



## Landscape Statement, for land at Grange Field, Great Shelford

Date: March 2020 (Issue 3)

Submitted to: Land Partners

Prepared by: RSK ADAS Ltd, 11D Park House, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire,  
OX14 4RS, Tel. no: 01235 355630

Project number: 1050630



## Quality Assurance

Author	Checked	Approved
Daniel Haigh B.Sc. (Hons), GradDip, PgDip, CMLI	Daniel Leaver BSc (Hons), BLD, CMLI	Kenny Dhillon BSc (Hons), MRTPI

### Disclaimer

RSK ADAS Ltd (ADAS) has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and ADAS. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by ADAS for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of ADAS and the party for whom it was prepared.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work.

This work has been undertaken in accordance with the quality management system of RSK ADAS Ltd.

Revision	Date	Amendments
First issue	28/02/2020	Draft for comment
Second issue	03/03/2020	Addition of non-technical summary and other minor text revisions
Third issue	05/03/2020	Minor text revisions



© RSK ADAS LTD 2020



## Non-technical summary

This Landscape Statement report has been undertaken by ADAS for the Land at Grange Field, Great Shelford. The report has been prepared in order to identify potential landscape opportunities and constraints for residential development to be put forward for adoption as part of the 'Call for Sites' process as part of The Greater Cambridge Partnership consultation on the next Local Plan.

The report contains a landscape and visual analysis of the site, a Landscape Sensitivity Assessment which assesses the sensitivity of the site to residential development and a Green Belt assessment which assesses how the site performs against the reasons for Green Belt in the NPPF. It then makes recommendations for landscape measures should residential development be taken forward on the site.

The site is not located in any National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The landscape of the study area is not considered to be valued in terms of the NPPF, paragraph 170, as it is not covered by any statutory designations and is not identified as valued within the Development Plan. The site is within the Great Shelford Conservation Area.

Views of the site are restricted to people immediately adjacent to the site. The visibility of any proposed residential development in the wider landscape would be limited by built form to the north and west and the tree belts and other vegetation to the west, east and south.

It is considered the site has a **Medium / Low** sensitivity to residential development and it can accommodate development in many situations without significant character change or adverse effects.

The site does not score highly in any of the five purposes of the Green Belt as described in the NPPF and as such could be considered for removal from the Green Belt.

In landscape and visual terms, with the establishment of appropriate mitigation planting, the site could be considered suitable to be allocated for residential development.

# Contents

- 1 Introduction..... 1**
  - 1.1 Objectives of the report.....1
  - 1.2 Structure of the report.....1
  - 1.3 Author of the report .....2
  
- 2 Methodology ..... 3**
  - 2.1 Relevant guidance .....3
  - 2.2 Landscape and visual methodology .....3
  - 2.3 Landscape sensitivity methodology.....3
  - 2.4 Green Belt assessment .....4
  - 2.5 Site survey.....4
  - 2.6 Spatial scope.....4
  - 2.7 Mapping visibility .....4
  - 2.8 Visualisations.....5
  - 2.9 Limitations.....5
  - 2.10 Consultations.....5
  - 2.11 Assumptions about any potential development.....5
  
- 3 Landscape baseline ..... 6**
  - 3.1 Landscape Character .....6
  - 3.2 Site and study area.....7
  - 3.3 Designations .....8
  
- 4 Visual baseline ..... 9**
  - 4.1 Overall visibility .....9
  - 4.2 Visual receptors close to the site.....9
  
- 5 Landscape sensitivity assessment ..... 10**
  - 5.1 Susceptibility..... 10

5.2	Value.....	11
5.3	Overall sensitivity .....	12
6	<b>Green Belt review .....</b>	<b>14</b>
7	<b>Opportunities and Constraints .....</b>	<b>15</b>
8	<b>Landscape and visual recommendations .....</b>	<b>16</b>
9	<b>Landscape and visual conclusions .....</b>	<b>17</b>
10	<b>References .....</b>	<b>18</b>

**Appendix 1: Figures**

*Figure 1: Topography*

*Figure 2: Cambridge Green Belt Study - LCA*

*Figure 3: Designations*

*Figure 4: Context*

*Figure 5: Viewpoints and visibility*

*Figure 6: Landscape and visual opportunities and constraints*

**Appendix 2: Glossary**

**Appendix 3: Landscape and visual methodology**

**Appendix 4: Landscape sensitivity methodology**

**Appendix 5: Viewpoint photographs**

# 1 Introduction

A Landscape Statement report has been undertaken by ADAS for the Land at Grange Field, Great Shelford (herein after referred to as the site). The location is shown in **Figure 1** in **Appendix 1**. The terminology used in this report can be found in **Appendix 2**. This report has been prepared in order to identify potential landscape opportunities and constraints for residential development to be put forward for adoption as part of the 'Call for Sites' process as part of The Greater Cambridge Partnership consultation on the next Local Plan.

