

Landscape Proof of Evidence

In respect of Horn Crag Quarry,

Land off Fishbeck Lane, Silsden, West Yorkshire,
BD20 0NR.

On behalf of Mr. Andrew Calvert.

Date: 22nd January 2024 | Pegasus Ref: P23-1784

PINS Ref: APP/W4705/W/23/3332884 | LPA Ref: 23/00829/MCF

Author: Radek Chanas M Eng Landscape Architecture, MA Garden and Landscape History CMLI



Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
V1	22 January 2024	RCH	RCH	~



Contents.

1. Witness Background and Particulars	1
2. Introduction and Scope of Landscape Evidence	2
3. Landscape Character	6
4. Visual Amenity	27
5. Planning Policy Context	34
6. Summary And Conclusions	42

Appendices contents.

Appendix 1	Pegasus' LVIA Methodology
Appendix 2	Optional Landscape Mitigation Proposals Plan (drawing number 232/5 – 16, Revision 1.0, prepared by The Mineral Planning Group Ltd)



1. Witness Background and Particulars

- 1.1. My name is Radek Chanas, and I hold a Master of Engineering degree in Landscape Architecture and Master of Arts in Garden and Landscape History. I am a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI), and undertook the Integrated Environmental Management module at the University of Bath. I have been employed at Pegasus Group since 2011 and have worked at various private practices in Northern Ireland and England.
- 1.2. I have over 15 years of landscape planning consultancy experience. Prior to Pegasus Group, I was employed at Soltys Brewster Consulting in Belfast where I worked on a number of Heritage Lottery Funded projects. I was also involved in the preparation of the Village Design Statement (VDS) for Sandymount, Dublin, which was part of an urban pilot VDS for the Heritage Council Ireland's Phase 2 VDS programme, various large scale health care developments, and wind farm projects. I also worked at Portus and Whitton in Cirencester where I was involved in a number of projects for the National Trust, Paragraph 80 houses, and assessment of 'replacement' dwellings.
- 1.3. I specialise in addressing environmental planning issues which relate to various forms of development such as large scale built form and energy infrastructure. I have had a considerable experience of and involvement in a wide range of residential development and built infrastructure projects throughout the UK, many of which have involved statutory protected landscapes including National Parks and National Landscapes (otherwise known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)), as well as non-statutorily local plan landscape designations such as Special Landscape Areas (SLAs). I have been involved in a number of planning appeals and acted as expert witness at the recent Examination for the DCO Heckington Fen Solar Park.
- 1.4. I am based in the Cirencester office of Pegasus Group. The landscape architects within the team at Pegasus Group undertake their work in compliance with the Landscape Institute's Standards of Conduct and Practice for Landscape Professionals (May 2012).
- 1.5. This Landscape Proof of Evidence, which I have prepared, is based on my professional judgement, and is presented in accordance with the guidance of the Landscape Institute. Its content represents my true professional opinion and is provided to the appeal mindful of my duty to the Inspector and irrespective of by whom I am instructed.

2. Introduction and Scope of Landscape Evidence

2.1. I am instructed on behalf of Mr. Andrew Calvert of A.D. Calvert Architectural Stone Supplies Ltd ('the Appellant') to present evidence relating to landscape and visual matters in respect of the Public Inquiry relating to an application for the Horn Crag Quarry, which was submitted to City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council ('the Council') and validated on 07th March 2023 – planning application reference number: 23/00829/MCF. The application proposed the re-opening of Horn Crag Quarry for the purposes of releasing a proven locally distinctive building stone resource.

2.2. The application was subject to a pre-application consultation with the Council, with the feedback provided in July 2020 referring to the existing Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) and the need for diversion, and effects upon Horn Crag and the Rombalds Ridge Landscape Character Area.

2.3. The application was refused with the decision notice issued in late May 2023 and citing four Reasons for Refusal (RfR). The RfR No.2 relates to landscape and visual matters and states:

"2. The proposal as submitted is unacceptable, as it will not make a positive contribution towards the conservation, management and enhancement of the diversity of landscapes within the designated landscape character area of the Rombalds Ridge Landscape Character Area. The change is not considered acceptable, as it will have adverse landscape and visual effects, particularly in relation to; the loss of an area of distinct character and a local landmark within the broader character area; the significant impact on recreational use due to the visual impact of the quarry works; the length of disruption and disturbance locally and on the broader enjoyment of the surrounding Landscape over a minimum of 20 years with potentially an additional 15 years to achieve some maturity in the restored scheme; the adverse visual impacts on amenity for residential properties; the adverse impacts on tourism; and the adverse impacts on recreation.

As such, the proposal is contrary to policies EN4, DS2, DS5, EN1 EC4 (F) and EN9 (3) of the Bradford Core Strategy, the Landscape Character Assessment SPD for Rombalds Ridge and SWES5 and SWES6 of The Steeton with Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Development Plan."

2.4. I was not involved in the planning application thus the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) submitted as part of the application was prepared by a different landscape consultant. I have considered the LVA, and other supporting information submitted with the application, and have visited the site and the study area. Having conducted my own analysis of the landscape and visual issues I concluded that I was able to support the proposed appeal scheme, and I therefore formally accepted the instructions. However, my assessment approach and conclusions vary in certain respects from those presented in the submitted LVA and I deal with this issue later in my Proof.

2.5. My Landscape Proof of Evidence should be read in conjunction with the Planning Proof of Evidence prepared by Mr Chris Heffernan and Ecology Proof of Evidence by Ms Erica Kemp. Although planning policy and matters relating to the planning balance are dealt with in detail within the evidence of Mr Chris Heffernan, I have set out at Section 5 of my evidence a brief review of the planning policy context where this may have a bearing on the consideration of landscape and visual issues.

2.6. Having read the RfR No.2, the following matters are considered within my Landscape Proof of Evidence:

- Character of the host Rombalds Ridge Landscape Character Area.
- Visual effects upon recreational users.
- Visual effects upon residential receptors.
- Perception of the countryside during the operational phase of the appeal scheme.
- Duration of the appeal scheme and its restoration.
- Contribution to the conservation, management, and enhancement of the diversity of the landscape.

2.7. In preparing my evidence, I have reviewed the application reports and drawings, the principal ones of which include the following:

- Landscape & Visual Appraisal (LVA), Revision C dated 24th January 2023, and prepared by Collington Winter Environmental (**CD 01-14**).
- Photomontages prepared by The Mineral Planning Group Ltd (**CD 01-45, 01-46, and 01-47**).
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plus Tree Survey dated November 2021, and prepared by Brooks Ecological (**CD 01-28**).
- Officer's Delegated Report dated 23 May 2023 (**CD 03-03**).
- Landscape Consultation Responses (**CD 03-05**).
- Response to Officer Queries (**CD 02-01, 02-02, 02-03, and 02-06**).

2.8. Where appropriate, I draw upon the relevant information from these documents and seek to avoid unnecessary repetitions. In preparing this Landscape Proof of Evidence, I have been mindful of both the arboricultural and LVA reports, and I have cross referred to these two documents where appropriate to avoid duplication.

2.9. Overall, I note that the appeal site and the appeal scheme have been carefully considered by the Applicant and their landscape consultant at the time of the application. I consider the appeal scheme to be suitable in landscape character and visual terms, given its location and the current characteristics of the appeal site, and its typology. In my view, the landscape and visual effects arising from this appeal scheme are highly localised and limited.

Difference in Professional Judgement

2.10. As part of my instruction, I have undertaken a detailed review of the LVA which was submitted as part of the planning application. I have reviewed this together with other supporting documents and also assessed the appeal scheme with reference to the LVA



viewpoints surrounding the appeal site together with the photomontages prepared by The Mineral Planning Group Ltd that illustrate the appearance of the appeal scheme.

- 2.11. Consequently, I have come to slightly different professional conclusions to those found in the LVA. This is not unusual. As far as my analysis is concerned, my conclusions are based on the proposition that the site and local landscape are a pleasant, but undesignated landscape of medium sensitivity to the appeal scheme. In doing so I have relied on Pegasus' standard LVIA methodology which guides my judgment regardless of the proposed typology – Appendix 1 to my Proof.
- 2.12. This is further discussed in Section 3 and Section 4 of my Landscape Proof of Evidence.
- 2.13. The analysis that I have undertaken has allowed me to consider the landscape and visual effects with reference to the issues raised in the RfR No. 2, and to make informed professional judgements concerning such matters. Within the scope of my area of expertise I assess whether the level of harm is deemed to be acceptable or otherwise from a landscape and visual perspective, mindful that the planning balance is for the planning witness.

Representative Viewpoints and Visualisations

- 2.14. The LVA photographs have been taken from a number of representative and illustrative viewpoints in the landscape surrounding the appeal site, both in terms of views of the appeal site and its immediate landscape context, the nearby receptors, and the wider surrounding countryside. I consider the LVA viewpoints to be appropriate and proportionate to the appeal scheme, given its typology and limited complexity.
- 2.15. I also note that the viewpoint selection had been coordinated and agreed with the Council. Following the initial landscape comments received from the Council in April 2022, further viewpoints (Viewpoints 17 to 22) were added to consider the potential effects upon the residents associated with the Cringles Park Home Estate and those located to the west of the appeal site. In other words, the additional viewpoints were concerned with residential visual amenity in close proximity to the appeal site, and not the perception of the local landscape or general visual amenity. The revised and re-submitted LVA (Revision C) addressed these requirements (**CD 01-14**).
- 2.16. No further requests were made during the determination stage of the application. It follows that the selected viewpoints, their geographical extent, and selected receptor types were deemed by the Council to be acceptable; other receptors and areas of the study area were not considered to be affected or informative to the decision making process.
- 2.17. It should be recognised that it is not practical to include viewpoints from every possible location. The viewpoints which have been selected illustrate a range of visual receptors at different distances and directions from the appeal site, often representative of a kinetic sequential viewing experience. The photography is considered appropriate given the type and scale of development. The representative viewpoints have been prepared with regard to the current best practice. The visualisations were prepared by Mineral Planning Group Ltd for illustrative purposes only, as an artistic interpretation and snap shot of what the appeal scheme might look like. It is recognised, however, that there is no substitute for visiting the viewpoints in the field to gain a first-hand appreciation of the viewing context, and to assess the effects in-situ.



