE		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
West Drive, Tintwistle	P1	Site comprised of flat, improved grassland/football ground. Screened by adjacent residential properties and topography, low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. If site is developed football ground would need to be relocated. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Roughfields, Hadfield (previously consulted on as G3)	P2	Sloping, semi-enclosed/open, semi-improved/improved grassland adjacent to existing residential properties on the edge of the settlement which has previously undergone consultation as a potential housing site. Sensitive site due to high visual prominence when seen from The National Park. However, there is some potential for development on lower lying land on the south-west of the site adjacent to existing development. Planting should be used to screen such development and reduce visual prominence. There is also some potential for development along Goddard Lane adjacent to existing frontage properties. Such development would have to be in keeping with the character of these properties. Part of the site is to be retained for future education use. If partial development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Shaw Lane, Hadfield	P3	Flat, open, predominantly improved grassland adjacent to residential properties on the edge of the settlement within the Strategic Gap identified in the Preferred Options document. It is suitable for inclusion in the Strategic Gap as development of both P3 and G23 could cause physical (but not visual) coalescence between Hadfield and Glossop. Development of P3 in isolation would not affect the purposes of the Strategic Gap in terms of physical coalescence but it is recognised that G23 is a Preferred Housing Site Option and thus it may be assumed will come forward for development.

		P3 is screened by residential properties and topography to the north and east. Medium visual prominence from The National Park to the south but low impact as any development would be seen against the context of the adjacent residential development. If the site were to be developed, mitigation measures should include vegetation planting along Dinting Road or the retention of green space adjacent to Dinting Road to reduce visual prominence. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Land abutting Dinting Lane Industrial Estate	P4	Sloping, open, semi-improved/improved grassland adjacent to industrial estate. Medium visual prominence, visible from the National Park. However impact on the setting of the National Park would be limited as development would be seen against existing industrial development. Trees and shrubs on the periphery of the site should be retained and strengthened. Further trees and shrubs should be planted along east/north-east boundaries and within the site, to screen and break up development in order to reduce visual prominence. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework. However this land has been identified for allocation as an allotment site and is suitable for this purpose.
Land to the rear of Gamesley Bridge Farm	P5	Flat, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland adjacent to the existing settlement edge. Well screened by vegetation and existing properties, low visual prominence and impact on the setting of The National Park. Trees and shrubs on the periphery of the site should be retained. However this land has been identified for allocation as an allotment site and is suitable for this purpose.
Homestead Farm, Charlesworth (previously consulted on	P7	Gently sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland adjacent to existing residential properties. Generally screened by existing adjacent properties with low visual prominence. Dry stone walling/vegetation on the north-east boundary would need to be strengthened in order to reduce visual

as G27 and G28)		prominence when seen from the north-east. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Cliffe Road, Glossop (previously consulted on as G17)	P9	Flat/sloping, open, improved/semi-improved grassland open on the east side with the rest of the site enclosed by development and allotments. Steeply sloping on northern edge. Partial screening by vegetation and topography, medium visual prominence. Visible from the National Park but low impact on the setting due to the surrounding development. Existing trees within and surrounding the site should be retained, particularly the woodland blocks in the south-west corner and along the northern boundary. Tree and shrub planting should be used along the eastern boundary to screen development and additional trees and shrubs should be planted within the site in order to break up development. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Pyegrove, Glossop	P10	Flat, semi-enclosed, improved football ground currently designated for recreation/open space adjacent to existing residential properties and former bus depot which is currently being developed. Partial screening by vegetation and adjacent properties, low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. If the site is developed, development should be limited to lower lying land in the south of the site with vegetation on the northern boundary retained and strengthened in order to reduce visual prominence and strengthen the settlement edge. If site is developed the football ground will need to be relocated. A Green Belt extension is recommended for the triangular area of Open Countryside to the north-west of the site, north of the cricket club, as this fulfils the same Green Belt purposes as the surrounding land which is included within the Green Belt. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.

7.2.3 Table 3 presents a summary of remaining land in the Areas of Search on the periphery of each settlement (excluding areas of land identified as being suitable for development in landscape terms above) which could not accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park.

Table 3. Areas of Search which could not accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park.

PERIPHERY OF SETTLEMENTS	
Settlement	Summary
Tintwistle	Eastern edge is within the National Park. Land to the north and west is elevated and visually prominent and development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park. Land to the south could potentially accommodate development as identified in P1 (see above).
Hadfield	Land to the east and north is elevated and visually prominent. Development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park. Development could cause coalescence with the settlements of Tintwistle, Padfield and Glossop. Land to the south is unsuitable due its role in preventing coalescence between the settlements of Hadfield, Glossop and Gamesley. The exception to this is P3 (see above). To the west the A57 acts as a strong boundary and should not be breached.
Gamesley	Melandra Castle Road acts as a strong settlement boundary to the north and west that should not be breached. Land beyond it is visually prominent and has important heritage assets. To the south current Preferred Option G25 could be extended to include all Open Countryside (see P5 above). However it should be noted that this land has been identified for allocation as an allotment site and is suitable for this purpose. The railway line to the south also acts as a strong physical and visual boundary that should not be breached. Land to the east is unsuitable in landscape terms due its role in preventing coalescence between the settlements of Hadfield, Glossop and Gamesley.

Charlesworth	Other than P7, land surrounding the settlement is unsuitable for development in either landscape terms (due to high elevation, visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park) or due to allocation as a school site. Land to the north/north-east and south-west is also unsuitable for development in landscape terms due to potential physical and visual coalescence with the settlements of Chisworth and also Gamesley. This land also prevents physical coalescence with Glossop.
Glossop	Land to the north is elevated with high visual prominence and development could impact on the setting of the National Park. The area of land to the north of Howard Park fulfils Green Belt purposes particularly in relation to restricting the sprawl of large built up areas. This area is recommended for inclusion in the Green Belt. Land to the east and south is unsuitable for development in landscape terms due to its high visual prominence and proximity to the National Park. Land to the west is unsuitable for development in landscape terms due to potential coalescence with the settlements of Hadfield, Charlesworth and also Gamesley. There is also an existing strong settlement boundary (completed with the development of Adderley Place, see above) that should not be breached.

7.3 CENTRAL

7.3.1 Table 4 presents the summary and recommendations for each of the Preferred Options within the Central Sub-Area including sites from the Draft Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Table 4. Preferred Options in the Central Sub-Area

PREFERRED OPTIONS HOUSING		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Hayfield Road, Hayfield	C1	Flat, enclosed, previously developed site within an already urban area bordered by vegetation and a railway embankment. Some visibility from the National Park but low impact on setting due to urban location. Existing vegetation

		within and surrounding the site should be retained where possible in order to maintain relatively low visual prominence.
New Mills Road, Hayfield	C2	Flat, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland adjoining residential properties on the edge of the settlement and the Green Belt boundary. Some visibility from the National Park but low impact on setting due to adjoining properties. Existing vegetation within and surrounding the site should be retained and improved, particularly on the western boundary in order to strengthen settlement edge on the Green Belt boundary. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Derby Road, New Mills (Policy DS6)	C3	Predominantly flat, semi-enclosed, improved grassland adjacent to residential properties and playing fields on the edge of the settlement. Screened from the National Park by topography with low impact on setting. Constraint of overhead lines could cause separation from existing settlement edge and this should be addressed. It should be considered in Policy DS6 that there is the potential for improvement to the urban edge of the settlement.
Ollersett Lane/Pingot Road, New Mills (Policy DS7)	C5	<p>Sloping, open, semi-improved grassland adjacent to residential properties on the edge of the settlement. Visibility from the surrounding area created by elevated position. Development could be extended to the residential properties to the north (see P12 below) and site C6 to the south (see P13 below), whilst retaining the existing woodland block between C5 and C6. The following recommendations are made for inclusion in Policy DS7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on the higher, eastern edge of the site should be restricted to reduce the impact on the setting of the National Park. • Mitigation should include tree and woodland planting on this boundary to improve urban edge. <p>An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.</p>