## 1.1 Objectives of the report

The main objectives of this report are as follows:

1. Describe the baseline landscape character of the site and its surroundings and identify landscape elements associated with the site.
2. To identify potential visual receptors (i.e. people who would be able to see the development),
3. Undertake a landscape sensitivity assessment in relation to residential development.
4. Undertake a Green Belt assessment of the site in relation to residential development.
5. Identify any landscape and visual opportunities and constraints to development on the site.

## 1.2 Structure of the report

This report is structured in the following manner:

- Section 2 **Methodology**. Describes the methodology used to undertake the landscape sensitivity and green belt assessments.
- Section 3 **Landscape Baseline**. Describes the landscape baseline information, identifying landscape receptors (landscape character of the site and the study area along with the landscape elements within the site).
- Section 4 **Visual Baseline**. Identifies the visual receptors (people who would be able to see the development).
- Section 5 **Landscape Sensitivity Assessment**. Assesses the sensitivity of the site to residential development.
- Section 6 **Green Belt Assessment**. Assesses how the site performs against the reasons for Green Belt in the NPPF.
- Section 7 **Opportunities and Constraints**. Identifies any landscape and visual Opportunities and Constraints in relation to residential development on the site.
- Section 8 **Landscape and visual recommendations**. Describes the recommended landscape measures should residential development be taken forward on the site.
- Section 9 **Conclusions**. Provides a summary of the findings of the report.

### 1.3 Author of the report

This report was undertaken by a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI), who is trained and experienced in undertaking landscape and visual assessments.



## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Relevant guidance

For the purposes of this report, the methodology used to undertake the baseline information gathering takes account of and is based upon recommendations given in *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (Third Edition 2013) (Ref. 1), produced jointly by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment.

The sensitivity assessment is based upon guidance within *An approach to landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management*, (2019) (Ref. 2) produced by Natural England.

The type of photographs used as part the document are proportionate to the level of report and the type produced have been guided by *Visual Representation of Development Proposals* (2019) (Ref. 3), produced by the Landscape Institute.

### 2.2 Landscape and visual methodology

The aim of the landscape and visual baseline is to identify potential receptors that could be affected by the proposed development. Landscape and visual matters are separate, though linked.

Changes to landscape receptors relate to changes to the features, character and quality of the landscape resource and how it is experienced. Visual changes relate to those that might arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, and also consider people's visual amenity.

Further details of the methodology can be found in **Appendix 3**.

### 2.3 Landscape sensitivity methodology

Landscape Sensitivity is described in *An approach to landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management*, (Ref. 2) as:

*“**Landscape Sensitivity.** Within the context of spatial planning and land management, landscape sensitivity is a term applied to landscape character and the associated visual resource, combining judgements of their susceptibility to the specific development type / development scenario or other change being considered together with the value(s) related to that landscape and visual resource. Landscape sensitivity may be regarded as a measure of the resilience, or robustness, of a landscape to withstand specified change arising from development types or land management practices, without undue negative effects on the landscape and visual baseline and their value.”*

The Landscape Sensitivity section of the report aims to assess the sensitivity of the site to residential development. This is achieved by assessing the susceptibility of the site to residential development and combining this with an assessment of the value of the landscape and visual amenity to give the overall sensitivity. The process of assessment in this report is guided by the principles within *An approach to*

*landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management* (Ref. 2). The full list of criteria and indicators can be found in **Appendix 4**.

## 2.4 Green Belt assessment

The Green Belt does not designate landscape for its quality, but rather it is used as a spatial planning tool to guide development. There is no published guidance or methodology for undertaking the review of Green Belt land. A number of studies have been undertaken throughout the country, employing different qualitative and quantitative methods to assess how particular land parcels or landscape character areas perform against the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019), (Ref. 3). The Green Belt section of the report discusses how the site performs against the five purposes of the Green Belt as described in the NPPF.

## 2.5 Site survey

The assessment contained in this report is based on field observations undertaken during a settled and cloudy day with some rain, on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2020. Use has been made of O.S. Explorer Maps (1:25,000 scale), aerial images, and information obtained from character assessments at national, county and local level (where available).

## 2.6 Spatial scope

The spatial scope for all the baseline studies including topography, landscape designations, landscape character and representative viewpoints is 2km radius from the site. Experience on similar projects and initial site appraisal, indicates that noticeable landscape / visual effects were likely to be limited beyond this distance due in part to the scale of the proposed development, the quality and condition of the baseline landscape and due to screening provided from the surrounding, landform, built environment and existing mature vegetation.

## 2.7 Mapping visibility

To establish the potential extent of visibility of the proposed development a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was produced. This was based on a potential maximum ridgeline height of 10m above ground height of any residential development and is shown in **Figure 6**. This ZTV was produced based on Digital Surface Model with areas of woodland as shown in the National Forest Inventory added to give an understanding of how woodland effects visibility.

The map indicates theoretical visibility only - that is, the areas within which there may be a line of sight. However, the proposal may not actually be visible in reality due to localised screening which is not represented by the Digital Surface Model.