- 2.18. It is anticipated that the Inspector will visit these representative viewpoints set out in the LVA, and the photographic evidence included in the application LVA (CD 01-14), and the photomontages would act as aide memoire only.

Rule 6 Parties

- 2.19. I understand that there is Rule 6 party with regard to this Inquiry, but their evidence will be limited to biodiversity and protected species matters. I am aware that there are third party representations from local residents, and I therefore address residential visual amenity in my Landscape Proof of Evidence.

3. Landscape Character

- 3.1. In this section of my evidence, I consider the effects of the appeal scheme on the local landscape, namely the host Rombalds Ridge LCA and its associated Upland Pasture LCT, and the adjacent Airedale LCA and its associated Enclosed Pasture LCT. As part of my analysis, I describe the character of the receiving landscape and its sensitivity to the type and scale of development as that present at the appeal site, and give consideration to the value associated with the local landscape. I also have regard to the potential effects on visual receptors present within this landscape and how the appeal scheme may affect their appreciation of this landscape.
- 3.2. Within this section of my evidence, I rely on the photographic evidence included in the submitted LVA (CD 01-14) and photomontages prepared by The Mineral Planning Group Ltd (CD 01-45, 01-46, and 01-47).
- 3.3. The baseline information is presented in the submitted LVA (CD 01-14) and I do not propose to repeat this information here. Instead, I focus on the analysis of the landscape character change brought about by the appeal scheme and the scale of residual effects in light of the RfR No.2.

Landscape Value

- 3.4. The landscape associated with the site and study area represents an example of a managed and settled undulating agricultural landscape with partly developed valley landscape framed by the elevated moors. The landscape within the defined study area is not subject to any statutory landscape designations such as National Park or National Landscapes (otherwise known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs)).
- 3.5. This is confirmed in the Council's published *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01).
- "5.4.1 There are no international or European landscape designations within Bradford. Areas of England and Wales whose landscape and natural beauty are considered to be of national importance are designated as either National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Bradford district does not contain either of these designations."***
- 3.6. The landscape is not subject to any non-statutory landscape designations either as none are identified in the adopted *Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)*, the *Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Development Plan Made Plan* (June 2011), and its associated Policies Map (June 2021), or the emerging Local Plan and its associated Policies Map (Map 1 – BDLP Preferred Options Draft Policies Map (Feb 2021)).
- 3.7. Paragraph 6.3 of the Council's Statement of Case (CD ID-03) states that the Council ***"... does not designate areas for high landscape value"***. However, the Council does designate areas for other interests, which have a bearing on their landscape value. In this regard, the published *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01) also states:

"5.1 The City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council has an existing framework of designations and policy relating to the environment all of which has an influence on the

landscape in its entirety. Designations and policies have a hierarchy from International to National, Regional, District wide and local.

5.2 The district has a similar covering of policies and designations for nature conservation, geology, and the built heritage/archaeological sites all of which contribute to the quality of the landscape.”

- 3.8. Evidently, at this time, the Council did consider it necessary to protect areas for their nature conservation, geology, and built heritage/archaeological value. I have reviewed previous iterations of the Council’s development plan – the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District (October 2005), but have found no district or local landscape designation covering the appeal site. I do note that the former Upper Airedale Local Plan Proposals Map May 1986 included Special Landscape Areas, and the correspondence relating to the previous quarry applications in the 1980s – application reference 86/O6567/FUL, indicated that the site was once covered by the Special Landscape Area designation and an area of High Landscape Value identified in the West Riding County Council Development Plan (approved 1966 and still in force at the time). I find it informative that the Council did not choose to carry through these non-statutory designations into their current Development Plan and did not consider any parts of the Borough’s landscape to be of such value as to warrant a local non-statutory landscape designation.
- 3.9. Section 15 of the *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)* (December 2023) is concerned specifically with conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Paragraph 180 notes that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by **“a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan)...”** with 180 b) stating: **“b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (...) and of trees and woodland;..”** This is further clarified in Paragraph 181 of the NPPF, which states: **“Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites...”** therefore, clearly establishing the principle of hierarchy between designated and non-designated countryside.
- 3.10. The meaning of the words “valued landscape” was considered by the High Court in *CEG Land Ltd v SSCLG*, where Mr Justice Ouseley said:

“In coming to a view as to whether or not a site falls to be classified as a valued landscape within the terms of the Framework, it seems to me that one first has to consider the extent of the land which makes up the landscape under consideration before examining whether or not there are features which make it valued. Developments and appeal sites vary in size. For example, it is possible to conceive of a small site sitting within a much larger field/combination of fields which comprise a landscape and which have demonstrable physical characteristics taking that landscape out of the ordinary. The small site itself may not exhibit any of the demonstrable physical features but as long as it forms an integral part of a wider ‘valued landscape’ I consider that it would deserve protection under the auspices of paragraph 109 (at the time) of the Framework. To require the small site itself to demonstrate the physical features in order to qualify as a valued landscape is to me a formulaic, literal approach to the interpretation of the question and an approach which could lead to anomalies. It could lead to individual

parcels of land being examined for physical characteristics deterministic of value. Adjoining parcels of land could be categorised as valued landscapes and 'not valued landscapes' on this basis."

"When assessing what constitutes a valued landscape I consider it more important to examine the bigger picture in terms of the site and its surroundings. That is not to borrow the features of the adjoining land but to assess the site in situ as an integral part of the surrounding land rather than divorcing it from its surroundings and then to conduct an examination of its value"

- 3.11. Then Paragraph 170 [now 180] of the NPPF was considered in the Lakeland District Council v. Zephyr Investments Ltd. Kirkby Moor Appeal Decision dated 29th January 2019. The Inspector concluded at paragraph 45:

"...however, the paragraph clearly refers to statutory status or identification in the development plan. Although the site is close to the LDNP and the WHS, these designated areas do not include a buffer and the site is therefore outside the area covered by any statutory status. Nor is the site identified in the development plan. Although clearly appreciated by local people and visitors, this does not mean that it is a valued landscape in terms of national policy."

- 3.12. The Planning Practice Guidance (its section 'Natural Environment') states:

"Where landscapes have a particular local value, it is important for policies to identify their special characteristics and be supported by proportionate evidence. Policies may set out criteria against which proposals for development affecting these areas will be assessed. Plans can also include policies to avoid adverse impacts on landscapes and to set out necessary mitigation measures, such as appropriate design principles and visual screening, where necessary." (Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 8-036-20190721, Revision date: 21 07 2019)

- 3.13. In the present case, the reason for refusal does not allege any conflict with para 180(a) of the NPPF, and neither the decision notice nor the delegated officer's report suggest that the appeal site forms part of a valued landscape within the meaning of that paragraph. I agree with that assessment. The local landscape and indeed the elevated exposed moor landscape is not statutorily protected for the landscape value or natural beauty. I am not aware of any boundary review associated with any of the nearby National Landscapes or National Parks and which would concern the site and its landscape context, confirming that the area was not judged by the Government to be suitable as a national statutory landscape designation. The site and the local landscape are also not identified in the Local Plan as a non-statutory landscape designation.

- 3.14. Therefore, logically the site and the surrounding tracts of the Rombalds Ridge LCA and the Upland Pasture LCT, and the adjacent Airedale LCA and Enclosed Pasture LCT fall at the lower spectrum of the landscape value continuum being a pleasant and working, but undesignated countryside.

- 3.15. Whilst the absence of designation is plainly relevant to the question whether this is a valued landscape, I recognise that it is not conclusive. The emerging LVIA practice requires undesignated landscapes to be assessed against the criteria set out in the *Guidelines on*

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ('GLVIA3') (its Box 5.1) and the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note O2/21: *Assessing landscape value outside national designations* (TGN O2/21).

- 3.16. I have therefore analysed the landscape within the site and study area in accordance with Box 5.1 of the *GLVIA3* and the Landscape Institute guidance including TGN O2/21, with reference to the published Natural England's National Character Area (NCA) 36 'South Pennines' (CD 11-07) and *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01), and verified during my site visit. The results are set out in **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Assessment of Landscape Value (after <i>GLVIA3</i> Box 5.1 and TGN O2/21)	
Natural Heritage	<p>The site and surrounding countryside comprise actively managed pastoral farmland. The site and the local area are not covered by any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations, albeit there are various designations in the wider surrounding area. The pastoral fields, and boundary treatment – dry stone walls and hedgerows on the lower and upper valley slopes are characteristic of the local landscape. Mature and robust tree belts are present on the edge of Cringles: <i>“Some small areas of beech woodland around Cringles”</i> as acknowledged in the published <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 3) (CD 07-01).</p> <p>DEFRA on-line mapping does not identify any statutory conservation designations in the area with the closest designations being the South Pennine Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) covering the Addingham High Moor to the south east of the site and Brown Bank Lane.</p> <p>Site and its immediate context – low value. Wider and distant landscape, outside of the study area – medium to localised high value.</p>
Cultural Heritage	<p>No specific cultural or heritage connections, beyond the ordinary managed agricultural landscape. Occasional listed buildings in Cringles to the east with a number of listed buildings dispersed in the wider area. The published <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 6) (CD 07-01) states: <i>“There are approximately 39 Listed Buildings within the Rombalds Ridge Character Area. <u>There are no Grade I or Grade II* listed buildings and/or structures, which are of exceptional historical importance, within this landscape character area.</u>”</i> (underlining is my emphasis)</p> <p>No conservation areas or registered parks and gardens in the vicinity. The Brunthwaite Conservation Area and Silsden</p>