Laneside Road, New Mills	C6	Predominantly flat, semi-enclosed, improved grassland adjacent to residential properties on the edge of the settlement. Some visibility from the National Park but low impact on setting due to context of existing urban edge. Development could be extended to link with site C5 to the north (see P13 below). The existing woodland block between these sites should be maintained and additional tree and woodland planting on the eastern boundary would improve the urban edge. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Woodside Street, New Mills Newtown	C7	Flat, enclosed, brownfield site within an already urban area bordered by industry, residential properties and the canal. Development should be in keeping with the setting of the canal and the character of surrounding buildings.
Wharf Road, Whaley Bridge	C8	Flat, enclosed, brownfield site comprising of commercial properties and derelict buildings within an already urban area. Screened by woodland and elevated railway, low visual impact from surrounding area due to surrounding woodland which should be retained.
Buxton Road, Chinley	C13	Flat, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland. Screened from National Park and surrounding area by elevated railway to the north. Potential to improve settlement edge through tree planting on eastern edge of site.
Between Old Road and Buxton Road, Whaley Bridge	N/A	Steeply sloping, enclosed, semi-improved grassland within an already urban area. Site slopes down from railway line to adjacent residential properties. Visible from National Park and surrounding areas, but would have low impact on setting due to surrounding urban development. Development should be consistent with the character of the existing adjacent properties in order to sit within the existing settlement.
Land opposite Tesco along railway	N/A	Sloping woodland site adjacent to existing residential properties on the edge of the settlement. Some visibility from the National Park and Green Belt but low impact on setting due to context of adjacent built development.

embankment		Woodland and vegetation surrounding the site should be retained where possible to reduce visual impact.
PREFERRED OPTIONS GREEN SPACE		
Name		Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
New Mills Green Wedge between Church Lane and St. Georges Road		Site forms a significant break between development within the settlement, acts as a woodland corridor and provides views out to the surrounding countryside. There are visually significant views of the site from long distance views and from the footpath that crosses the site. However the site does not afford significant views from the adjacent surrounding area. Increased access to the site could improve its value to the community and increase its suitability as a Green Wedge. Alternatively Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) could be placed on trees within the site in order to protect it from development and maintain the woodland corridor within the settlement.
New Mills Green Wedge, Ladyshaw Bottom		Site is of high ecological importance at a local level, forming a break between residential and industrial/commercial development and offers significant external and internal views. It is easily accessible due to the number of public rights of way crossing the site, and its value has recently been increased with improvements to the Sett Valley Trail. Suitable as a Green Wedge.
Green Belt boundary amendment, Furness Vale		Sloping, semi- enclosed site comprised of ruderal grassland and commercial properties, enclosed by residential properties, Buxton Road and the railway. Does not fulfil Green Belt purposes. It is enclosed on all sides by road, canal or existing residential properties. Due to the surrounding built infrastructure the site does not currently prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another or safeguard the countryside from encroachment Retention within the Green Belt would not assist in urban regeneration as there are no identified regeneration sites within Furness Vale. Development on this site would not cause coalescence

	of settlements or have a high impact on the setting of The National Park. Potential site identified for removal from the Green Belt and suitable for development.
PREFERRED OPTIONS EMPLOYMENT AND REGENERATION	
Name	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Britannia Mill, Buxworth (Policy DS8)	<p>Predominantly flat, enclosed Green Belt site comprising derelict mill buildings, brownfield land, container storage and woodland, adjacent to settlement edge and the canal. Brownfield area of site only partially fulfils Green Belt purposes in that whilst it prevents physical coalescence between the settlements of Buxworth, Whaley Bridge and Furness Vale, it does not prevent visual coalescence between these settlements. This woodland also contributes to the character of the adjacent settlement of Buxworth. The following recommendation is made for inclusion in Policy DS8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woodland surrounding and within the site should be excluded from development and retained to provide a landscape framework to ensure visual coalescence does not occur. <p>Brownfield area of site is suitable for development in landscape terms subject to the retention of an appropriate landscape framework.</p>
Bingswood, Whaley Bridge (Policy DS9)	<p>Predominantly flat, enclosed site comprising ruderal grassland, woodland, an industrial estate, a supermarket and recent planning permissions. Adjoins Goyt Mill Wood Local Wildlife Site. Screened by elevated road and woodland, low visual impact from surrounding area. Currently proposed route of access road would be impractical in landscape terms due to change in levels and river crossing requiring substantial clearance of vegetation and habitats. Alternative access should be considered. The following recommendations are made for inclusion in Policy DS9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening vegetation on periphery of site should be retained.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woodland corridors within the site which provide linking habitats to the adjacent Local Wildlife Site should be retained. <p>An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.</p>
Furness Vale Industrial Estate, Calico Lane, Furness Vale (Policy DS10)		Enclosed flat industrial estate. Screened by vegetation with low visual impact on surrounding area. No effect on the setting of the National Park. Vegetation within and on the periphery of the site should be retained in order to maintain low visual prominence. No further recommendations for Policy DS10.
Torr Vale Mill (Policy DS11)		<p>Enclosed site containing a woodland block to the south and sloping steeply down to mill buildings at the bottom of the valley. Site is well screened by vegetation and the adjacent elevated road with low visual impact. No effect on the setting of the National Park. Development should be in keeping with the setting of the Conservation Area. The following recommendation is made for inclusion in Policy DS11:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woodland block to the south contains mature trees and should be retained to maintain low visual prominence.
Thornsett Industrial Estate		Flat, enclosed industrial estate. Well screened by steep valley edges and vegetation with low visual prominence and impact on the setting of The National Park. Vegetation on the periphery of the site should be retained in order to maintain the low visual prominence of the site.
DRAFT CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Chapel Plan site at Bowden Hey	N/A	Large flat/sloping, semi-enclosed site comprising grassland, disused allotments, agricultural and commercial properties, located between the settlement edge and the A6 adjacent to existing commercial and industrial properties to the north-west, south-west and south-east. Screened from the National Park by vegetation and topography. Low visual prominence

		and impact on the setting of The National Park. Existing vegetation within and on the periphery of the site should be retained and strengthened in order to maintain the low visual prominence of the site when seen from the National Park. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Chapel Plan site at Bowden Lane	N/A	Flat, open, improved grassland outside of the settlement, south of and adjacent to the A6. Mature woodland within the site to the east. Highly visible from the National Park and surrounding areas, development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park and the nearby Chapel Milton and Wash Conservation Areas. Separated from the current settlement boundary by the A6 which forms a well defined limit to development. Site could not accommodate development due to the issues of visibility, loss of vegetation and the impact on the National Park and Chapel Milton and Wash Conservation Areas.

7.3.2 Table 5 presents the summary and recommendations for land within the Areas of Search in the Central Sub-Area where development could be accommodated without significant harm. The table includes appropriate mitigation recommendations to improve the urban edge or to enable proposed development to be more readily absorbed within its setting.

Table 5. Land with potential to accommodate development in the Central Sub-Area

WITHIN OPEN COUNTRYSIDE		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
North of Ollersett Lane, New Mills (previously consulted on as C4)	P12	Sloping grassland, semi-enclosed by adjacent residential properties on the settlement edge. Low visual impact, low impact on setting of National Park. Potential to strengthen settlement edge in conjunction with development of sites C5 and C6. Trees and shrubs should be planted along open eastern edge to screen development and strengthen the settlement edge. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.