The Zone of Theoretical Visibility shows how much of the proposed development may be visible from any given point; areas in red would see a greater proportion of any proposed development such as the whole

roof and a proportion of the building, whilst areas in yellow might see a small part of the ridgeline of one roof.

## 2.8 Visualisations

All the viewpoint photographs are presented as Annotated Viewpoint Photographs (TYPE1 visualisations). Reproduced at a size which aids clear understanding of the view and context, these simply show the extent of the site within the view and annotate any key features. These can be found in **Appendix 5**. They have been created in accordance with *Visual Representation of Development Proposals* (2020) (Ref. 4) produced by the Landscape Institute.

## 2.9 Limitations

This report is not a landscape and visual assessment or appraisal and does not assess or quantify any landscape and visual effects (minor / moderate / major adverse or beneficial) of any proposed development on the site or surrounding landscape.

A search for other residential developments in the area to understand cumulative changes to landscape character and visual amenity has not been undertaken as part of this report.

No review of local planning policy has been undertaken.

## 2.10 Consultations

No contact has been made with South Cambridgeshire District Council with regards to the content of this report.

## 2.11 Assumptions about any potential development

This report assumes that any future development on the site would be residential in nature. It assumes that this would be two-story, up to a ridge height of 10m above ground level.

## 3 Landscape baseline

### 3.1 Landscape Character

#### 3.1.1 National landscape character

At a national level, the site and the whole of the study area is located within National Character Area (NCA) 89: East Anglian Chalk.

#### 3.1.2 County landscape character

The *Landscape document* (1991) (Ref. 5), produced by Cambridgeshire County Council, differentiates a number of character types within the County. The site and the whole of the study area is located within the Chalklands Landscape Character area which is described as:

*“...The majority of the chalkland is devoted to growing cereal crops, despite the frequently poor, thin soils. It is a broad-scale landscape of large fields, low mechanically trimmed hedges and few trees. The eastern part of this area has a number of woodlands and shelter belts which help to break up the long distant views and give some form and character. Certain high points have small beech copses or ‘hangers’ which are prominent and characteristic features in the open landscape...”*

This study does not identify any key landscape features of the landscape character area or assess its value or sensitivity.

#### 3.1.3 District landscape character

The *Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study* (2015) (Ref. 6), produced by LDA Design, differentiates a number of character areas within South Cambridge District as shown in **Figure 2**. The site and the majority of the study area is located within the 4B. Granta Valley Landscape Character area which is described as:

*“The Granta Valley is situated to the south of Cambridge. It has the low-lying, gentle topography of the River Valley landscape type, but its character is distinguished by its wooded appearance and by the relatively built-up and suburban character of its villages. The woodland within the landscape gives it a relatively enclosed character, increases the “greenness” of the landscape setting, and screens views. This restricts views to the villages, as well as more distant views to Cambridge.*

*Settlement comprises a relatively large proportion of the land area. Many villages have developed along key routes into Cambridge, including the A10 and the A1301. The majority of these villages (which include Sawston, Shelford and Harston) have expanded through cluster or ribbon development, and this has led to a more suburban feel on the approaches to the city through this area.”*

This study does not identify any key landscape features of the landscape character area or assess its value or sensitivity.

### 3.1.4 Local landscape character

At the local level the landscape of the site and its immediate surroundings is predominantly built development. This is the case to the east, north and west with more rural land to the south. There is a recreation ground to the east, which separates the site from the residential areas further to the east. There is an open boundary to the north which provides a strong relationship with built form. The site is separated from the wider landscape by the tree belts to the south and east, built form to the north and by the curtilages of the larger residential properties to the west. The site does not form part of any gateways into the settlement.

## 3.2 Site and study area

### 3.2.1 Landform

The topography of the study area is shown on **Figure 1**. The site is located at the base of the shallow River Cam valley. The topography of the study area is predominantly flat throughout and varies between 10m and 20m AOD. It rises to the south-west towards St Margret's Mount (43m AOD) and to the north-east towards Clarkes Hill (45m AOD) and White Hill (40m AOD).

### 3.2.2 Land use

The majority of the study area outside of the built environment is made up of arable land with a number of blocks of woodland. Just under half of the study area is covered by the settlements of Great Shelford, Little Shelford and Stapleford. There are several A and B roads that run through and connect the settlements. The M11 motorway runs in a north/south orientation in the western part of the study area. The site is located on the southern edge of the settlement of Great Shelford directly adjacent to a residential area known as The Peacocks.

### 3.2.3 Site description

The site and its immediate context are shown on **Figure 4**. The site is predominantly flat throughout, albeit it gently slopes from the northern boundary towards the River Cam. The site comprises a field of rough grassland, bisected by a hedgerow that runs east to west through its centre. At the time of the survey, the field was used as horse grazing. There are several isolated mature trees on the site located close to the eastern and western boundaries. The site contains a belt of woodland that runs along most of the eastern boundary. It is noted that this woodland and several the trees in the site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This woodland appears to be used informally by users of the recreation ground. There is also an area of wet woodland running along the edge of the river on the southern part of the site. The site has two stable blocks on it.