	<p>Conservation Area to the south, c. 1.3km and 1.5 away respectively. Addingham Conservation Area some 2.6km to the north east at its closets point – not located within the host LCA. A number of scheduled monuments at Woofa Bank / Counter Hill / Addingham Moor to the north west – within the host LCA: “Woofa Bank – to the west of Cringles, several locations of ‘cup and ring’ stones and prehistoric earthworks point to continuous settlement since Neolithic times” – <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 5) (CD 07-01).</p> <p>A relatively high concentration of scheduled monuments south and south east of Ilkley – eastern part of the host Rombalds Ridge LCA, but outside of the host Upland Pasture LCT.</p> <p>The published <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 5) (CD 07-01) refers to Rombalds Moor and Baildon Moor and associated multiple heritage assets. No reference to Cringles or Horn Crag.</p> <p>Site and its immediate context – low value. Wider and distant landscape, outside of the study area – medium to localised high value.</p>
<p>Landscape Condition</p>	<p>The local landscape is considered to be in generally good condition as acknowledged in the <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 22) (CD 07-01): “The improved pasture grasslands are in good condition with traditional sheep and cattle grazing predominating. Stone boundary walls are in good repair.”</p> <p>Pastures are the predominant land use with dry stone walls forming a consistent boundary treatment across the upland landscape, with the published <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 21) (CD 07-01) referring to the: “... simplicity of well managed field systems...”</p> <p>Caravan parks form a detracting feature in landscape character terms and incongruous to the settlement pattern, which is described in the <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 23) (CD 07-01) as being: “Isolated farmsteads in traditional gritstone.” A distant wind farm represents ‘forces for change’ across the elevated upland and moorland landscape.</p> <p>The settlement of Silsden is a major urban feature. The Silsden Golf Course and Bracken Ghyll Golf Course represent a clear departure in landscape character terms, in terms of</p>

	<p>landscape pattern, and vegetation pattern. Their presence in the landscape is expected to be long term to permanent.</p> <p>On balance, medium value.</p>
Associations	<p>No well-known specific associations with notable people, events, or the arts in this local area. Low value.</p>
Distinctiveness	<p>The site and its context form part of the wider Rombalds Ridge LCA, which covers large tracts of land. The host Upland pasture LCT covers the lower lying undulating ‘saddle’ landscape between Silsden to the south west and Addingham to the north east, and occurs elsewhere within the Borough, i.e., it is not distinctive to this part of the landscape.</p> <p>The landscape is not rare in terms of its quality, land cover or other landscape attributes, and is undesignated. Moderate value.</p>
Recreational	<p>The local PRoWs provide access to the countryside and connect the nearby settlements. The PRoWs are more frequent around and converge at settlements – for example at Silsden, Addingham, and distant Ilkley. PRoWs along with Areas of open Access Land provide access to Addingham High Moor.</p> <p>Single PRoW within the site; single PRoW abuts the site and crosses the proposed access route. A Byway / Lippersley Lane is located to the north and east, some two fields apart. No promoted long distance paths of National Trails in the local area.</p> <p>The promoted long distance Millenium Way crosses the western side of the valley and leads north east towards Addingham, partially falling on the edge of the host LCA – lower slopes of Counter Hill.</p> <p>Distant areas of Open Access Land to the north west.</p> <p>There are no areas of Common Land, Open Access arrangements, or Country Parks in the immediate vicinity of the site. Localised lower value, rising to high where such features are concentrated. The landscape around the site is considered to be of medium value.</p>
Perceptual – Scenic	<p>Pleasant undulating landscape, with the field pattern marked by dry stone walls, and occasional areas of structural vegetation. Pleasant views across the valley looking west. The elevated Addingham High Moor, Ilkley Moor, and Rombalds</p>

	<p>Moor rise above the surrounding undulating landform of the Rombalds Ridge LCA and attract attention due to their dramatic landform and relative height. Patchwork of pastoral landscape, framed by woodlands / tree belts in the west – outside of the host LCA.</p> <p>Medium value within this part of the LCA with higher value within the Gritstone moorland LCT.</p>
<p>Perceptual – Wildness and Tranquillity</p>	<p>The local landscape is clearly managed for agriculture. Human presence is evident and frequent with movement visible, and noise audible particularly from the nearby A6034 – i.e., that closest to the appeal site. Away from the site, the highway, and the settlement of Silsden the surrounding landscape has a reduced level of noise. It is not, however, a wild landscape one would associate with exposed or remote areas such as Dartmoor, areas of Wild Land in Scotland, or the interior of the Yorkshire Dales National Park.</p> <p>The published <i>Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document</i> (October 2008) (page 21) (CD 07-01) states <i>“The upland pasture to the east of Cringles (...) The farmsteads here are smaller and more frequent ...”</i>.</p> <p>Views from around the appeal site and its context, and indeed the higher ground to the south east of the appeal site include the urban environment of Silsden, small scale farm scale wind turbines and a distant wind farm visible to the south. The landscape is peaceful / quiet, in places. Its relative level of tranquillity, however, is reflective of its settled character. This conclusion is supported by the description of the NCA 36 Southern Pennines, paragraph 11.1 ‘Tranquillity’, which states: <i>“Based on the CPRE map of tranquillity (2006), the areas of greatest tranquillity are unsurprisingly the moorlands and moorland fringes. The lowest scores for tranquillity are along the valley bottoms, where roads, railways, industry and housing are all squeezed in.”</i> Evidently the appeal site is not associated with the elevated moorland or the valley bottom, and its relatively tranquillity would be of moderate value.</p> <p>I consider it to be of medium value.</p>
<p>Functional</p>	<p>No special function beyond the ordinary countryside and former quarry site. I consider it to be of low value.</p>

3.17. The GLVIA3 clearly identifies a hierarchy of valued landscapes when discussing the level of importance which they signify. It clearly states that the value decreases from internationally valued landscapes such as World Heritage Sites, to nationally valued landscapes such as National Parks and National Landscapes, to locally valued landscapes: ***“...locally valued***

landscapes, for example local authority landscape designations or, where these do not exist, landscapes assessed as being of equivalent value using clearly stated and recognised criteria... (underlining is my emphasis). The site and the surrounding landscape do not fall under any of the above categories. On balance, the value of the site's landscape and that of the study area is taken as medium.

- 3.18. I accept that other parts of the host LCA may be classified as 'valued', for example due to the extensive nature of PRoWs and Open Access Land arrangement, the concentration of heritage assets, and the heightened sense of remoteness and relative tranquillity experienced across the elevated and exposed moorlands, albeit the focus of my assessment was on the appeal site and its landscape context not the wider LCA. But we have to draw the line somewhere and evidently the appeal site and its immediate landscape context – i.e. the north-western part of the host LCA – does not possess any specific attributes or landscape features which would justify attributing a special value to the site. The site and local area are therefore not of high value landscape in the context of paragraph 180(a) of the NPPF.

Landscape Susceptibility and Sensitivity

- 3.19. I note that the published *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008), paragraph 5.1 (CD 07-01) states that the host Rombalds Ridge LCA is very sensitive to change: ***"Rombalds Ridge can be regarded as very sensitive to change due to its strong character, high historic continuity, displaying a safe feeling of remoteness."***
- 3.20. The document, however, does not appear to follow the guidance provided in the GLVIA3, which advocates that landscape sensitivity is ***"...a term applied to specific receptors, combining judgments of susceptibility of the receptor to a specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor"*** (Glossary, page 158). The document also omits the fact that the landscape is a non-designated countryside thus of lower hierarchy as identified in the NPPF.
- 3.21. The GLVIA3 is clear on this issue and states (paragraphs 5.40 – 5.42):

"This means the ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character or quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area, or an individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect) to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies.

The assessment may take place in situations where there are existing landscape sensitivity and capacity studies, which have become increasingly common. They may deal with the general type of development that is proposed, in which case they may provide useful preliminary background information for the assessment. But they cannot provide a substitute for the individual assessment of the susceptibility of the receptors in relation to change arising from the specific development proposal. (underlining is my emphasis)

- 3.22. This is further clarified in paragraph 5.42, which states: ***"Some of these existing assessments may deal with what has been called 'intrinsic' or 'inherent' sensitivity, without reference to a specific type of development. These cannot reliably inform***

assessment of the susceptibility to change since they are carried out without reference to any particular type of development and so do not relate to the specific development proposed. Since landscape effects in LVIA are particular to both the specific landscape in question and the specific nature of the proposed development, the assessment of susceptibility must be tailored to the project.”

3.23. I also find it useful to refer to paragraph 5.46 of the GLVIA3, which deals with ‘susceptibility’ and states (2nd and 3rd bullet point):

- **“It is possible for an internationally, nationally or locally important landscape to have relatively low susceptibility to change resulting from the particular type of development in question, by virtue of both the characteristics of the landscape and the nature of the proposal.**
- **The particular type of change or development proposed may not compromise the specific basis for the value attached to the landscape.”**

3.24. The GLVIA3 does not provide prescriptive guidance on how to assess the landscape susceptibility. The Technical Information Note 01/21 ‘GLVIA webinar Q&As’ provides some limited advice: **“Both landscape susceptibility and landscape value should be considered as part of the process. It is up to the assessor to show how these factors have been taken account of in the assessment.”**

3.25. In order to determine the susceptibility to change, in relation to the typology proposed – a small scale quarry – I find it useful to analyse various landscape criteria, which when combined, help define the character of the local landscape. These are: landscape scale, enclosure, field pattern, landform, land cover, human presence and man-made influences, remoteness and tranquillity, scenic quality and character, skylines and settings, inter-visibility, landmarks and features, key views & vistas, and typical receptors. The list is based on the advice given in the document titled *An approach to landscape sensitivity assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management* (June 2019) and more specifically its Annex 2 (CD 11-03).

3.26. I do not propose to analyse each landscape criterion in detail, but rather a brief commentary is provided in the following paragraphs.

3.27. The landscape is large scale and of open character, particularly the elevated moors: **“Large-scale sweeping landform with an open character formed of high altitude gritstone moors... Clear evidence of underlying geology and its contribution to subsequent land use and development, in particular building stone, with geodiversity revealed through both natural features and quarries”** (the NCA 36 Southern Pennines, section ‘Landscape attributes’). This suggests low susceptibility to small scale quarry work, contained within a single medium scale field enclosure and landscape that is of large scale. The sense of enclosure, judged against the relative elevation of the appeal site, suggest medium susceptibility – but the retained tree vegetation acts to mitigate the introduced adverse change, as recognised in the NCA 36: **“Woodlands provide strong visual backdrops, and assist with absorbing the scattered farmsteads / hamlets / other development into the valley landscapes.”**

3.28. The field pattern across the ‘saddle’ is strongly geometric and largely rectilinear with field enclosure small to medium scale, increasing to large across the moorland. The appeal scheme would be wholly contained within the existing field pattern – low susceptibility.