North of Ollersetthall farm, New Mills	P13	Sloping open grassland. Low visual impact, low impact on setting of National Park. Potential to strengthen settlement edge in conjunction with development of sites C5 and C6. Adjacent woodland block to west of site should be retained. Trees and shrubs should be planted along open eastern edge to screen development and strengthen the settlement edge. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Macclesfield Road, Whaley Bridge (previously consulted on as C9)	P14	Sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland adjacent to existing residential properties on the settlement edge. Parts visible from The National Park but seen in the context of existing development. Low impact on the setting of the National Park, however, visibility increases on the higher land to the west. Some screening by trees to the south and east. Consideration should be given to designating land along the northern boundary and in the north-west of the site as Open Space. Trees within and on the periphery of the land, particularly the mature trees aligned north to south through the centre, could have TPOs placed upon them. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Mevril Road, Whaley Bridge (previously consulted on as C10 and C11)	P15	Flat, semi-improved grassland enclosed by existing residential properties on the settlement edge. Low visual impact and effect on the setting of the National Park due to screening by vegetation particularly on southern boundary and topography to the south and east. Existing vegetation within the land and on the periphery, particularly the southern boundary, should be retained in order to maintain low visual prominence.
New Horwich Road, Whaley Bridge	P16	Sloping strip of ruderal grassland adjacent to the road between existing frontage properties. Visible from the surrounding area. Potential to develop frontage properties to fill existing gap and strengthen settlement edge. Development should be in keeping with the character and scale of existing adjacent properties.

Stodhart Farm, Chapel-en-le-Frith	P17	Sloping strip of improved grassland partially within settlement boundary enclosed by the railway to the west and an industrial estate to the east. The southern area is currently in active use as an allotment site. The railway acts as a strong limit to development. The northern part of the land has higher visual prominence and development here could affect the setting of the National Park from some viewpoints. Existing vegetation should be retained and enhanced to limit visual impacts. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
South of school, Chapel-en-le-Frith	P19	Flat, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland adjacent to school grounds. Low visual impact and low effect on the setting of the National Park due to screening by vegetation. Vegetation on the southern, eastern and western boundaries should be retained and strengthened in order to maintain low visual prominence. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Meadow Farm, Dove Holes	P22	Flat, enclosed, semi-improved grassland, tree belt and container storage adjacent to existing residential properties and the railway to the west within the existing settlement. Screened by railway embankment and topography to the west, and vegetation and existing properties. Low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. Potential to improve setting of the settlement through change in land use.
WITHIN GREEN BELT		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Kinder Road, Hayfield	P11	Sloping grassland within the Green Belt, semi-enclosed by existing residential properties on the settlement boundary. Site does not fulfil Green Belt purposes as development could strengthen the settlement edge, which in turn could safeguard the countryside from encroachment and check unrestricted sprawl. There are no neighbouring towns in

		proximity to the site and there is little/no derelict land within the settlement. There are no historic towns in proximity to the land. Low visual impact due to screening by topography and adjacent properties. Development would have a low impact on setting of National Park. Potential to strengthen settlement edge. Trees and shrubs should be planted along open edge to the east to screen development and strengthen the settlement edge. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
--	--	---

7.3.3 Table 6 presents a summary of remaining land in the Areas of Search on the periphery of each settlement (excluding areas of land identified as being suitable for development in landscape terms above) which could not accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park.

Table 6. Areas of Search which could not accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the Green Belt and National Park.

PERIPHERY OF SETTLEMENTS	
Settlement	Summary
Hayfield	As a valley-bottom settlement, most land on the periphery is elevated and would have high visual prominence and impact on the setting of the adjacent/adjoining National Park. Development to the west of the site is unsuitable in landscape terms due to potential coalescence with the settlement of Birch Vale. If P11 (see above) is developed the east of the settlement will have a strong well defined boundary which should not be breached. Remaining land around the settlement is elevated and any development would have high visual prominence.
New Mills	As a valley-bottom settlement, most land on the periphery is elevated with high visual prominence and potential impact on the setting of the National Park. Low lying areas are adjacent to the

	green wedges and are considered unsuitable for development in landscape terms in order to retain the openness of these spaces. The entire eastern, western and southern areas not considered previously are considered unsuitable in landscape terms due to potential physical and visual coalescence with the settlements of Birch Vale, Disley and Furness Vale. The suitability of the land surrounding Beardhough Farm was considered, but was determined to be too visually prominent and important for the character and openness of the settlement.
Furness Vale	Further development to the north or south of the settlement creates the potential for physical and visual coalescence with the settlements of New Mills and Whaley Bridge. Land to the east and west is elevated and unsuitable in landscape terms due to its visual prominence and effect on the setting of the National Park. Land at Bridgemont to the south is located on a floodplain and within the Green Belt. It has high visual prominence with views to the National Park and surrounding areas. Development would impact on the setting of the National Park. It fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt, particularly for preventing coalescence between the settlements of Whaley Bridge, Furness Vale and Buxworth.
Whaley Bridge	As a valley-bottom settlement, most land on the periphery is elevated with high visual prominence and potential impact on the setting of the National Park. The north of the settlement has a strong existing settlement edge that should not be breached and development could cause potential physical and visual coalescence with the settlement of Furness Vale. Land to the east and west has a strong existing settlement edge that should not be breached, is highly elevated and is visually prominent. Land to the south is elevated, visually prominent and includes historic parkland. Open Countryside to the west could be included within the Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl.
Chinley	With the exception of Preferred Option site C13, any further development is considered unsuitable in landscape terms. To the north the settlement is adjacent to the National Park and the railway acts as strong settlement boundary that should not be breached.

	There are strong settlement edges to the west and east preventing coalescence with the settlements of Buxworth and Chapel Milton. The majority of the south-west of the settlement is within a Conservation Area. Any further development is likely to affect the character and the setting of the Conservation Area and the settlement.
Chapel-en-le-Frith	All land to the east, south and west is elevated and visually prominent. Any development would have a high visual impact and affect the setting of the National Park. The A6 acts as a strong settlement boundary to the north and east of the settlement and development should not breach this well defined boundary.
Dove Holes	Much of the land to the east and south has been extensively quarried. Development may therefore be difficult to achieve without investment in a comprehensive landscape framework. To the west development should not breach the railway line, as beyond this the land is elevated and development would have a high visual impact on the setting of the National Park. At the northern end of the settlement, between the railway and the A6, there is an area of low lying land. However this is open and visually prominent. Development here could affect the setting of the National Park.

7.4 BUXTON

7.4.1 Table 7 presents the summary and recommendations for each of the Preferred Options within the Buxton Sub-Area.

Table 7. Preferred Options in the Buxton Sub-Area

PREFERRED OPTIONS HOUSING		
Name	Ref	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
Batham Gate Road, Peak Dale	B1	Gently sloping, improved grassland, semi-enclosed by residential properties and church. Western edge of the site is elevated and visually prominent. Western site boundary could be moved eastwards to be in line with the edge of the residential properties to the south thus reducing visual impact and strengthening the settlement edge. There is land where further development could be

		accommodated without significant landscape harm to the south of the site (see P23 and P24 below). Tree planting should be used along western edge of site to reduce visual impact. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
Land at Batham Gate, Peak Dale	B2	Flat, open, improved grassland adjacent to Batham Gate Road between frontage residential properties. Development should consist of frontage properties only in order to prevent an adverse impact on the current urban form. Development should be in keeping with the character of the adjacent residential properties.
Land at Hogshaw, Buxton (Policy DS12)	B3/ B4	Semi-enclosed/open site with varied topography comprising improved and ruderal grassland, scrub and woodland. The south-west of the site is at a low elevation and extremely undulating. The north and east of the site is flat and at a higher elevation but partially screened by topography and existing development. Development within the north-east of the site (B3) would have significant landscape impacts and an adverse impact on the setting of the National Park as this area has high visual prominence. The following recommendation is made for inclusion in Policy DS12: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing vegetation and woodland in the north of the site should be retained and enhanced and additional native tree and shrub blocks should be planted at an early phase on the northern and eastern boundaries in order to screen future development and strengthen the settlement boundary. North-east of site has significant landscape impacts and detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning as set out above would be required to address the issues of visibility and the impact on the National Park.
Ambulance Station, The	B5	Flat site currently occupied by ambulance station comprising a car park, garage and offices, enclosed by