The northern boundary is delineated by a fence which separates the site from the residential area to the north. Much of the eastern boundary is not marked but is delineated by the eastern edge of the woodland

belt. The southern boundary is marked by the bank of the River Cam. The western boundary is marked by a mixture of fences that join to the gardens of adjacent properties.

### 3.3 Designations

#### 3.3.1 Landscape designations

The site is not located in any National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as shown on **Figure 3**.

The landscape of the study area is not considered to be valued in terms of the NPPF, paragraph 170, as it is not covered by any statutory designations and is not identified as valued within the Development Plan.

#### 3.3.2 Cultural heritage designations

The site sits within the Great Shelford Conservation Area. The site is located within an area marked as 'positive undesignated open space' in the *Great Shelford conservation area appraisal* (2007) (Ref.7) produced by South Cambridgeshire District Council. The appraisal document does not identify any 'important views' which look into the site.

The closest Listed Buildings to the site are located to the north-west and include The Grange and The Red House.

## 4 Visual baseline

### 4.1 Overall visibility

The site visit established the potential extent of visibility of the proposed development within the landscape. Views of the site are restricted to receptors immediately adjacent to the site. The visibility of any proposed residential development in the wider landscape would be limited by built form to the north and west and the tree belts and other vegetation to the west, east and south. The areas of high ground to the south-west and north-east were visited as part of the site work that was undertaken to inform this report. Views of the site were either blocked by the intervening vegetation or built form. The viewpoint locations and visibility of the site and shown in **Figure 5**.

### 4.2 Visual receptors close to the site

Visual receptors in close range of the site (under 500m) are shown on **Figure 4** and include:

- The south facing ground and upper floor windows and southern gardens of properties within the Peacocks development immediately adjacent to the north would have views of any development on the site and houses further to the north-west along Church Street (as represented by **viewpoint 2**).
- East facing ground, upper floor windows and gardens of properties close to and adjacent to the western boundary would have partial views of any development on the western part of the site;
- Users of the recreation ground and houses that face onto the site from the east (along Woodland Road) would have glimpsed winter views of any development filtered by the tree belt along the eastern boundary of the site (as represented by **viewpoint 1**).

## 5 Landscape sensitivity assessment

### 5.1 Susceptibility

The tables below assess the landscape and visual susceptibility of the site to residential development.

**Table 1: Landscape susceptibility**

Criteria	Comments	Susceptibility
Scale	Small to medium scale landscape of the site	high / medium
Enclosure	Very enclosed landscape of the site due to built form and vegetation.	low
Landform	Flat landscape	high
Landcover and Pattern	Mix of land cover around the site including built form, rural areas and recreation ground.	Low / medium
Engineered / Built Influences	Within 500m of the site the land use is half built up and half rural with the wider study area being predominantly rural.	medium
Naturalness and Tranquillity	The site is influenced by the built form to the north and west and by the road to the north. The site is separated from the wider open countryside by the River Cam.	medium

**Table 2: Visual susceptibility**

Criteria	Comments	Susceptibility
Skylines	There are no prominent skylines around the site. To the north the skyline is marked by the built form of the settlement, to the south it is marked by the vegetation along the River Cam.	low
Movement	There is frequent movement along the road to the north of the site and infrequent movement of users of the recreation ground to the east and residential properties to the north and west.	medium
General visibility, key views	The site is well contained by the surrounding built form and land form with some detractors such as built form facing straight on to the site to north and horse stables within the site.	low



Criteria	Comments	Susceptibility
Typical receptors	Typical visual receptors into the site include residents of the surrounding properties from ground and upper floor windows and gardens facing the site and users of the recreation ground to the east.	medium / high
<i>Views to and from important Landscape and Cultural Features</i>	There are no views to other important landscape and cultural heritage features from the site.	low

The susceptibility to change of the landscape of the site is considered to be medium whilst the visual susceptibility is considered to be medium / low. Overall it is considered to be **medium / low**.

## 5.2 Value

The tables below assesses the landscape and visual value of the site.

**Table 3: Landscape value**

Criteria	Comments	Value
Landscape quality	The landscape elements within the site appear to be in medium condition as they are neither declining nor particularly well managed.	medium
Scenic quality	The County and District Landscape Character Assessments do not make any mention of scenic quality of the areas that the site sits within.	low
Rarity	The County and District Landscape Character Assessments do not list any rare landscape elements within the landscape character area. The landscape character of the site and local landscape is not considered to be rare.	low
Representativeness	The landscape character of the site and local landscape is typical of the LCA without containing elements that could be considered as representative of more valued landscapes.	medium
Conservation interests	The site is within the Great Shelford Conservation Area.	high
Recreational value	There are no Public Rights of Way on the site or adjacent to it. The recreation ground is adjacent to the east but there is little intervisibility between the two.	low