- 3.29. The landform is simple and uncomplicated, particularly across the 'saddle' in the northern part of the host Rombalds Ridge LCA. Given the proposed typology and character of the site – with the quarry face being already exposed – the susceptibility is considered to be medium.
- 3.30. The predominant land cover across the local 'saddle' landscape comprises managed pastures, which are common in the area and characteristic of the local landscape, and relatively easy to replace when compared to woodland vegetation. The susceptibility is medium.
- 3.31. Human presence and man-made influences are evident, particularly around the appeal site with the Cringles Park Home Estate and at Brown Bank Lane. Small scale farm wind turbines are evident and punctuate the landscape. The A6034 is the closest public highway, the traffic is frequent, and noise is audible in the vicinity of the appeal site. This reduces the ruralness of the landscape, its remoteness and tranquillity. The susceptibility is medium. I accept that the relative level of tranquillity on the elevated moors is higher, as stated in the description of the NCA 36: ***“Relatively high levels of tranquillity especially on moorlands and moorland fringes.”*** This, however, does not apply to the lower lying undulating landscape – the appeal site and its surrounding area.
- 3.32. The combination of the elevated landform, open and somewhat exposed character of the moorland, use of local stone which reflects the geology, consistent land use – settled pastoral landscape, and dry stone walls – influence the scenic quality and character of the local area, as recognised in the description of the NCA 36: ***“Striking visual continuity, through extensive use of local building materials with sandstone flags on roofs, creating a high degree of visual unity to towns, villages and farmsteads; also fields are bounded by drystone walls which form strong patterns in places”, “Building materials sourced locally” and “Visual coherence arising from widespread use of local sandstones for building and roofing.”***
- 3.33. With regard to the skylines and settings, the undulating 'saddle' around the appeal site is partially visible from the landscape to the west. In such views, the landform is smooth and uncomplicated. The appeal scheme would not introduce any strong vertical features that would break the horizon or cause change to this criterion. In views from the higher ground, the eye overlooks the 'saddle' and looks towards the distant uplands and moorlands. I consider this criterion to be of low susceptibility. I also find it informative to note that the *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01), under sub-heading 'Skylines' specifically refers to the northern edge of Rombalds Moor overlooking Ilkley and Whetstone Gate on the southern aspect of Rombalds. It does not refer to the skyline around Cringles or the appeal site.
- 3.34. In terms of inter-visibility, landmarks and features, key views and vistas, and typical receptors, I have discussed these previously in Table 1 and expand on them in the following paragraphs. Receptors are infrequent and generally transient. There are no landmarks or identified key views and vistas in this part of the host landscape. On balance this criterion is judged to be of medium susceptibility, at most.
- 3.35. I note that the NCA 36 refers to: ***“Extensive views from elevated locations. Extensive views out, and also views in, often punctuated by key features such as Stoodley Pike, communications masts, windfarms.”***

3.36. In addition, the published *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01), specifically refers to a number of landmarks, key views and vistas, memorable places, none of which would be simultaneously visible with the appeal site or make the appeal site or the associated 'saddle' upland prominent:

"Landmarks

- ***Archaeological features such as Cowpers Cross and Double Stones.***
- ***Cow and Calf Rocks.***
- ***Radio Mast at Whetstone Gate. (...)***

Key Views and Vistas

- ***"Dramatic views of Airedale/Wharfedale at Buck Stones***
- ***Long distance views in all directions from Thimble Stones and the summit of Baildon Moor.***
- ***Views north from Addingham to Silsden Road around Marchup area, towards Yorkshire Dales, and the landscape setting of Addingham***
- ***Many key views in all directions due to elevation of the character area and accessibility via public footpaths particularly into the Yorkshire Dales and the northern slopes of the Wharfe Valley towards Blubberhouse Moor.***
- ***The Saltaire Environmental Capacity Study and the Saltaire Conservation Area Assessment both identify key views and vistas into and out of the World Heritage Site. Any development proposal shall take these into account and ensure that they are preserved.***

Memorable Places

- ***Cow and Calf Rocks***
- ***White Wells – cottage, the first spa.***
- ***Small wooded valleys on Ilkley Moor with streams, pine trees and rock outcrops are 'picturesque'."***

3.37. Overall, I consider this part of the local landscape to be of medium susceptibility and overall medium sensitivity to the appeal scheme. This translates to medium sensitivity of the northern part of the host Rombalds Ridge LCA and the Upland Pasture LCT.

Landscape Character Effects

3.38. The RfR No.2 refers to: ***"...the designated landscape character area of the Rombalds Ridge Landscape Character Area."*** It is worth reiterating that the neither the site nor the local landscape are designated for their scenic qualities, landscape value, or natural beauty. The site and local landscape fall within the Rombalds Ridge LCA as identified in published

Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document (October 2008) (CD 07-01), but this in itself does not carry any designation status.

- 3.39. I note that the RfR No.2 refers to Policy SWES5 Airedale's Valued Landscape, yet the area of the Airedale's Valued Landscape is not precise and has not been mapped on the Policies Map (June 2021) associated with the *Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Development Plan Made Plan* (June 2011) (CD 06-03).
- 3.40. The document titled: *A Neighbourhood Plan for Silsden, Steeton and Eastburn Background information* does not identify this area either. Under the sub-heading The Environment it identifies a number of natural and man-made features: **"The importance of the River Aire and the Leeds Liverpool Canal are both recognised. Their significance is in terms not only of leisure activities but also for their role in providing bio-diversity and also in terms of managing flood risk."** Horn Crag and its immediate landscape context have not been identified.
- 3.41. I also note that at paragraph 5.21, the *Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Development Plan Made Plan* (June 2011) (CD 06-03) states: **"...the key policy aims recommendations are relevant to the neighbourhood plan area: preserving the character of the uplands e.g., by retaining field boundaries; protecting historic and archaeological features; and developing the area's use for recreation in a sensitive way."** There is no mention of local landscape designations.
- 3.42. Even if we accept that the boundary of the Airedale landscape is that shown at Figure 5 of the *Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Development Plan Made Plan* (June 2011) (CD 06-03), in any case the appeal site falls outside of this area. It follows then that the appeal scheme would not have any direct effects upon the character of the Airedale landscape, by virtue of being located outside of it. Any landscape character effects would be indirect and simply relate to the appreciation of the Airedale landscape.
- 3.43. With reference to the above, the RfR No.2 states that the appeal site is a **"...local landmark within the broader character area..."** and I disagree with this statement.
- 3.44. In this context I refer to the wording of Policy SWES5 points c), d), and f) which state:

"New development proposals, where appropriate, will be required to incorporate the following landscape design principles in order to protect and enhance the valued landscape character of the area: (...)

c) Retention and conservation of existing field boundaries, especially in areas of enclosed pasture.

d) Retention of trees, areas of woodland, hedgerows, and stonewalling. Any additional planting should be of suitable native species, well related to existing woodland and be concentrated in areas where it will have a suitable visual impact.

f) Protection and enhancement of important views by limiting the height or visibility of large vertical structures. In assessing impacts on such views particular regard should be had to:

i. Views of, and from, the wooded incline and tower above Steeton.

ii. Views of Rombalds Ridge.

iii. Views of Airedale from Silsden Road and Holden Lane.

iv. Views along the floodplain pastures in Silsden.

v. Views along and from the Leeds and Liverpool Canal.

vi. Views from the towns of upper valley slopes and pastures.”

- 3.45. The above quoted list at point f) is detailed and site specific, yet it does not specifically identify Horn Crag as worthy of protection. Rather, it refers to the large scale landscape of the Rombalds Ridge as a whole. Horn Crag forms a very small part of this area and is located within its northern lower ‘saddle’ which is less visible. In addition, it plainly refers to large vertical structures – the appeal scheme would not be a tall vertical structure.
- 3.46. In this regard, I refer to the adopted Core Strategy and its paragraph 5.4.89, which puts emphasis on tall vertical structures and the backdrop of moorland:
- “Within Bradford open moorland provides the backdrop to the wide shallow valleys of the rivers Aire and Wharfe, where locations along the moorland edge offer long extensive views. Within such an open landscape, in areas where there are few other structures, vertical elements such as wind turbines can be prominent features. Recently, due to support for energy from renewable and low carbon sources, there has been an increase in the numbers of individual turbines proposed and implemented, leading to cumulative impacts on the landscape.”*** (underlining is my emphasis)
- 3.47. Even if we accept that point f) of Policy SWES5 applies or is informative to the decision making process, the appeal scheme would not be prominent or highly visible, with the appeal scheme being low lying and largely concealed by its landform and retained vegetation along its western edge. In other words, the appeal scheme would not materially affect those views. The appeal scheme forms a minute part of the Rombalds Ridge, and a minute part of the overall panoramas, and the overall appreciation of this landscape would not be materially harmed.
- 3.48. The published *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01) does not identify Horn Crag as a feature. The topographic contour lines across the site read between approximately 232m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) along its western edge and 261m AOD at its highest point, gently sloping to approximately 248m AOD at its south eastern corner and 251m AOD at its north eastern corner. This is broadly reflective of the landform locally.
- 3.49. With reference to Ordnance Survey (OS) Explorer map 1:25:000; Figure 2 of the submitted LVA (CD 01-14), it is evident that the topography of the appeal site is not unique and in my mind Horn Crag forms part of the wider undulating topography of the northern Rombalds Ridge LCA, i.e., that associated with its lower lying ‘saddle’ – the Upland Pasture LCT. Similar contour lines extend across the immediate area, for example at Delf Hill, then rise to culminate in the nearby Sea Moor Hill (approximately 278m AOD) and then wrap around the Addingham High Moor, which forms the highly elevated part of the host Rombalds Ridge LCA – for example at Light Bank and Brunthwaite Crag, south east of the appeal site. At this point the landform becomes steep, the landscape largely denuded of any substantial areas of structural planting, thus becoming highly visible from the surrounding areas. It is this

elevated and exposed part of the Rombalds Ridge that is visible and attracts attention when viewed from the valley and the Airedale landscape.