Glade, Buxton		existing residential properties. Well screened by surrounding properties, low visual prominence, no impact on the setting of the National Park or adjacent Conservation Area. Only the entrance requires consideration of mitigation measures as this abuts the Conservation Area.
Hardwick Square South, Buxton	B6	Flat urban site comprised primarily of wholesale/retail post-war development, enclosed by surrounding residential and commercial properties. Low visual prominence. Development should respect existing character, size and scale of the Conservation Area. Potential to improve frontage on Hardwick Square South, development should be in keeping with adjacent frontage properties.
Market Street Depot, Buxton	B7	Flat, enclosed site within the existing urban area comprising residential properties, a car park, garages and storage space. Low visual prominence, screened by existing adjacent development. Existing character properties on Market Street and stone buildings within Corporation Yard should be retained and renovated. Remainder of site could be cleared for development which should respect the character, size and scale of the Conservation Area, in particular the small garden frontages and street trees on Market Street. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.
West of Tongue Lane, Fairfield, Buxton (Policy DS13)	B8	Flat, open, improved grassland adjacent to and to the east of the route of a planned bypass. Medium/high visual prominence both surrounding the site and from long distance views. Development could have an adverse impact on the setting of the National Park. Site extends well beyond the current settlement boundary and the proposed route of the bypass (current built-up area boundary). The planned bypass will form a strong settlement boundary. Site has significant landscape

		impacts and detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning would be required to address the issues of visibility and the effect on the settlement boundary. This should be considered in Policy DS13.
Land off Dukes Drive, Buxton (Policy DS14)	B10	<p>Flat, open, improved grassland elevated above surrounding and adjacent road (Dukes Drive). Screened from long distance views (National Park) by topography. Limited visual prominence when seen from surrounding area. Low impact on the setting of the National Park. Potential for the boundary of the site to be extended to include the existing allotment site which adjoins to the west and relocate the allotment to the far east in order to reduce visual prominence of development. The following recommendation is made for inclusion in Policy DS14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planting should be used in combination with the topography and existing field pattern to further reduce visual prominence and the scale of development. <p>An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.</p>
Sherbrook Lodge, Harpur Hill Road, Buxton	B11	<p>Sloping, semi-enclosed site comprising woodland and ruderal grassland. An arboricultural survey of the mature woodland would be required. Medium visual prominence locally. Development would have a low impact on the setting of the National Park. However, it has a role in preventing coalescence between Buxton and Harpur Hill and retaining the openness of the settlement when considered with the Potential Green Wedge (see P27 above). Site has significant landscape impacts and detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning as set out above would be required to address the issues of visual and physical coalescence and loss of woodland.</p>
Foxlow Farm, Ashbourne Road, Buxton	B20/ B21/ B22	<p>Sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved/improved grassland. Majority of the site is elevated and highly visible from the National Park and surrounding areas, particularly</p>

(Policy DS15)		<p>to the south and west of the site. Development should respect the character of the surrounding area. The following recommendations are made for inclusion in Policy DS15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing vegetation within and surrounding the site should be retained and strengthened where possible. • Planting should be used along the south-east boundary adjacent to Fox Low and the west boundary in order to screen development. • Trees and shrubs should be planted within the site, particularly along the track running south-west to north-east, to break up the development and create corridors connecting the woodland blocks within and in proximity to the site. • Land in the south-west of the site could be considered for open space provision in order to reduce the impact on the setting of the National Park. <p>Site has significant landscape impacts and detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning as set out above would be required to address the issues of visibility and impact on the National Park and the character of the surrounding development.</p>
Harpur Hill College Campus	B27	<p>Sloping, semi-enclosed site comprising a former college campus that has been almost entirely demolished. Elevated but well screened by adjacent residential properties and vegetation, medium visual prominence but low impact on the setting of the National Park due to context of surrounding development. Existing screening vegetation on the south-east boundaries should be retained and strengthened. Development should be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. Potential to improve setting of the settlement through development. An appropriate landscape framework will</p>

		need to be created.
Frontage to Cavendish Golf Club, Manchester Road, Buxton.	N/A	Open woodland and ruderal grassland sloping up to the adjacent road and extending out from the settlement edge. High visual prominence when seen from the National Park. Development could have a high impact on the setting of the National Park. In addition the site extends beyond the existing settlement and development could adversely affect the existing strong settlement edge. Site has significant landscape impacts and detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning would be required to address the issues of visibility, loss of vegetation and the effect on the settlement boundary.
Leek Rd/Macclesfield Rd former car showroom	N/A	Small site of demolished car showroom enclosed by roads and residential properties within the existing urban area. Low visual prominence, no impact on the setting of the National Park. Development would have to be in keeping with the character, size and scale of the adjacent residential properties.
PREFERRED OPTIONS EMPLOYMENT AND REGENERATION		
Name	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations	
Station Road and Spring Gardens Regeneration Area, Buxton (Policy DS17)	Urban area with northern portion of site elevated, currently comprising commercial and retail properties and a railway station. Opportunities to improve the setting of the Conservation Area are available. Historical features and frontages should be retained. Opportunities to screen current development that is not in keeping with the character of the Conservation area should be explored. No further recommendations for Policy DS17.	
Employment land allocation and Primary Employment Zone, Waterswallows	Flat, open, industrial site screened by woodland on western edge. Site boundary should be extended on the east edge to field boundary, thus allowing for a woodland block to be planted in order to reduce visual impact. Recent planting should be retained and opportunities to strengthen it should be explored. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.	

<p>Employment land allocation and proposed extension, Staden Lane, Buxton</p>	<p>Gently sloping, semi-enclosed, semi-improved grassland. Medium visual prominence when seen from the surrounding area, including the National Park. However this would be seen against the context of adjacent industrial development with only a limited impact on the setting of the National Park. Existing vegetation to the north and east should be retained and enhanced in order to reduce visual prominence. Development should be limited to the Preferred Option site boundary, and not extend to the higher land to the north-east which includes an Archaeological Site. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.</p>
<p>Tongue Lane (land south of Tongue Lane Industrial Estate) (Policy DS16)</p>	<p>Flat, open, semi-improved grassland containing derelict and occupied properties adjacent to existing industrial estate on the settlement edge. Partially screened by topography to the east with low visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. The following recommendation is made for inclusion in Policy DS16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing vegetation on the boundary should be retained and enhanced in order to further reduce visual prominence. <p>An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.</p>
<p>Hoffman Quarry, Harpur Hill</p>	<p>Undulating, semi-enclosed, previously developed land/grassland adjacent to existing industrial estate and quarry. Well screened on east and south sides by topography. Medium visual prominence when seen from the west and visible from the National Park. However, such views would be seen within the context of adjacent industrial development to the west with only limited impact on the National Park. Trees and shrubs should be planted as a screen along the western boundary to reduce visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. An appropriate landscape framework will need to be created.</p>

7.4.2 Table 8 presents the summary and recommendations for land within the Areas of Search in the Buxton Sub-Area where development could either be accommodated without significant harm or is suitable as a Green Wedge. The table includes appropriate mitigation recommendations to improve the urban edge or to enable proposed development to be more readily absorbed within its setting.