Criteria	Comments	Value
Perceptual aspects	The county and district Landscape Character Assessments do not make assessments on the value of perceptual aspects. The landscape character of the site, local landscape and local LCA's is not considered to be tranquil given its location adjacent to the residential areas, recreation ground and close to the road.	medium
Associations	The county and district Landscape Character Assessments do not list the site as having any particular cultural associations that contribute to the perceptions of natural beauty.	low

**Table 4: Visual value**

Criteria	Comments	Value
Iconic views	There are no iconic views, to and from, or, that the site is contained within.	low
View related to designated landscapes and landscape related features	There are no views to or from the site from designated landscapes.	low
Regionally / locally values views	There are no views recognised in the local plan or on OS maps to and from, or, that the site is contained within. There are a number of important views within the recreation ground listed as part of the Great Shelford Conservation area appraisal. These views include the tree belt along the eastern boundary of the site, however, the main part of the site is not visible.	medium
Views valued by the community	There are no locally valued views from the site, or, that the site is contained within.	low

This value of the landscape of the site is considered to be medium / low whilst the visual value is considered to be low. Overall it is considered to be **medium / low**.

### 5.3 Overall sensitivity

The susceptibility and value assessments are combined to give an overall sensitivity for the site. Using the criteria above it is considered that the site has a **medium / low** sensitivity to residential development. Using the methodology in **Appendix 1** this is defined as:

**Medium / Low** – Landscape and / or visual characteristics of the assessment unit are resilient and of low susceptibility to change and / or its values are medium / low or low and it can accommodate the relevant type of development in many situations without significant character change or adverse effects. Thresholds for significant change are high.

## 6 Green Belt review

This section will discuss how the site performs against the five purposes of the Green Belt as described in the NPPF.

### **Purpose 1: To check unrestricted Sprawl of Large Built-up Areas.**

Any proposed development site would extend the built form of the settlement. It would not be perceived as a large extension to the town as it does not extend the settlement any further south than the existing residential development to the east and west. The River Cam to the south of the site is a robust defensible barrier which would prevent any development sprawl to the south. It is considered that the site does not contribute strongly to this purpose of the Green Belt.

### **Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.**

The site does not form a gap between Great Shelford and any of the surrounding settlements and any development on the site would not be perceived as coalescing with any of the wider settlements. It is considered that the site does not contribute strongly to this purpose of the Greenbelt.

### **Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.**

The site is strongly influenced by the built character of the residential area to the north. It is enclosed to the west, north and east and is not open to the wider rural areas. It is considered that the site does not contribute strongly to this purpose of the Greenbelt.

### **Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.**

The site is within the Great Shelford Conservation Area and as such does form part of the historic town of Great Shelford. It is isolated from the wider Conservation Area and main body of the site does not form part of any important views as listed in the management plan. It is considered that the site performs moderately against this purpose of the Green Belt.

### **Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.**

Assisting urban regeneration, by encouraging the reuse of previously developed land is considered to be more complex to assess than the other four purposes. As the relationship between the Green Belt and reuse of urban land is influenced by a range of external factors including local plan policies, brownfield land availability and the land / development market. Therefore, all assessed parcels are likely to perform equally well. In most cases all areas are regarded as having an equal contribution to Purpose 5. As such it is considered that the site does not perform more or less strongly than any other parcel against this purpose of the Greenbelt.

## 7 Opportunities and Constraints

The landscape and visual opportunities and constraints is shown on **Figure 6**.

### Opportunities

- Limited visibility of the site from the wider study area due to the surrounding landform, built form and vegetation.
- Most local views filtered by the existing built form and vegetation.
- Existing tree and hedgerow structure in the site and along the edges could form the basis for enhanced green infrastructure within and around the site, maintain connectivity of habitats and could be left relatively unchanged by development on the site. The TPO covering several of these trees would preserve their presence on the site long term ensuring that the visual screening they provide remains.
- Enhancement of existing boundary vegetation and creation of new landscape buffer planting along the western boundary could further screen the site from the properties to the west.
- Incorporating tree planting within any proposed development would help to filter views from the north and west.

### Constraints

- Open and partial views of any development on the site from local properties to the north.
- Changes to the landscape character of the site.

## 8 Landscape and visual recommendations

If development is taken forward on the site, the recommended landscape measures for the mitigation of any changes are:

- Retain and enhance the existing trees and hedgerows along the boundaries to positively contribute to the landscape framework and improved screening of the site. This should include a BS5837:2012 tree survey to identify tree constraints to ensure the trees are protected and incorporated into the site design.
- Enhance vegetation along the western boundary, with new mixed native tree and shrub screening to further screen the site.
- Manage the trees and vegetation in the southern part of the site to link to the recreation ground to the east.
- Manage the trees and vegetation in the eastern part of the site to form a green corridor linking the development to the recreation ground to the east.
- Further enhance the landscape framework of the site by providing strategic tree and shrub planting within the site (where appropriate) to increase visual screening within and across the site, to promote biodiversity and habitat connectivity.
- The use of native species should be encouraged wherever possible and appropriate.