- 3.50. I am not aware of any landscape related guidance that would help guide the identification of landmarks and the *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01) does not identify Horn Crag as a specific feature of the local landscape. In the absence of any landscape related guidance, I refer to the published *Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage Historic England Advice Note 7* (Second Edition 2021), which states:
- “Landmark Status: An asset with strong communal or historical associations, or because it has especially striking aesthetic value, may be singled out as a landmark within the local scene.”***
- 3.51. For a parcel of land or feature to be identified as being a local landmark it would have to be exposed or highly visible, views consistently available across the wider area, prominent in views, and attract attention. I do not find the appeal site to exhibit such characteristics. Often such features are identified on OS Explorer map 1:25:000 by a variety of symbols such as a castle or fort, cathedral, or the blue star symbol identifying ‘other tourist feature’. The closest such feature is the Swastika Stone located near the south western edge of Ilkley. In addition, viewpoints identified on OS Explorer maps signify the attractiveness of views gained at such locations. The Cow and Calf viewpoints on the south eastern edge of Ilkley is the closest such feature. No such features are identified on the north western slopes of Addingham High Moor, around the appeal site, or to the north of the appeal site.
- 3.52. As illustrated by the LVA Viewpoints 1 – 6 and 12 (CD 01-14), the appeal site sits low in those views, with the backcloth of the rising upland and moorland landscape beyond.
- 3.53. Even if we consider the views from the adjacent Airedale landscape on the western valley slope – west of the Silsden Reservoir and outside of the host Rombalds Ridge LCA; LVA Viewpoints 9 – 11 (CD 01-14), the appeal site is either backclothed by the higher ground located to the east of it, or reads as forming part of the relatively smooth undulating landscape with the eye traveling either towards the valley floor or the highly elevated Addingham High Moor. In such views, I consider White Cragg and the steep northern slope of the Addingham High Moor to act as a feature, not the appeal site. In other words, I do not consider Horn Crag to perform such function.
- 3.54. In this context the description of the NCA 36 is also helpful and in the ‘Landscape attribute’ section it states: ***“Major industrial buildings are often significant landmarks in valleys”*** and ***“Internationally important concentrations of carved prehistoric rocks on Ilkley and Rombalds moors”*** and ***“Large mills with chimneys act as focal points in valleys”***.
- 3.55. In the following paragraphs, I proceed to describe the degree of change and landscape character effects, and the residual effects. In doing so, I present my own analysis of the appeal scheme and its effects on the landscape character of the appeal site and its surroundings. The assessment has been written with regard to the current best practice – Appendix 1 of my Proof.
- 3.56. The GLVIA3 states (its paragraph 5.56, page 92 and 93):
- “There are no hard and fast rules about what makes a significant effect, and there cannot be a standard approach since circumstances vary with the location and***

landscape context and with the type of proposal. At opposite ends of a spectrum it is reasonable to say that:

- **major loss or irreversible negative effects, over an extensive area, or element and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspect that are key to the character of nationally valued landscape are likely to be of the greatest significance; and**
- **reversible negative effects of short duration, over a restricted area, on elements and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key characteristics of landscape value are likely to be the least significant and may depending upon the circumstance, be judged as not significant. (...)**

- 3.57. I also note that Figure 5.10 of the GLVIA3 identifies that ‘less significant’ effects, or in other words effects of a lesser scale, would occur within an area in “... **poorer condition or of degraded character. Effects on lower-value landscape**”.
- 3.58. The western part of the appeal site is a man-made feature, which natural landform and character had been partly eroded by the historic quarry works and land management. The available historic maps from mid-19th Century, for example the OS Six-inch England and Wales, 1842–1952, Sheet 168, Surveyed: 1850, Published: 1854 identifies Horn Crag as a single undulating field enclosure. In comparison, the nearby Brook’s Crag to the north of the appeal site, is characterised by a natural linear rocky outcrop. I also note a number of identified small scale quarry sites dispersed across the local area and the north facing outcrop at the nearby Delf Hill.
- 3.59. In comparison, the OS Six-inch England and Wales, 1842–1952, Sheet CLXVIII, Surveyed: 1889 to 1890, Published: 1896 identifies a quarry at the aforementioned Brook’s Crag and being almost completely cloaked in woodland. No such features are identified within the appeal site.
- 3.60. The landscape change occurred in the early 20th Century with the OS Six-inch England and Wales, 1842–1952, Sheet CLXVIII.SE, Revised: 1907, Published: 1910 identifying a small scale quarry within the appeal site. The Brook’s Crag quarry, the Asker Hill quarry, and a quarry at Cringles – cloaked in Cringles Plantation, are also evident, giving evidence of the changing landscape and the amount of quarry work that had occurred in this landscape – all within or on the edge of the ‘saddle’ landscape – the northern part of the Rombalds Ridge LCA i.e. the Upland Pasture LCT – and at comparable elevation AOD. This to me, indicates that quarry work was a feature of the landscape with stone quarried across the ‘saddle’ landscape – the Upland Pasture LCT – where it was readily available.
- 3.61. Evidently the appeal site is characterised, in parts, by its man-made topography and made-up ground. Therefore, it is right to say that its natural landscape had been partially eroded, with the maturing trees located at its western edge mitigating against the change. I judge the sensitivity of the landform, associated with the site, to be low; with the vegetation (structural and low lying scrub and grassland) being high to medium respectively.
- 3.62. I accept that the appeal scheme would bring about a high degree of change and major adverse effects upon the current character of the appeal site, and its landscape features, where they are removed. Such effects would prevail throughout the operational stage of the appeal scheme, as it progressively changes its landform, vegetation, and overall character. I do note, however that according to the Planning Application Supporting Statement by The Mineral Planning Group Ltd the site is approximately 5.9ha and the proposed extraction

would occur within approximately 3.9ha only. It is important to state that the extraction would be phased thus the change introduced through each phase would be relatively modest and incremental, in order to reduce the visual effects – I discuss this in Section 4 of my Proof. As an example, the area within Phase 5 and Phase 6 would be left undisturbed until the Restoration Phase A has commenced, some 10 – 12 years after the start of the works.

- 3.63. The phasing of the appeal scheme (extraction Phases 1 – 6) also enables the appeal site to be partially restored (Restoration Phases A – C) before the final extraction works have completed; with the initial restoration works at Phase A commencing approximately 10 – 12 years after the start of the extraction works – as indicated on the Proposed Restoration Phasing drawing 232/5 – 10, Rev 1.0 (**CD 00-09**). Once the excavation at Phase 5 and Phase 6 have been completed, the remaining part of the appeal site would be fully restored – Restoration Phase C. The restoration of the appeal scheme would not involve the importation of any waste. The stripped soil would be stored within Phase 1 of the appeal scheme with any extracted mineral waste, not processed off site, retained within each of the consecutive extraction phases and wholly within the appeal site.
- 3.64. The schematic restoration scheme, planning application drawing 232/5 – 7 (**CD 00-06**) and E454-005 (**CD 01-53**) indicatively illustrate that the overall profile of the restored appeal site would be in keeping with the local landform and would echo the natural contours of the site, albeit with the levels reduced. In other words, the anticipated finished ground levels across the appeal site, once the remediation work has been completed, would be lower than the existing topography of the appeal site. I do not consider this to be materially harmful.
- 3.65. With regard to the residual effects of the appeal scheme, I refer back to the Brook’s Crag quarry, shown on the previously discussed historic maps. With the maturing tree vegetation on its western edge, and the reprofiled smooth contour of the appeal site, the restored appeal scheme would not manifest itself in the landscape and I would judge such residual change to be negligible with the residual effects negligible in landscape character terms.
- 3.66. According to the topographical survey (**CD 01-49 & 01-50**), the western part of the appeal site is overgrown with tree vegetation sat at approximately 230m AOD – 244m AOD. According to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plus Tree Survey (**CD 01-28**), the most extensive areas of existing vegetation are: Group G19 (over 10m high) and Groups G23 and G24, (both over 8m high but largely including small scale vegetation). In addition, Group G14 (over 10m high) and trees T16 and T17 (both c. 18m high) along with other nearby trees and groups of trees (largely between 8m – 12m high) provide a degree of enclosure. I note Groups G21 and G22, and a small part of G24 would be removed to accommodate Phase 1 of the appeal scheme. Given the relative elevation of the retained tree vegetation, maximum height of the appeal site (**CD 01-49 & 01-50**), and proposed extraction levels (**CD 05-54**) it is evident that the operational activities would be enclosed, and views filtered by this retained vegetation. This would help visually and physically contain the negative influence of the appeal scheme upon the wider landscape.
- 3.67. The appeal site falls within the National Character Area (NCA) 36 South Pennines (**CD 11-07**) and the Rombalds Ridge LCA (**CD 07-01**). The character of the local landscape and indeed the host NCA 36 South Pennines and Rombalds Ridge LCA would be affected to a very limited degree only.

3.68. The 'Cultural Services' identified for the NCA 36:

“Sense of place/inspiration: The dramatic landform of hills and narrow valleys has given rise to a distinctive upland pastoral landscape, with gritstone settlements and a backdrop of woodlands on steep slopes. This landscape combines with a strong cultural background based on the textiles industry to create a strong sense of place. Feelings of escapism and inspiration are often expressed in relation to the open moorlands, with their expansive views and strong sense of isolation and wildness.”

3.69. The NCA 36 description, at paragraph 2.2 'Landform and process', states: ***“The rocks dip to the east, resulting in a series of escarpments, steep to the west and sloping away to the east, forming some prominent rocky edges.”*** This description does not apply to the appeal site or its immediate landscape context.

3.70. I do not consider the landform of the appeal site or the upper valley slope at Cringles to be dramatic and the valley is relatively wide and shallow. It is the landform of White Cragg and Brunthwaite Crag, the northern edge of the Addingham High Moor and Black Hill, the contrast between the steep slopes of Ilkley Moor rising from the River Wharfe and the settlement, and even the unassuming Woofa Bank at Bank Lane to the north west of the appeal site, or the narrow valley of Cowburn Beck which drains to the Silsden Reservoir, that are attractive and unique to this landscape.