Table 8. Land with potential to accommodate development/suitable for Green Wedge in the Buxton Sub-Area

WITHIN OPEN COUNTRYSIDE		
Name	Ref.	Summary Mitigation and Design Recommendations
School Road, Peak Dale	P23	Gently sloping, semi-enclosed, improved grassland to the west of school and existing frontage properties. Medium visual prominence when seen from the surrounding area, low impact on the setting of the National Park due to screening by existing development when seen from the east. Potential to strengthen settlement edge in conjunction with B1 and P24. Vegetation should be planted as a screen along the western boundary to reduce visual prominence and strengthen the settlement edge. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Meadow Farm, Peak Dale	P24	Gently sloping, semi-enclosed, improved grassland to the west of church and existing frontage properties. Medium visual prominence when seen from the surrounding area, low impact on the setting of the National Park due to screening by existing development when seen from the east. Potential to strengthen settlement edge in conjunction with B1 and P23. Trees and shrubs should be planted as a screen along the western boundary to reduce visual prominence and strengthen the settlement edge. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Macclesfield Old Road, Buxton	P25	Sloping/undulating improved grassland (with cottage on northern boundary) adjacent to the road between existing frontage properties. Medium visual prominence from

		Macclesfield Old Road but longer distance views are screened by topography especially to the north-west, low impact on the setting of the National Park. Potential to fill gap in existing frontage and strengthen settlement boundary. Development should be in keeping with the character, scale and size of existing adjacent properties and vegetation which contributes to character should be retained. A Grade II listed obelisk is located at the existing cottage within the site. Potential setting issues will need to be addressed. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Fields off Green Lane/ London Road, Buxton	P26	Sloping, semi-enclosed, improved grassland adjacent to existing residential properties and school grounds on the settlement boundary. Screened by topography and woodland blocks to the south and west. Generally low visual prominence which increases on the higher land to the south-west, with limited impact on the setting of the National Park. Development would have to be in keeping with the character of the adjacent properties and settlement. Playing fields would need to be relocated if land were to be developed. Existing vegetation should be retained and strengthened in order to maintain/ensure low visual prominence. If development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework.
Holmfield, Buxton	P28	Improved/semi-improved grassland behind existing residential properties on the edge of the settlement, sloping up to Buxton Country Park. Partially screened by topography and woodland to south and east. Low visual prominence in the surrounding area but medium visual prominence in long distance views. Low impact on the setting of The National Park due to site being seen within context of existing development. Woodland adjacent to the site forms a strong boundary to development and should be retained in order to maintain low visual prominence. Development should be in keeping with the character of existing adjacent properties.

Green Lane, Buxton	P29	Playing fields between and behind existing residential properties on the edge of the settlement, sloping up to grassland adjacent to Buxton Country Park. Screened by topography and woodland to the south and west and adjacent properties to the north and east. Low visual prominence and impact on the setting of The National Park. Playing fields would need to be relocated if site were to be developed. Woodland adjacent to the site should be retained in order to maintain low visual prominence. Development should be in keeping with the character of existing adjacent properties and should not extend beyond the boundary of the playing field as the adjacent grassland has higher visual prominence and development could impact on the setting of The National Park. Potential to relocate the playing fields within this area.
POTENTIAL AREAS OF LAND IDENTIFIED FOR GREEN WEDGE		
Buxton Green Wedge, Sherbrook	P27	Land is of high ecological importance at the local level, prevents visual and physical coalescence between Buxton and Harpur Hill and provides significant external and internal views. The majority of this land is inaccessible by the public but still provides high amenity value. Potential area of land identified as being suitable as a Green Wedge.

7.4.3 Table 9 presents a summary of remaining land in the Areas of Search on the periphery of each settlement (excluding areas of land identified as being suitable for development in landscape terms above) which could not accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the National Park.

Table 9. Areas of Search which could not accommodate development without significant harm on visual amenity, landscape character and the purposes of the National Park.

PERIPHERY OF SETTLEMENTS	
Settlement	Summary
Peak Dale	Batham Gate Road acts as a strong settlement boundary to the north

	and should not be breached. In addition land to the north of this road is open and elevated. Land to the north-east (south of Batham Gate Road) was identified as being important for the character and setting of the settlement. Land to the east and south is open, with high visual prominence and development could impact on the setting of the National Park. Excluding the land that has already been referred to within this study (site B1 and land at P23 and P24), land to the west is elevated, visually prominent with a high impact on the setting of the National Park. Also, if land at P23 and P24 was to be developed this would create a strong development boundary to the west which should not be breached.
Buxton (North)	Land to the north is extremely open, elevated and visually prominent. Development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park. The approach into Buxton along the A6 is considered unsuitable for development due to its importance for the setting and character of the settlement.
Buxton (East)	Land to the east is extremely open, elevated and visually prominent. Development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park. Field pattern potentially dates from the 1500s and may be archaeologically important. The proposed bypass and Dukes Drive could provide a strong settlement boundary.
Buxton (South)	Land to the south has been identified as having potential to accommodate development (see P26 above). Land beyond this is too elevated, and would encroach on the Buxton Country Park. Development here would have high visual prominence and impact on the setting of the National Park. Land to the south-east has been recommended for inclusion in a Green Wedge (see P27 and Preferred Option B11 above).
Buxton (West)	Land to the west is extremely open, elevated and visually prominent. Development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park. There is also a strong settlement boundary on the western edge of Buxton created by woodland blocks, tree belts and changes in topography. Land to the south of recent housing development to the south-west of Buxton should not be developed further as this land is open, visually prominent and adjacent to the National Park boundary.

	As a consequence further development would have a high impact on the setting of the National Park.
Harpur Hill	The northern and western edges of Harpur Hill have strongly defined boundaries which should not be breached; potential for a Green Wedge has been identified in P27 and B11 above. The valley landscape to the west has high visual prominence and development within this area would have an adverse impact on the setting of the National Park. Land to the south/south-west is elevated and land beyond the industrial park and to the south-east is open. Both areas of land have high visual prominence and development would have an adverse impact on the setting of the National Park.

8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Preferred Options and land with the potential to accommodate development within the Areas of Search in High Peak.

8.1.1 The majority of Preferred Option sites were found not to have significant landscape impacts. Many will require the creation of an appropriate landscape framework, predominantly entailing planting trees and shrubs in order to screen development. The development of a small number of the Preferred Options would have significant landscape impacts, and thus these sites would require the formulation of detailed mitigation measures to address the landscape issues raised. This will need to include detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning. More detail for each of the Sub-Areas within the Borough is set out below.

8.2 Glossopdale Sub-Area

8.2.1 Two of the Preferred Options in the Glossopdale Sub-Area (G6 and G8/9/10) were found to have significant landscape impacts due to their high visual prominence and potential impact on the setting of the National Park. Both are adjacent to the Green Belt boundary. A detailed landscape masterplanning exercise will be required to address the issues relevant to each, namely visibility, impact on the setting of the National Park, loss of vegetation and the effect on the settlement boundary.

8.2.2 The Glossopdale Sub-Area was constrained in terms of development options due to its character as a valley-bottom settlement. Much of the remaining land in the Areas of Search on the periphery of the settlement is elevated, with high visual prominence; potential impact on the setting of the National Park; and fulfils Green Belt purposes. Nine areas of land with the potential to accommodate development were identified, predominantly on well screened land adjacent to and with the potential to improve the settlement edge. All of these areas will require the creation of a landscape framework if they were to be developed.