## 9 Landscape and visual conclusions

The visibility of any proposed development would be limited by the vegetation to the south, east and west and built form to the north and west, which would block views of the site from the wider study area in those directions. More open views of the site are restricted to a limited number of locations immediately around the site. The screening along the western part of the site could be improved with the incorporation of further tree and shrub planting. Once established, this would provide a level of visual screening from the larger properties in that direction. The inclusion of an open space in the southern and western parts of the site would connect the open spaces and development to the recreation ground to the east.

When taking into account the landscape and visual site context, it can be concluded that the site is most influenced by its close proximity to areas of residential land use to the north. If development is sensitively designed there would only be a limited loss of landscape features on the site.

As discussed above it is considered that the site has a **medium / low** sensitivity to residential development.

As discussed above the site **does not perform strongly in any of the five purposes of the Green Belt** as described in the NPPF and as such could be considered for removal from the Green Belt.

In landscape and visual terms, with the establishment of appropriate mitigation planting, the site could be considered **suitable to be allocated for residential development**.

## 10 References

- Ref. 1 Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition)*
- Ref. 2 Natural England (2019), *An approach to landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management*, (2019) (Ref. 2) produced by
- Ref. 3 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019), *The National Planning Policy Framework*.
- Ref. 4 Landscape Institute (2020), *Visual Representation of Development Proposals*
- Ref. 5 Cambridgeshire County Council (1991), *Landscape document*
- Ref. 6 LDA Design (2015) *The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study*
- Ref. 7 South Cambridgeshire District Council (2007), *Great Shelford conservation area appraisal*



## Appendix 1: Figures

Figure 1: Topography

Figure 2: Cambridge Green Belt Study - LCA

Figure 3: Designations

Figure 4: Context

Figure 5: Visibility and viewpoints

Figure 6: Landscape and visual opportunities and constraints

## Appendix 2: Glossary

**Cumulative effects.** Impacts resulting from incremental changes caused by other present or reasonably foreseeable actions likely to occur together with the project. (Ref.1 page 6)

**Direct effect.** An effect that is directly attributable to the proposed development. (Ref.2 page 155)

**Indirect effects.** Effects that result indirectly from the proposed project as a consequence of the direct effects, often occurring away from the site, or as a result of a sequence of interrelationships or a complex pathway. They may be separated by distance or in time from the source of the effects. (Ref.2 page 156)

**Key characteristics.** Those combinations of elements which are particularly important to the current character of the landscape and help to give an area its particularly distinctive sense of place. (Ref.2 pages 156 and 157)

**Landscape capacity** refers to the amount of specified development or change which a particular landscape and the associated visual resource is able to accommodate without undue negative effects on its character and qualities. (Ref.3 page 25)

**Landscape character.** A distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse. (Ref.2 page 157)

**Landscape character area (LCA).** These are single unique areas which are the discrete geographical areas of a particular landscape type. (Ref.2 page 157)

**Landscape character type (LCT).** These are distinct types of landscape that are relatively homogeneous in character. They are generic in nature in that they may occur in different areas in different parts of the country, but wherever they occur they share broadly similar combinations of geology, topography, drainage patterns, vegetation and historical land use and settlement pattern, and perceptual and aesthetic attributes. (Ref.2 page 157)

**Landscape effects.** Effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right. (Ref.2 page 157)

**Landscape quality** (or condition). A measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements. (Ref.2 page 157)

**Landscape receptors.** Defined aspects of the landscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal. (Ref.2 page 157)

**Landscape value.** The relative value that is attached to different landscapes by society. A landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons. (Ref.2 page 157)

**Magnitude** (of effect). A term that combines judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short or long term in duration. (Ref.2 page 158)

**Mitigation.** Measures, which are proposed to prevent, reduce and where possible offset and significant adverse effects (or to avoid, reduce and if possible remedy identified effects), including landscape and visual effects. (Ref.2 page 41, para.3.36)

**Sensitivity.** A term applied to specific receptors, combining judgements of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor. (Ref.2 page 158)

**Townscape.** The character and composition of the built environment including the buildings and the relationships between them, the different types of urban open space, including green spaces, and the relationship between buildings and open spaces. (Ref.2 page 158)

**Visual amenity.** The overall pleasantness of the views people enjoy of their surroundings, which provides an attractive visual setting or backdrop for the enjoyment of activities of the people living, working, recreating, visiting or travelling through an area. (Ref.2 page 158)

**Visual effect.** Effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people. (Ref.2 page 158)

**Visual envelope.** An area from which the scheme can be visible. (Ref.1 page 10)

**Visual receptors.** Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal. (Ref.2 page 158)

**Zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV).** A map, usually digitally produced, showing areas of land within which a development is theoretically visible. (Ref.2 page 159)

**Zone of visual influence.** Area within which a proposed development can have an influence or effect on visual amenity. NOTE: This is different from the visual envelope. (Ref.1 page 10)

Ref.1 Highways England, *LA 107 Landscape and visual effects*, 2019.

Ref.2 Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment, *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Effect Assessment, 3rd edition*, 2013.