3.71. The Statement of Environmental Opportunity SEO2 refers to: ***“Retaining and restoring historic patterns of drystone walls on the moorland fringes, on upland pastures, around farmsteads and settlements, and along tracks.”*** This is echoed in the SEO3, which refers to: ***“Maintaining the visible evidence of the historic environment of the moorland fringes and valleys, in particular retaining historic field patterns defined by drystone walls, farmsteads, laithe houses, barns, weavers’ cottages, mill buildings, terraced houses, chapels and artefacts associated with canals, mills and factories.”***

3.72. Furthermore, the description of the NCA 36, at paragraph 5.1 'Boundary treatment', states: ***“Field boundaries are predominantly drystone walls constructed with local sandstones from the Millstone Grit and the Coal Measure Series or in some localities, limestone.”***

3.73. The existing perimeter stone wall would be retained during the operational stage of the appeal scheme, repaired where necessary, and would continue to contribute to the character of the local landscape once the appeal site has been restored. The appeal scheme would not require any change to the field pattern or the demolition of any of the above identified built form.

3.74. With regard the SEO4 and public access, the existing Public Footpath Silsden 18 does not follow its correct alignment with its route disrupted by the quarry face. Currently, public access within the appeal site constitutes trespass. The appeal scheme would formalise the public access within the appeal site moving the route away from the quarry face, and making it safe for the PRoW users. Its proposed alignment is logical and reflective of other PRoWs in the vicinity where the routes follow existing field boundaries.

3.75. I also find it informative that the 'Additional opportunities' section of the NCA 36 recognises the importance of locally quarried stone – Point 1: ***“Using local stone for field boundaries and farmsteads so that their relationship to underlying geology is revealed.”*** This is also echoed at paragraph 8.3 'Local vernacular and building materials': ***“The use of local hard sandstones which, are very suitable for building, in particular Millstone Grit, in all***

constructions, from drystone walls and farmsteads to terraced houses and factories, gives a high degree of visual coherence to the appearance of settlements and reveals a close connection with the underlying geology." Evidently the appeal scheme would enable such relationship to continue.

- 3.76. The 'Additional opportunities' Point 2 refers to broadleaved tree vegetation, and the retained tree vegetation along the western edge of the appeal site would continue to perform its function. Larger areas of woodland, however, have not been considered as part of the mitigation or restoration proposals, in order to avoid conflict with the site's ecology.
- 3.77. With regard to the description of the host Upland Pasture LCT, its 'Strength of Character' is defined as: **"A uniform simplicity of the gently rolling landform managed pastures and stonewall boundaries give this landscape type a strong character."** The appeal scheme would cause some highly localised change to the landform and land cover, but this would be limited to the appeal site itself. The surrounding underlying undulating landscape and the distant moors would not be affected. Given the low profile of the appeal scheme there would be no tall structures that would be visible on the horizon or compete visually with the scale of the valley landscape or the elevated moors. The appeal scheme, if visible, would not detract from any landmarks or views identified in the published landscape character assessments – as discussed in the previous paragraphs. I also note that the image included in the published description of the Upland Pasture LCT illustrates the Addingham High Moor as seen from around the Brown Bank Caravan Park, rather than the undulating upland landscape in the northern part of the LCA.
- 3.78. None of the natural or man-made features identified in the published landscape character assessments, both on the national and borough level, would be affected physically. The appeal site is sufficiently distant, small, and screened, not to be visible simultaneously or cause any material change to the perception of those assets. The appeal scheme would bring about some complexity to the local landscape, but this would be geographically limited and would occur within an area already affected by past quarry activities – in my mind this is a strong consideration that reduces the landscape character effects.
- 3.79. I note that the published *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01) states in relation to the host LCT: **"The upland pastures have an open character and are notably prominent from the A6034 giving a pleasing visual framework to Addingham High Moor to the south east and Skipton Moor to the north west."** This does not apply to the appeal site, which is enclosed by tree vegetation, and largely screened from the road. During my site visit I gained prolonged views of the Addingham High Moor and the associated Gritstone moorland LCT, the fields adjacent to the road, and Brook's Hill and Delf Hill to the north, but not the appeal site. Intermittent views towards the appeal site do exist, locally, but the appeal site is cloaked in tree vegetation, and I do not consider the appeal site to be prominent.
- 3.80. Most importantly none of the 'Key Landscape Elements' identified for the host Rombalds Ridge LCA would be affected:
- **"Wild open exposed moorland**
 - **Fields enclosed by stone walls**
 - **Plantation woodland**

- **Rock outcrops**
- **Simple structure with few landscape elements.”**

3.81. At this point I refer to Natural England’s *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment* (October 2014) page 51 (CD 11-02), which states: “**...key characteristics are those combinations of elements which help to give an area its distinctive sense of place. If these characteristics change, or are lost, there would be significant consequences for the current character of the landscape...**” (underlining is my emphasis)

3.82. To put it simply, major adverse landscape character effects, and by extension material harm, would occur when the underlying key characteristics of the local landscape would be redefined, or the appeal scheme would result in a major change to the appreciation of the landscape. This is not the case here.

3.83. I also refer to the adopted Core Strategy, which states at paragraph 5.5.2:

“Supporting new investment in minerals extraction is both a responsibility, in terms of Bradford playing its part in supplying the raw materials necessary for economic growth, but also an opportunity, in terms of enhancing Bradford’s reputation as a supplier of high quality building materials and increasing skilled employment particularly in rural areas. The primary purpose of policy EN9 is to support new investment in minerals extraction within the District, where such development can be undertaken sustainably, without resulting in an unacceptable level of harm to communities or the natural environment. The secondary objective of the policy is to reduce the need for minerals development to take place on new greenfield sites by encouraging developers to consider any options they may have to fully exhaust remaining reserves within existing workings, or to extend those workings, before looking at opening up new sites.” (underlining is my emphasis)

3.84. This suggests that the Council accepts that a degree of landscape and / or visual harm is likely to occur. As I evidenced in my analysis, presented above, the degree of harm upon the local landscape character is non material, geographically limited, and reversible, and would occur within an area used for stone extraction in the past, with the appeal site bearing the marks of the past quarry activities.

3.85. At the same time the locally sourced stone would be processed and can be used locally, reflecting the local geology and local distinctness as accepted in the Council’s *Minerals Background Report & Evidence Report* (February 2021) paragraphs 3.4.10 and 3.4.12:

“3.4.10 The need for materials for the repair, alteration or extension of historic and culturally important buildings within the district, such as listed buildings and many buildings within Conservation Areas, is less significant than new build in terms of sales but of key importance in terms of the maintenance of the character of the traditional built environment of Bradford.

3.4.12 The report goes on to note that there are only a limited number of operational quarries supplying building stone with appropriate aesthetic characteristics for use within the District. The scarcity of supply of coarse grained ‘gritstone’ walling, suitable for use in settlements to the north of the district, and stone slate roofing are particularly highlighted. Concerns are raised that the natural stone materials currently imported from outside the district can have subtly different aesthetic characteristics to local stone, in terms of colour, texture and course thickness. The report concludes that

there is a clear need for greater availability of local stone for local use, and that particular emphasis should be placed on increasing supplies of roofing stone.
(underlining is my emphasis)

3.86. This was supported by the Council's Conservation Team as outlined in the Officer's Delegated Report (CD 03-03), which stated:

"It is noted that the quarry is expected to produce building stone. There may be some indirect heritage benefits associated with the provision of local sandstone/millstone which is suitable for construction. The contribution of local stone to local distinctiveness and the character of the nearby settlements is noted in the Conservation Area assessments/appraisals of Silsden, Brunthwaite, Steeton, Keighley, Ilkley and Addingham. Local stone to match the existing is often required as part of development proposals for both new buildings and for alterations, extensions and general upkeep of existing traditional buildings."

3.87. In summary, I consider that the appeal scheme would bring about a low degree of change and minor adverse effects, which would not be material. Therefore, in my mind the appeal scheme can be accommodated in the receiving landscape without any undue harm to its character, landscape attributes and landscape criteria, as analysed in the preceding paragraphs of my Proof. The appeal scheme is small scale, concealed by the landform and vegetation, when visible views would be transient and geographically localised or seen as part of a wide expansive panorama which would act to reduce the degree of change. The characteristics of the appeals site and nature of the appeal scheme would result in limited change to the baseline character, and the phased operational stage of the appeal scheme would create modest incremental change over the course of some 20 years.

3.88. Once the proposed site has been restored to its new profile, the existing quarry would be effectively 'removed' from the landscape. The restoration scheme would positively contribute to the landscape character and the conservation, management, and enhancement of its diversity, reflecting the existing matrix of planting, securing active positive management of the acid grassland and heathland, thus positively influencing the character of the local landscape.

3.89. The RfR No.2 states: ***"The change is not considered acceptable, as it will have adverse landscape and visual effects (...) over a minimum of 20 years with potentially an additional 15 years to achieve some maturity in the restored scheme..."*** The restoration works would start before the end of the extraction works, approximately 10 years after the start of the appeal scheme, thus enabling early remediation of the introduced change and enabling the introduced mitigation planting to start maturing early, making the introduced change and landscape character effects temporary and of short duration.

3.90. I note that a detailed restoration scheme would be secured via condition but the Schematic Restoration Scheme (CD 00-06), included as part of the planning application, is informative. The introduced acid grassland would be sown in the first suitable planting season, once the residual topographical profile of the appeal site has been established. Grassland, as a landscape element, requires a relatively short period of time to establish, and seeds would typically germinate the same or the following year – depending on the season. I expect that the grassland would be visually evident within the following growing season.

- 3.91. The areas of new native mixed scrub species seeding and planting would take a few years to establish and mature, but depending on the species composition and growth rate they could be visually evident within the first 5 years post completion. I accept that it may take longer for the new plant communities to fully mature. With regard the proposed gorse scrub and heathland areas, gorse and heather are not fast growing species, but the plants are readily available as an approximately 15–30cm high stock, and the proposed areas can be overplanted to provide high density ground cover; the texture and colour of the flowering gorse and heather could be achieved relatively quickly, and potentially within the first 5 years post completion.
- 3.92. At the same time, the tree vegetation retained within the western part of the appeal site would continue to grow, with an approximately 0.5m annual growth, and continue to mature throughout the operational stage of the appeal scheme, gaining height and canopy spread, and providing further visual and physical enclosure. . Following the restoration proposals, the appeal scheme would positively contribute the conservation, management and enhancement of the local landscape.