8.2.3 Land at P3 was identified as being suitable to form part of the previously identified Strategic Gap as development of both P3 and G23 could cause physical (but not visual) coalescence between the settlements of Hadfield and Glossop. The development of P3 in isolation could potentially be undertaken without adversely affecting the purposes of the Strategic Gap as physical coalescence could be avoided, but as a Preferred Option the development of G23 is expected to take place. It is

suggested that this should be taken into consideration when finalising preferred development options.

- 8.2.4 Both Local Green Spaces put forward as Preferred Options were found to fulfil their purposes. The boundary of the Padfield LGS could be extended to include the adjacent grassland which would also fulfil LGS purposes. If the boundary were to be extended, trees between the current site and the adjacent grassland could be removed in order to enhance its status as a single site and level of protection, subject to planting elsewhere within the site.
- 8.2.5 The proposed boundary of the George Street LGS is logical. George Street LGS is important for the setting and character of Glossop and the adjacent Harehills Park. Consideration should be given to extend the Park to include the LGS, thus increasing connectivity and access to George Street. There is the potential for frontage housing to be developed on the scrub to the north-east of the site. Derelict buildings on George Street could also be included within the site to encourage regeneration in George Street and thus improve the setting and the character of the area.

8.3 Central Sub-Area

- 8.3.1 One site in the Central Sub-Area put forward as part of the Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Development Plan (Chapel Plan Site at Bowden Lane) was found to have significant landscape impacts due to being on open land with multiple constraints. The site is located beyond the A6, which acts as a strong settlement boundary which should not be breached. It has high visual prominence and development would impact on the setting of the National Park. It contains a Roman road and development would impact on the setting of the Wash and Chapel Milton Conservation Areas.
- 8.3.2 The Central Sub-Area was constrained in terms of development options due to its character as a valley-bottom settlement. Much of the remaining land in the Areas of Search on the periphery of the settlement is elevated, with high visual prominence and potential impact on the setting of The National Park. However 11 areas of land with the potential to accommodate development were identified within the Areas of Search around settlements, predominantly on well screened land adjacent to and with the potential to improve the settlement edge.
- 8.3.3 Development potential in New Mills has been identified on the eastern edge, where there is land with a relatively low visual prominence. If P12 and P13 were to be

developed they would connect Preferred Options C5 and C6 to create a strong settlement edge.

- 8.3.4 Development on land at Bridgemont, which has been identified for potential employment allocation by the Whaley Bridge Steering Group, would cause coalescence between the settlements of Whaley Bridge, Furness Vale and Buxworth. It is on a floodplain, within the Green Belt and development would impact the settings of the Conservation Area of Buxworth and the Archaeological Sites of the Peak Forest Canal and the Britannia Cotton Mill.
- 8.3.5 Two areas of land with the potential to accommodate development were identified in Whaley Bridge, P14 and P15. If they were to be developed, development should be initially constrained to the lower lying land within these sites with relatively low visual prominence. Land to the north-west of Whaley Bridge could potentially be included in the Green Belt (see para 8.5.6) to prevent further development within low density housing.
- 8.3.6 Development in Chapel-en-le-Firth should not breach the A6 which acts a strong settlement boundary.
- 8.3.7 In landscape terms, development potential in the smaller settlements within the Sub-Area was constrained. One small area of land with the potential to accommodate development was identified in Hayfield (P11). No further development options were identified in Furness Vale and Chinley due to the current size, scale and character of these settlements. Most of the land around Furness Vale is highly elevated and development would adversely impact on Green Belt purposes. The majority of Chinley is within a Conservation Area. The Furness Vale Green Belt boundary amendment was determined to be suitable (see para 8.5.2 below) for development and for removal from the Green Belt. One area of land with the potential to accommodate development was identified in Dove Holes (P22). The boundaries of this site are bordered by existing built development and/or topography which would provide a strong settlement boundary. The development of P22 has the potential to improve the setting and character of the area through the change of land use and removal of containers adjacent to the railway line.
- 8.3.8 The New Mills Green Wedge between Church Lane and St. Georges Road was found to partially fulfil its purposes. The site forms a significant break between development within the settlement, acts as a woodland corridor and provides views out to the surrounding countryside. However it has limited amenity value to the

community. Increased access to the site could improve its value to the community and increase its suitability as a Green Wedge. Alternatively Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) could be placed on trees within the site in order to protect it from development and maintain the woodland corridor within the settlement.

- 8.3.9 The New Mills Green Wedge at Ladyshaw Bottom was found to fulfil its purposes. The site is of high ecological importance at the local level, forming a break between residential and industrial/commercial development and offers significant external and internal views. It is easily accessible due to the number of public rights of way crossing the site, and its amenity value has recently been increased with improvements to the Sett Valley Trail.

8.4 Buxton Sub-Area

- 8.4.1 Five of the Preferred Options in the Buxton Sub-Area were found to have significant landscape impacts. Development of B8, B11, Hogshaw (B3/4), Foxlow Farm (B20/21/22) and Cavendish Golf Club would have high visual prominence and would impact the setting of The National Park. B8 and Cavendish Golf Club are outside of the settlement and would have an adverse impact on the current settlement edge. B11 is heavily wooded and prevents coalescence between the settlements of Buxton and Harpur Hill. It is also located within the proposed Green Wedge (see para 8.4.5 below). The Foxlow Farm and Hogshaw sites have high visual prominence and development would impact on the setting of The National Park. Thus if the above sites were to be developed the formulation of detailed mitigation measures to address the landscape issues raised would be required. This will need to include detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning.
- 8.4.2 The settlement of Buxton was constrained in terms of development options due to its character as a valley-bottom settlement. Much of the land on the periphery of the settlement is elevated, with high visual prominence and development could impact on the setting of The National Park. Four areas of land with the potential to accommodate development were identified within the Sub-Area. Emphasis should be put on the need to ensure all development is in keeping with the character of the historic town.
- 8.4.3 Two areas of land with the potential to accommodate development were identified in the smaller settlement of Peak Dale. If these areas of land (P12 and P13) were to be developed they would create a strong settlement edge in conjunction with B1.

8.4.4 Development on Harpur Hill is very constrained due to the high elevation, visual prominence and potential impact on the setting of The National Park. Because of these constraints no further areas of land with the potential to accommodate development were identified and the Foxlow Farm sites were determined to be unsuitable for development in landscape terms without the formulation of detailed mitigation measures to address the landscape issues raised would be required. This will need to include detailed and extensive landscape masterplanning.

8.4.5 A Green Wedge is proposed on the land between Buxton and Harpur Hill, which includes Preferred Option B11. This land was considered to be unsuitable for development in landscape terms due to the coalescence between Buxton and Harpur Hill, as well as high visual prominence and a high impact on the setting of the National Park for the western part of this area. Where visual prominence is lower it is heavily wooded/ vegetated and this prevents coalescence.

8.5 **Recommended Green Belt amendments**

8.5.1 The following amendments to the Green Belt are recommended.

8.5.2 The removal of land in Furness Vale from the Green Belt as proposed in the Preferred Options (see Map ST13567/008) is supported, as this site does not fulfil Green Belt purposes. It is enclosed on all sides by road, canal or existing residential properties. Due to the surrounding built infrastructure the site does not currently prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another or safeguard the countryside from encroachment. In addition it is considered that its retention within the Green Belt does not assist in urban regeneration as no such sites have been identified in Furness Vale. Development on this site would not cause coalescence of settlements or have a high impact on the setting of The National Park.

8.5.3 Further potential removal of land from the Green Belt was identified in Hayfield on P11 (see Map ST13567/007). This land does not fulfil Green Belt purposes as its development would strengthen the settlement edge, which in turn would safeguard the countryside from encroachment and check unrestricted sprawl. There are no neighbouring towns in proximity to the land and there is little/no derelict land within the settlement. There are no historic towns in proximity to the land.