Ref.3 Natural England, *An approach to landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management*, 2019.

## Appendix 3: Landscape and visual methodology

### Scope of report

This report considers the preliminary baseline conditions of the proposed development context but does not attempt to score the level of potential effects; however, it does identify potential issues for further consideration in subsequent design proposals.

To provide an appropriate context, the report includes a description of the baseline position for landscape and visual amenity, including reference to landscape character assessments from national to local scale and a range of visual receptors.

The report encompasses desk studies, collection of baseline data and site surveys on the context, character and quality of the Study Area, an evaluation of the landscape and an assessment of properties and local views potentially affected by the proposed development. The assessment also recommends mitigation measures to reduce potential adverse changes.

Heritage assets such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Registered Parks and Gardens all contribute to the overall landscape character, context and setting of the area. Visual and Landscape changes on the setting of Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments are not included in the scope of this report.

This is not a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment or a Landscape and Visual Appraisal and no assessment of landscape and visual effects have been made as part of this report.

This report considers the sensitivity of the site to development.

### Extent of Visibility

The visibility of a proposed development is influenced by landform, vegetation, built development and existing infrastructure. It is important to determine the extent to which the project would influence the existing views and identify the likely receptors. The extent of visibility is defined below:

The extent of visibility is defined below:

- Open view – A clear view of a significant proportion of the site within the wider landscape.
- Partial view – A view of part of the site or a distant view in which the site forms a proportion of the wider view.
- Glimpse view - a very brief, passing view of the site or a distant view in which the site forms a small proportion of the view in the wider view.
- No view – Views towards the site are blocked by visual barriers or a view of the site is difficult discern.

## Appendix 4: Landscape sensitivity methodology

A sensitivity is achieved by assessing the susceptibility of the site residential development and combining this with an assessment of the value of the landscape and visual amenity to give the overall sensitivity. The process of assessment in this report is guided by the principles within An approach to landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management, Natural England (2019).

### Susceptibility

The sensitivity to change of the key landscape characteristics and the ability of a particular type of landscape to accommodate change without material effects upon its integrity, reflects key aspects of landscape character including scale and complexity of the landscape and degree of ‘wildness’ or ‘remoteness’.

Table 1 and 2 provide lists of key characteristics and attributes that have been used in this appraisal as indicators of levels of susceptibility. The tables are indicative rather than prescriptive and the susceptibility of the landscape and visual is categorised as High, Medium or Low using professional judgement. Typically a landscape receptor with a High susceptibility to a proposed change would have a lesser ability to accommodate that change without undue consequences; a landscape receptor with a Low susceptibility to a proposed change would have a greater ability to accommodate that change.

**Table 1: Susceptibility of Landscape Character to Change**

Criteria	Attributes indicating higher susceptibility to change		Attributes indicating lower susceptibility to change
Scale	Small-scale landform/ landcover; fine grained; enclosed; sheltered	↔	Large-scale landform/land cover; coarse grained
Enclosure	Open	↔	Enclosed
Landform	A flat, uniform landscape	↔	An undulating landscape
Landcover and Pattern	Complex, irregular or intimate landscape patterns; diverse land cover	↔	Simple, regular landscape patterns; uncluttered, sweeping lines; consistent land cover

Criteria	Attributes indicating higher susceptibility to change		Attributes indicating lower susceptibility to change
Engineered / Built Influences	General absence of strongly engineered, built or manmade influences such as: electrical infrastructure, roads, a geometric field pattern or man-made watercourses. Predominance of traditional or historic settlements, buildings and structures	↔	Engineered forms/land use pattern; frequent presence of man-made elements, brownfield or industrial landscapes; railways; embankments; wind farms; major road networks; presence of contemporary built structures; electrical infrastructure; man-made watercourses; and commercial forestry
Naturalness and Tranquillity	Landscape with predominance of perceived natural features and forms. Sense of peace and isolation; remote and empty; little or no built development	↔	Non-natural landscape; busy and noisy; human activity and development; prominent movement

**Table 2: Susceptibility of Visual Receptors to Change**

Criteria	Attributes indicating higher susceptibility to change		Attributes indicating lower susceptibility to change
Skylines	Prominent / uninterrupted skylines or ones with distinctive landscape features such as historic landmarks.	↔	Less prominent skylines or ones with existing vertical modern development features or existing built development.
Movement	Infrequent movement.	↔	Busy, constant, frequent access
General visibility, key views	Views along key gateways / approaches. High intervisibility with the wider landscape. Poor relation with settlement edge with view or no detractors	↔	Visually well contained with limited inward views. Good relationship with existing settlement edge with visual detractors
Typical receptors	More sensitive receptors such as residential, communities and people undertaking outdoor recreation on national trails.	↔	Less sensitive receptors such as transport users.