4. Visual Amenity

- 4.1. In order to gain a better understanding of the extent and nature of the change brought about by the appeal scheme on the appearance of the local landscape, it is necessary to examine the effect of the appeal scheme on the general and recreational amenity of the landscape and the perception of those visual receptors (people) using the landscape.
- 4.2. Visual amenity is defined in the *GLVIA3* (Glossary, page 158) as:
- “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.”***
- 4.3. In order to confirm the potential visual envelope of the appeal scheme I have reviewed the Zone of Theoretical Visibility plan prepared as part of the submitted LVIA (its Figure 3) and visited the viewpoints agreed with the Council during the application stage.
- 4.4. The ZTV plan represents a worse-case level of visibility from the surrounding landscape whilst taking into account the landform, built form and large blocks of woodland vegetation present in the local area. It does not take into account smaller groups of structural vegetation, the vegetation within the appeal site, or field boundary hedgerows which are particularly frequent in the landscape west of Cringles, i.e. the western part of the study area where the level of theoretical visibility is relatively consistent. For context, this area coincides with the Airedale LCA and the Enclosed pasture LCT, which is characterised by frequent hedgerows, as acknowledged in the published *Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document* (October 2008) (CD 07-01): ***“It is, however, distinct in that hedges and hedgerow trees are more prominent in the landscape than dry stone walls.”***
- 4.5. The surrounding countryside is crossed by a number of PRowWs. Many of these PRowWs tend to follow the existing field boundaries within the landscape and as a consequence these routes are often flanked by hedgerows and tree cover, particularly in the western part of the study area. This vegetation provides a physical and visual barrier often interrupting views towards the appeal site.
- 4.6. I have considered the LVA viewpoints associated with PRowW users (CD 01-14) and, for ease, provide a summary of my assessment below in a tabular form.
- 4.7. The below is my short commentary on the sequence of works associated with the appeal scheme. When analysing the viewpoints and establishing the scale of effects I do not provide exhaustive narrative, but rather comment on the key aspects of the appeal scheme, and particularly those elements that would exert visual influence as perceived from the given location. At the outset I wish to reiterate that the open and panoramic, and often exposed and distant nature of the views gained, substantially act to mitigate against the perceived change. The appeal site forms a small component of the overall composite view. There are no views where the appeal site and appeal scheme would form the dominant feature or be seen in isolation without any wider landscape context. Even at close range views, the receptors gain an appreciation of the distant and often elevated landscape beyond, and views are not solely focused on the appeal site.

- 4.8. Due to the nature of the work, being a dimensional stone quarry, it is accepted that extraction work may occur simultaneously within the adjoining Phases – reflecting the proposed maximum excavation contours, i.e., the quarry benches; such that work in the southern part of Phase 2 – 4 would be completed first with the Restoration Phase A being implemented in advance of the extraction of the northern part of Phase 2 – 4 and subsequent Phase 5 and Phase 6, to avoid the appeal site being waste bound.
- 4.9. The works would initially include levelling and screening the existing material within the area identified as Phase 1. Phase 1 would incorporate part of the existing quarry face. As a result, the ground levels would reduce to 232m – 240m AOD, being the final extraction contours in 2m incremental terraces. The access would slope into the newly excavated quarry bottom, with the higher ground around retained to help enclose, physically and visually, the works in Phase 1 area.
- 4.10. Moving on, the works would include soil stripping across Phase 2, and moving it to Phase 1. Subsequently the extraction would begin, starting from the southern boundary and moving towards the northern part of Phase 2, which may happen simultaneously with the initial extraction works taking place in the southern part of Phase 3. Phase 2 would remove the remaining part of the quarry face, the south central part, and the highest point of the appeal site, with the final extraction contours between approximately 236m – 244m AOD.
- 4.11. Phase 3 would result in further incremental change to the profile of the appeal site and would remove the higher ground in the south central and central part of the appeal site. The extraction works would be visually screened, in parts, by the landform in the south eastern part of the site – Phase 4, which would have not been extracted yet. Any mineral waste would be stored within the Phase 2 area. The final extraction contours within Phase 3 would be between approximately 240m – 246m AOD
- 4.12. Subsequently, soil stripping would occur within Phase 4 with the soil transported to the Phase 1 area. The excavation would begin from west to east, and then north towards Phase 5. The mitigation measures would include an offset from the existing perimeter wall with the rerouted PRow enclosed by a new stone wall. The final extraction contours would be at approximately 242m – 248m AOD, some 7m lower than the retained buffer near the site's south eastern corner, and some 4m lower than the site's eastern edge. With the work starting at the southern edge of the appeal site and moving north, the unexcavated land on the northern edge of the appeal site – that associated with Phase 5 – would act to screen the works from the north and north east, as illustrated by Photomontage of Viewpoint 2 (application drawing 232/5-11a) (**CD 01-45**).
- 4.13. The Restoration Phase A would be completed prior to the extraction works associated with Phase 5 and Phase 6.
- 4.14. Phase 5 and Phase 6 are located in the northern part of the appeal site, with the landform gently sloping north and north east. The final extraction contours would be at approximately 240m – 248m AOD within Phase 5 and 248m – 252m AOD within Phase 6. The retained ground levels near the north western corner of the extraction works (the western edge of Phase 5) would read approximately 246m – 254m AOD with the northern edge of the appeal site (north of Phase 6) reading 253m AOD. A 1.2m high stone wall marks the northern and southern edge of the appeal site, and acts to restrict views. Views from Public Footpath Silsden 18 and Bridleway Silsden 17 would include the activities within Phase 5, and then the subsequent Phase 6, with simultaneous restoration work within the

Restoration Phase A in the south eastern part of the appeal site. The restoration works would include backfilling the previously excavated areas with the mineral waste stored on site, and then moving the reserved soil from the Phase 1 area, and re-seeding /replanting. The final restoration levels are such that the exposed quarry face on the southern edge of Phase A, retained after the extraction has been completed, would be partially visible. The new stone wall enclosing the re-routed Public Footpath Silsden 18 would be also visible.

- 4.15. The restoration proposals, in simple terms, aim to restore the dome / undulating topographical profile of the appeal site, in order to echo the former natural profile of the appeal site and reflect the undulating topography of the local landscape. The retained soil and mineral waste would be utilised to restore the appeal site. Following the restoration proposals, the appeal scheme would positively contribute the conservation, management and enhancement of the local landscape.
- 4.16. In summary, Phase 1 would be inconsequential – negligible in visual terms upon the close range and long range PRoW users in the local and wider landscape, including the elevated Addingham High Moor to the south east and the receptors in the western part of the study area – the Enclosed pasture LCT of the Airedale LCA. I accept that the closest residential receptors may experience some noise and limited movement associated with Phase 1 seen through the tree canopies, but given the intervening vegetation and landform within the Phase 5 and Phase 6 areas, the nature of the work, and the final extraction levels, the visual effects would not be material and I consider the visual effects to be negligible.
- 4.17. The receptors associated with Public Footpaths Silsden 18 and Silsden 19, as they skirt the edge of the extraction works and the appeal site, would experience the works within Phase 2 – Phase 6 at close quarters with the effects major adverse. Such effects would be highly localised, temporary, and reversible upon the completion of the restoration scheme. I consider the residual effects, where direct views into the site land are available, to be negligible.
- 4.18. As the receptors associated with Public Footpaths Silsden 18 and Silsden 19 move away from the appeal scheme, the inter-visibility with the appeal scheme would vary. Phase 2 and Phase 3 would become increasingly screened in views from the north, north east, and east, being screened by the remaining landscape within the appeal site, with the extraction levels considerably lower than the landform in the subsequent Phases 4 – 6. Some limited movement and noise, and work as the soil stripping and extraction starts to lower the profile of the appeal site, would be identifiable in close range views such as Viewpoint 1 & Viewpoint 2.
- 4.19. The soil stripping would be carried out by a small scale excavator, similar in scale and appearance to agricultural plant. I do not consider such activities to be materially harmful, in visual terms. I also note areas of recent tree planting along Bridleway Silsden 17. With time, this would have the ability to filter views towards the appeal scheme, reducing the adverse visual influence.
- 4.20. With regard to Phase 4 – Phase 6, the receptors may gain an understanding of the activities occurring within the appeal site as the soil stripping and extraction takes place. In views from the north and east, the profile of the appeal site would incrementally reduce. In views from the east, Phase 4 would result in a ‘void’ / reduced profile with the land whilst Phase 5 and Phase 6 remain as existing.