8.5.4 It is recommended that the Green Belt to the north of Glossop should be extended, as identified on Map ST13567/006. This land fulfils the same Green Belt purposes as the Green Belt land adjacent to the north. These are:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas
 - **Yes.** The existing settlement boundary to the south of the land (Howard Park) acts as a strong limit to development, and if this is breached there are no clear limits beyond it to prevent sprawl.
- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
 - **Yes.** This land prevents physical coalescence between the settlements of Glossop, Padfield and Hadfield.
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
 - **Yes.** The land is part of a substantial area of countryside on the edge of the settlement enclosed by the settlements of Glossop, Padfield and Hadfield and the National Park. The existing settlement boundary to the south of the land acts as a strong limit to development, and if this is breached there are no clear limits beyond it to prevent encroachment on the countryside.
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
 - **N/A.** There are no historic towns in proximity to the land.
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land
 - **Yes.** Preventing development on this land will encourage the recycling of derelict land within the surrounding settlements, such as Preferred Options G16 and the Former Ferro Alloys site.

8.5.5 It is also recommended that the Green Belt to the east of Glossop should be extended, as identified on Map ST13567/006. This land fulfils the same Green Belt purposes as the Green Belt land adjacent to the north-east. These are:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas
 - **Yes.** The existing settlement boundary to the west of the land acts as a strong limit to development, and if this is breached there are no clear limits beyond it to prevent sprawl.
- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
 - **N/A.** There are no neighbouring towns in proximity to the land.
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
 - **Yes.** The land is part of an area of countryside on the edge of the settlement enclosed by the settlements of Glossop and the National Park. The existing settlement boundary to the west of the land acts as a strong limit to development, and if this is breached there are no clear limits beyond it to prevent encroachment on the countryside.
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
 - **N/A.** There are no historic towns in proximity to the land.
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land
 - **Yes.** Preventing development on this land will encourage the recycling of derelict land within the settlement, such as Preferred Options G16 and the Former Ferro Alloys site.

8.5.6 In addition the Green Belt could be extended to land to the north-west of Whaley Bridge, as identified on Map ST13567/009. This land fulfils the same Green Belt purposes as the Green Belt land adjacent to the north, west and south. These are:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas
 - **Yes.** This land is outside of the settlement boundary and has no well defined edge or limit to development. The building density on this land is currently low and there is a large amount of open land which is vulnerable to inappropriate development which could lead to unrestricted sprawl.

- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
 - **N/A.** There are no neighbouring towns in proximity to the land.
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
 - **Yes.** The building density on this land is currently low and there is a large amount of open land which is vulnerable to inappropriate development which would encroach on the countryside.
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
 - **N/A.** There are no historic towns in proximity to the land.
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land
 - **Yes.** Preventing development on this land could encourage the recycling of derelict land within the settlement, such as Preferred Option C8.

STOKE-ON-TRENT
Sir Henry Doulton House
Forge Lane
Etruria
Stoke-on-Trent
ST1 5BD
Tel: +44 (0)845 111 7777

CARDIFF
22 Windsor Place
Cardiff
CF10 3BY
Tel: +44 (0)29 2072 9191

EDINBURGH
Suite 2/3, Great Michael House
14 Links Place
Edinburgh
EH6 7EZ
Tel: +44 (0)131 555 3311

GREATER MANCHESTER
2 The Avenue
Leigh
Greater Manchester
WN7 1ES
Tel: +44 (0)1942 260101

LONDON
Third Floor
46 Chancery Lane
London
WC2A 1JE
Tel: +44 (0)20 7242 3243

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE
City Quadrant
11 Waterloo Square
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 4DP
Tel: +44 (0)191 232 0943

PENRYN
Tremough Innovation Centre
Tremough Campus
Penryn
Cornwall
TR10 9TA
Tel: +44 (0)1872 560738

SHEFFIELD
Unit 5
Newton Business Centre
Newton Chambers Road
Thorncliffe Park
Chapelton
Sheffield
S35 2PH
Tel: +44 (0)114 245 6244

TRURO
Wheal Jane
Baldhu
Truro
Cornwall
TR3 6EH
Tel: +44 (0)1872 560738

WEST BROMWICH
Thynne Court
Thynne Street
West Bromwich
West Midlands
B70 6PH
Tel: +44 (0)121 580 0909

International offices:

ALMATY
29/6 Satpaev Avenue
Rakhat Palace Hotel
Office Tower, 7th Floor
Almaty
050040
Kazakhstan
Tel : +7-727-3341310

MOSCOW
Suite 2, Block 10,
Letnikovskaya St.
Moscow, Russia
115114
Tel: +7(495) 980 07 67

Wardell Armstrong Archaeology:

CUMBRIA
Cocklakes Yard
Carlisle
Cumbria
CA4 0BQ
Tel: +44 (0)1228 564820



APPENDIX A: Review of AMES Study

This review examines the relevance of the Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity (AMES) study produced by Derbyshire County Council, in order to determine its suitability as an evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.

The AMES study considered that the appropriate spatial unit for undertaking an assessment of environmental sensitivity was the Land Description Unit (LDU); the fundamental building block of the Derbyshire Landscape Character Assessment. A detailed methodology for the definition of a LDU can be obtained from “*The Living Landscapes Project Landscape Characterisation Handbook: Level 2 (Version 4.1)*”, Warnock S, 2002.

In general terms LDUs are distinct and relatively homogenous units of land defined by a number of attributes relating to:

- Physiography – the relationship between geology and landform
- Ground Type – the relationship between geology and soils
- Landcover – a reflection of surface vegetation; both land use and tree cover
- Cultural pattern – as assessment of settlement pattern and farm type

The AMES study considered that LDUs provide a structured spatial framework for the analysis of other environmental data across the country outside of the Peak District National Park. Furthermore all LDUs are digitally mapped and form part of a Geographic Information System (GIS) allowing for various datasets to be compared through a process of overlay and query mapping.

The AMES study recognised that in general terms those landscapes of highest sensitivity to change will be areas where the landscape remains intact both visually and structurally, have strong historic and cultural identity, and contain many widespread semi-natural habitats with associated linkages appropriate to the character of the area.

Our review noted that the categorisation of environmental sensitivity of the Ecological and Historic Environment related to the density of environmental assets,

with LDUs with an above medium average percentage coverage of assets being categorised as “sensitive”. For Visual sensitivity LDUs classified as “Unrefined” or “Coherent” within the Derbyshire Landscape Character Assessment were categorised as being significant.

Having selected the individual sensitivities, as outlined above, these were then brought together into (Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity’, further subdivide into ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ significance based on the following criteria:

- **Primary Significance** – where an LDU was recorded as significant for all three of the individual datasets
- **Secondary Significance** – where an LDU was recorded as significant in two of the individual datasets

Those areas of ‘Primary Significance’ were considered to be the most sensitive areas of landscape, which are most likely to be negatively affected by change or development in landscape terms and will attract a strong focus on the **Protection** (Conservation) of their environmental assets. Those areas of ‘Secondary Significance’ were still considered to have environmental sensitivities but are potentially weaker in one area. The AMES study stated that these areas will attract a strong focus on the **Management** (Conservation and Enhancement) of these areas; that is maintain those features of existing value but also addressing those in decline e.g. landscape restoration, habitat creation, etc. Areas of landscape that were not identified as being strategically sensitive to change, or conversely those which would benefit from a strong forward looking **Planning** (Restoration/creation) strategy.