Criteria	Attributes indicating higher susceptibility to change		Attributes indicating lower susceptibility to change
<i>Views to and from important Landscape and Cultural Features</i>	Strong association with the landscape and high intervisibility between the site and important features	↔	Weak association with the landscape and little or no intervisibility between the site and important features

## Value

### Landscape value

Landscape value relates to the importance attached to a landscape, often as a basis for designation or recognition which expresses national or regional consensus, because of its distinctive landscape pattern, cultural associations, scenic or aesthetic qualities. It should be noted that, in virtually all circumstances, landscapes are valued (frequently highly valued) in the local context by various if not all sectors of the community. The value of the landscape also takes account of factors listed in Box 5.1 of GLVIA 3 (Ref.1 page 84) which include Landscape quality (condition), Scenic quality, Rarity, Representativeness, Conservation interests, Recreational value, Perceptual aspects and Associations. Table 3 gives an indication of how landscape condition is assessed. Where relevant to the appraisal, the value or importance of the landscape is categorised as **High, Medium, or Low**

Landscape condition describes the state of repair or condition of elements of a particular landscape, its integrity and intactness and the extent to which its distinctive character is apparent.

**Table 3. Landscape Condition**

Condition	Description
<i>Good</i>	<p>Living landscape features are likely to have a diversity of age range and species, with little or no evidence of dead or diseased individuals. There would be evidence of recent appropriate management.</p> <p>E.g. Hedgerows or trees in good condition with signs of appropriate management with no damage. Well managed grassland, not over grazed or overgrown with a good species diversity.</p>

Condition	Description
<i>Fair</i>	<p>Living landscape features are likely to have some diversity of age range and species, with some evidence of dead or diseased individuals. There would be evidence of some appropriate management.</p> <p>E.g. Hedgerows or trees in with some signs of appropriate management with limited damage. Grassland with some areas of encroachment, some areas of overgrazing and erosion with some species diversity.</p>
<i>Poor</i>	<p>Living landscape features would have dominance of one age and species, with substantial amount of dead or diseased individuals. There would be no evidence of management or inappropriate management.</p> <p>E.g. Singles species hedgerows or trees in with no management and large gaps and large numbers of dead or diseased individual. Overgrazed grassland with erosion or large areas of encroachment.</p>

### Value Attached to Views

An appraisal of value attached to views refers to the judgement of whether any particular value or importance is likely to be attributed by people to their available views. For example, views experienced by travellers on a highway may be considered to be more highly valued due to the scenic context or views experienced by residents of a particular property may be considered to be less valued or important due to a degraded visual setting. The degree of value or importance is therefore a matter for reasoned professional judgement. Where relevant to the appraisal, the value or importance of visual amenity is categorised as **High**, **Medium**, or **Low**. Criteria that attribute to that judgment are listed in the table below:

**Table 4: Susceptibility of Visual Receptors to Change**

Criteria	Attributes indicating higher susceptibility to change		Attributes indicating lower susceptibility to change
Iconic views	Highly valued views of national or international importance which are important to the special qualities of a designated landscape, cultural associations, and views of high scenic quality.	↔	No recognised views.



Criteria	Attributes indicating higher susceptibility to change		Attributes indicating lower susceptibility to change
Views related to designated landscapes and landscape related features	Views from tourist routes, national trails and other recognised visitor designations, views to, from and within the setting of designated landscapes, historic and cultural sites and views recorded as important in relation to heritage assets.	↔	No recognised views.
Regionally / locally valued views	Views which are identified in the local plan and / or of particular regional importance. Views which appear on OS maps and tourist maps, guide books.	↔	No recognised views.
Views valued by the community	Views from locations where there is provision of facilities for community enjoyment. Views that are locally well known, well frequented and promoted destination. Views that have significant cultural associations.	↔	No recognised views.

## Overall susceptibility

Combining susceptibility and value assessments to give an overall sensitivity for the site on a five point scale, which are described below. As described in An approach to landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management, Natural England (2019).

**High** – Landscape and / or visual characteristics of the assessment unit are very susceptible to change and / or its values are high or high / medium and it is unable to accommodate the relevant type of development without significant character change or adverse effects. Thresholds for significant change are very low.

**High / Medium** – Landscape and /or visual characteristics of the assessment unit are susceptible to change and / or its values are medium through to high. It may be able to accommodate the relevant type of development but only in limited situations without significant character change or adverse effects if defined in the relevant land parcel summary. Thresholds for significant change are low.

**Medium** – Landscape and / or visual characteristics of the assessment unit are susceptible to change and / or its values are medium / low through to high / medium and / or it may have some potential to accommodate the relevant type of development in some defined situations without significant character change or adverse effects. Thresholds for significant change are intermediate.

**Medium / Low** – Landscape and / or visual characteristics of the assessment unit are resilient and of low susceptibility to change and / or its values are medium / low or low and it can accommodate the

relevant type of development in many situations without significant character change or adverse effects. Thresholds for significant change are high.

**Low** – Landscape and / or visual characteristics of the assessment unit are robust or degraded and are not susceptible to change and / or its values are low and it can accommodate the relevant type of development without significant character change or adverse effects. Thresholds for significant change are very high.

# Appendix 5: Viewpoint photographs