Our review considered that the reliance on density of environmental assets, without any apparent weighting, may have the potential to skew sensitivity categorisations. Consequently the results of this Landscape Impact Assessment study have been assessed against the findings of the AMES study, to determine its relevance to the site selection process required as part of the Local Plan process.

For the majority of sites/areas of search examined by this Landscape Impact Assessment, there were discrepancies between the results of the AMES study and

the findings of this assessment. Below is a selection of examples of where this occurs:-

- **Preferred Option G21 (Land off Dinting Road, Glossop)**

AMES classified Preferred Option G21 as being within an LDU which was historically and ecologically sensitive but not visually, resulting in a Secondary MES classification. This Landscape Impact Assessment did not identify any historic or ecological designations within, around or in view of the site. It did however find it is visually prominent when viewed from the National Park to the south and south-east.

- **Land north of Glossop (including Preferred Options G6 and G8)**

The AMES study did not classify this area as being visually sensitive. However this Landscape Impact Assessment found this area to be visually prominent when viewed from the National Park to the south and south-east. It therefore found this area to have high visual sensitivity and any development here would impact the setting of the National Park. The only designation it received in the AMES study was being historically sensitive, which was not enough to warrant an MES classification.

- **Land to the east of Buxton (including Preferred Options B8 and Tongue Lane)**

This Landscape Impact Assessment and the AMES study are partially in agreement on this area, as both found it to be historically and visually sensitive, but not ecologically. This Landscape Impact Assessment found the levels of visual and historic sensitivity in this area to be very high, combining to make the area extremely sensitive overall and highly unsuitable for development in landscape terms. However due to the classification system used within the AMES study the area is only classified as having Secondary MES, which promotes a strong focus on management. The high sensitivity of this area identified in this assessment merits a strong focus on protection, which is only promoted within the AMES study in areas with Primary MES.

- **Preferred Option G25 (Land off Melandra Castle Road, Glossop)**

The AMES study classified this site as having historical and ecological sensitivity, and Secondary MES overall. However this assessment found this site to have low overall sensitivity and was therefore suitable for

development in landscape terms. There were no noted historic or ecological assets within, around or in view of the site and it is not visually prominent.

- **Preferred Option Chapel Plan Site at Bowden Lane**

Both assessments agree that this site is visually and historically sensitive. The AMES study did not classify it as being visually sensitive, and subsequently it is only classified as having Secondary MES. However, this Landscape Impact Assessment found the site to be visually sensitive as it is open and visually prominent when viewed from the National Park to the north and south and Conservation Areas to the north, resulting in a high level of overall sensitivity. Consequently the site was deemed as being unsuitable for development in landscape terms.

- **Proposed Site P18 (Long Lane, Chapel-en-le-Frith)**

The AMES study found this site to be within an area that is visually, ecologically and historically sensitive, thus having Primary MES. However this Landscape Impact Assessment found it to have low visual sensitivity, as it is screened by the adjacent railway embankment, existing development and vegetation. Ecological sensitivity is limited to woodland within the site, and historical sensitivity is limited to an Archaeological Site within the north of the site. Although this Landscape Impact Assessment does agree that this is a sensitive site, it was deemed to not warrant a classification of Primary MES and could be developed following the creation of a suitable landscape framework.

- **Preferred Option B11 (Sherbrook Lodge, Harpur Hill Road, Buxton)**

Although the overall level of sensitivity of this site is similar in both assessments, the AMES study classified this site as being visually sensitive. This Landscape Impact Assessment found that as the site is located at the bottom of a valley, and is screened by vegetation, it is not visually prominent. However the site is located within a large classification area in the AMES study which does include areas of high visual sensitivity. It therefore appears that this has influenced the overall classification of the entire LDU.

For some sites the findings of this assessment were in agreement with the Environmental Sensitivity classifications of the AMES study. Examples of these are detailed below:-

- **Preferred Option Britannia Mill, Buxworth**

The AMES study classified the Britannia Mill site as being within an LDU which was historically and ecologically sensitive, but not visually sensitive, therefore warranting Secondary MES. This Landscape Impact Assessment identified several historic (Conservation Areas, Archaeological Sites) and ecological (water bodies, woodland) assets within and around the site, but found that it was well screened by topography and vegetation and so is not visually sensitive. The Secondary MES classification and the management focus it promotes, as put forward by the AMES study, were found to be appropriate for this site, as it is suitable for development that is sensitive to the existing ecological and historical assets.

- **Preferred Option C1, Hayfield Road, Hayfield**

The AMES study classified Preferred Option C1 as being historically and ecologically sensitive, but not visually sensitive, therefore warranting Secondary MES. This Landscape Impact Assessment identified several historic (Conservation Areas, Archaeological Sites, Listed Buildings) and ecological (woodland) assets within and around the site. It also found that the site is partially screened by topography and existing residential properties, and development would be seen against the existing urban context. As a consequence the site was deemed to not be visually sensitive. The Secondary MES classification and the management focus it promotes, as put forward by the AMES study, were found to be appropriate for this site, as in landscape terms it is suitable for development that is sensitive to the existing ecological and historical assets.

- **Preferred Option C2, New Mills Road, Hayfield**

The AMES study classified Preferred Option C2 as being historically and ecologically sensitive, but not visually sensitive, therefore warranting Secondary MES. This Landscape Impact Assessment identified several historic (Conservation Areas, Archaeological Sites, Listed Buildings) and ecological (woodland, semi-improved grassland) assets within and around the site. It also found that the site is partially screened by topography and existing residential properties, and any development would be seen against the existing urban context. As a consequence the site was deemed to not be

visually sensitive. The Secondary MES classification and the management focus it promotes, as put forward by the AMES study, were found to be appropriate for this site, as in landscape terms it is suitable for development that is sensitive to the existing ecological and historical assets.

In addition this review found that there was some discrepancy within the AMES study regarding the classification of urban areas. From the information provided it would appear that areas of high ecological sensitivity (as defined by the AMES study) extended over urban areas within Glossop and New Mills. However, the AMES study does note that LDUs classified as “urban” have no data relating to visual unity. It is not clearly stated whether historic sensitivity relates to “urban” areas. The question of whether “urban” areas are or are not included within the classifications of the AMES study is not clearly stated. The Following examples illustrate why this is important:

- **Preferred Options B6 (Hardwick Square South) and B7 (Market Street Depot)**

Both of these sites have high historic sensitivity, as there are several Conservation Areas, Archaeological Sites and Listed buildings located within, adjacent to and in visible from them. Development in these sites would have the potential to affect these historic assets. However, the AMES study does not appear to account for possible visual or historic sensitivity in LDUs that are classified as ‘urban’.

This review suggested that “urban” areas should therefore be excluded from Multiple Environmental Sensitivity classifications.

This review concluded that whilst the MES classifications put forward by the AMES study may be of benefit at a broad strategic county level, there is a large amount variation within these classifications. Thus areas classified with the same level of MES often show differing levels of sensitivity when assessed at the level of individual sites. This Landscape Impact Assessment study found that none of the Preferred Options were located in areas of Primary MES but several of the Proposed Sites, put forward by this current study as being suitable for assessment, were. These issues are most likely to be due to small scale variations in sensitivity that are not

accounted for by the large areas of classification used in the AMES study, (i.e. LDUs), as illustrated by some of the examples described above.

Visual sensitivity was the aspect which caused the most discrepancies between the AMES study and this assessment. The lack of stated historic and visual sensitivities within urban areas also indicates that urban areas should be excluded from the classifications of the AMES study.

It appears that the key cause of discrepancies between the results of this Landscape Impact Assessment and those of the AMES study are due to the size of the classification units considered, i.e. LDUs as large assessment areas used in the AMES study, contrasting with the relatively small individual sites examined in this assessment.