- 4.21. It is important to recognise that the extraction works in Phase 5 and Phase 6 would occur simultaneously with the restoration works taking place in the southern part of the appeal site – Phase A. In other words, the appeal scheme would result in partial change to the profile of the site, progressively shifting and being lowered, and being restored at the same time. The appeal scheme would not result in a large void.
- 4.22. In views from the south east and south, depending on the elevation of the viewpoint, initially views would be limited to the soil stripping within Phase 2 – Phase 4, with the movement and extraction works largely screened – given the final extraction contours. The overall topographical profile of the appeal site would be lowered as the works within Phase 2 – Phase 4 progressively move east. This would partially reveal the area in the western most part of the appeal site and the retained vegetation, but the movement at the quarry bottom would not be evident or would exert only limited influence given the distance and change in levels. The sequence of work is such that views would eventually include the exposed edge to Phase 5, which is likely to be the only apparent element of the appeal scheme with Phase 6 retained as existing, and subsequently extracted, as illustrated by Photomontage of Viewpoint 4 (application drawing 232/5-11b) (**CD 01-45**).
- 4.23. The profile of the appeal site would be reduced, revealing the vegetation in the western most part of the appeal site and the fields to the west of it, i.e. between the appeal site and Cringles. The backcloth of the pastoral fields, the greens of the fields, and tree canopies along the A6034 would act to reduce the perceived change to a substantial degree.
- 4.24. With regards to the views from the west, I consider Phase 1 would be inconsequential and negligible. The works associated with Phase 2- Phase 4 would be identifiable to a degree, as part of the distant landscape – the profile of the appeal site becomes reduced, and the exposed quarry face would become identifiable. The sequence of work and modest incremental change, coupled with the screening provided by the retained vegetation in the western part of the appeal site, would act to mitigate the visual harm. In the majority of views, with the exception of Viewpoint 10, none of the work would breach the skyline or change the overall smooth horizon created by the ‘saddle’ of the Upland Pastures LCT. The work during Phase 5 and Phase 6 would be less screened due to the lack of vegetation in this part of the appeal site and slope of the land but without any notable change to the overall panoramic view.
- 4.25. During my site visit, I visited the LVA viewpoints (**CD 01-14**) in the western part of the study area and walked the associated PRoWs. I noted that the appeal site is identifiable in these views not due to its elevation or topographical profile but rather due to the change in texture and colours, and the presence of tree vegetation within its western part, which differ from the surrounding upland landscape. My eyes were drawn towards the highly elevated and dramatic Addingham High Moor and the valley landscape, particularly that to the south east where the contrast between the moorland and valley landscape was the strongest, and south towards Silsden, backclothed by the undulating pastoral landscape.
- 4.26. In certain views, the appeal site was identifiable due to the tree vegetation along its western edge, but equally I noted frequent locations from where the views were screened or substantially restricted and directed away from the appeal site. This was particularly the case on the lower valley slopes, north of Silsden as one travels along PRoWs and the Millennium Way, towards Hay Hills Farm and then Dales Bank Farm, and into the valley of Great Gill Beck. The upper valley slopes do offer less restricted views towards the appeal site, but such views are increasingly distant and exposed, with the views elevated,

panoramic and the landscape perceived as large scale. Receptors have the ability to gain unrestricted panoramic views to the north, east, and south. Addingham High Moor and the distant moorlands to the north and north east (Beamsley Moor) attract attention and deflect the focus away from the appeal site and the 'saddle' landscape. All those factors act to diminish the degree of change brought about by the limited visibility and phased operation of the appeal scheme, without any notable change to the overall view.

- 4.27. Views from the PRowS and public highways to the north west, around Walker's Lane and Silsden Moor, are increasingly screened by the trees in Cringles and/or landform in the foreground. The appeal site is not evident or is not visible. The visual effects would not be material.
- 4.28. In views from the north, the north western part of the appeal site is identifiable in the distance, due to the slope, seen as part of the overall wide panorama. The made-up ground and trees along the western edge of the appeal site, coupled with the landform in Phase 5 and Phase 5 act to screen the remaining part of the appeal site. Again, my attention was drawn towards the Addingham High Moor and the valley landscape, not the appeal site. This coupled with the distance and exposed elevated nature of the views act to diminish the perceived change in the views, and the visual amenity of the receptors associated with this area would not be materially harmed.
- 4.29. With regard the residential receptors in Cringles, such views would be private views – thus I excluded them from the below summary Table 2. In the majority of views, the made-up ground and trees in the western part of the appeal site are visible and would continue to form the middle ground and contribute to the view, whilst partially screening the extraction works. The overall profile of the appeal site would be reduced, in sequence, and this would act to mitigate the degree of change with the receptors being able to familiarise themselves with the occurring change. Where direct to less restricted views are available, I accept that the degree of change would vary from medium to low with the effects major to moderate adverse, temporary, and reversible.
- 4.30. The submitted restoration plans did not envisage any additional tree planting. Having considered the appeal scheme, the views and affected receptors I consider that additional mitigation tree planting would help mitigate the degree of harm upon the residents at Cringles. This could be achieved by a suitably worded condition. An example of such planting proposals is included in Appendix 2 to my Proof (Optional Landscape Mitigation Proposals Plan, drawing number 232/5 – 16, Revision 1.0, prepared by The Mineral Planning Group Ltd.).

Table 2: Summary of Visual Effects

Viewpoint Reference Number	Distance to Appeal Site (approximate)	Receptor	Value	Susceptibility	Sensitivity	Key observation	Visual Amenity (Year 1: temporary worst case scenario)				LVA Assessment
							Magnitude Year 1	Effects Year 1	Magnitude Year 25	Effects Year 25	Effects Year 1
Viewpoint 1	0.3km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High	Incremental change – Phase 3 partially perceptible, Phase 4 lowers the profile; existing land within Phase 5 and Phase 6 still visible, then extracted. Restoration Phase A in place.	Medium	Major	Negligible	Negligible	Minor to Moderate Adverse
Viewpoint 2	0.43km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High	Incremental change – Phase 4 largely screened. Phase 5 and Phase 6 still visible, then extracted opening up the views but the overall profile is retained with the Restoration Phase A being implemented.	Low	Moderate	Negligible	Negligible	Minor to Moderate Adverse
Viewpoint 3	1.7km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High	Incremental change – Phase 3 and 4 partially visible as they lower the profile, very limited influence. Exposed edge to Phase 5 and Phase 6 visible, then extracted, with the Restoration Phase A in place. With time Phase B acts to restrict visibility of Phase 5 and 6.	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Adverse
Viewpoint 4	1.2km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Adverse
Viewpoint 5	1.1km	Road user	Medium	Medium	Medium	Incremental change – Phase 3 and 4 partially visible as they lower the profile, very limited influence. Exposed edge to Phase 5 and Phase 6 partially visible / partially screened by the Restoration Phase A, and then Phase B.	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Adverse
		PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	~
Viewpoint 6	1.4km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Adverse
Viewpoint 7	0.9km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High	Incremental change – Phase 2 and Phase 3 partially visible as they lower the profile, very limited influence. The Restoration Phase A, and then Phase B screen Phase 5 and Phase 6.	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Moderate Adverse
Viewpoint 8	0.3km	Road user	Medium	Medium	Medium	Perimeter wall screens the extraction works within the appeal site The profile of the appeal site reduced and vegetation removed.	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Neutral
Viewpoint 9	2.3km	Road user	Medium	Medium	Medium	Made-up ground and trees in the western part of the appeal site visible. Incremental change – Phase 3 and Phase 4 lower the profile and new quarry face temporarily visible. Phase 5 and Phase 6 seen side on – quarry face not evident / not visible.	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Neutral
		PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	~
Viewpoint 10	1.4km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Adverse
Viewpoint 11	1.7km	Road user	Medium	Medium	Medium	Made-up ground and trees in the western part of the appeal site visible. Incremental change – Phase 2, Phase 3, and Phase 4 lower the profile and new quarry face temporarily visible. Phase 5 and Phase 6 seen side on – quarry face partially visible.	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	~
		PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Adverse

Viewpoint 12	1.7km	Road user	Medium	Medium	Medium	Made-up ground and trees in the western part of the appeal site visible. Incremental change – extraction works in the northern part of Phase 2, and Phase 3 theoretically visible, but views partially screened by Phase 5 and Phase 6 and trees within the appeal site. The overall profile of the appeal site would reduce, new quarry face temporarily visible. Restoration Phase A in place. Extraction works in Phase 5 and Phase 6 very limited influence – quarry face not visible, but the profile reduced. Advancing Phase B.	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor Neutral
		PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	
Viewpoint 13	0.37km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High	Incremental change – extraction in Phase 2, Phase 3, and Phase 4 largely screened. Views include Phase 5 and Phase 6, then extracted opening up the views but the overall profile is retained with the Restoration Phase A being implemented. Advancing Phase B restores the round profile of the appeal site.	Medium	Major	Negligible	Negligible	Minor to Moderate Adverse
Viewpoint 14	0.2km	Road user	Medium	Medium	Medium	Incremental change – works in Phase 1 and extraction in Phase 2 and Phase 3 visible; Phase 4 partially screened; the profile reduced and exposed quarry face. Views of Phase 5 and Phase 6 heavily filtered – tree canopies but the exposed quarry face may be identifiable, but the overall profile is restored with the Restoration Phase A being implemented. Advancing Phase B restores the round profile of the appeal site.	Low	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	~
		PRoW user	Medium	High	High		Medium	Major	Negligible	Negligible	Major Adverse
Viewpoint 15	0km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High	Direct views into the interior of the quarry	High	Major	Negligible	Negligible	Major Adverse
Viewpoint 16	0km	PRoW user	Medium	High	High		High	Major	Negligible	Negligible	Major Adverse

5. Planning Policy Context

5.1. This section of my Proof comments on policies that are referred to in the decision notice. The commentary is from a landscape and visual perspective with interpretation and comment on these policies from a planning perspective addressed in the Planning Proof of Evidence.

5.2. The RfR No.2 relates to landscape and visual matters and states:

“2. The proposal as submitted is unacceptable, as it will not make a positive contribution towards the conservation, management and enhancement of the diversity of landscapes within the designated landscape character area of the Rombalds Ridge Landscape Character Area. The change is not considered acceptable, as it will have adverse landscape and visual effects, particularly in relation to; the loss of an area of distinct character and a local landmark within the broader character area; the significant impact on recreational use due to the visual impact of the quarry works; the length of disruption and disturbance locally and on the broader enjoyment of the surrounding Landscape over a minimum of 20 years with potentially an additional 15 years to achieve some maturity in the restored scheme; the adverse visual impacts on amenity for residential properties; the adverse impacts on tourism; and the adverse impacts on recreation.

As such, the proposal is contrary to policies EN4, DS2, DS5, EN1 EC4 (F) and EN9 (3) of the Bradford Core Strategy, the Landscape Character Assessment SPD for Rombalds Ridge and SWES5 and SWES6 of The Steeton with Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Development Plan.”

Bradford Core Strategy

5.3. Policy EN4 Landscape, states:

“A. Development Decisions as well as Plans, policies and proposals should make a positive contribution towards the conservation, management and enhancement of the diversity of landscapes within the District of:

- ***Airedale***
- ***Rombalds Ridge***
- ***Thornton and Queensbury***
- ***Wharfedale***
- ***Esholt***
- ***Wilsden***
- ***Tong Valley***
- ***South Bradford***
- ***Pennine Upland***

- **Worth and North Beck Valley**

This should use the approach set out in the Landscape Character Assessment SPD.

B. The following criteria will also be used to assess whether change can be considered acceptable:

1. The potential for adverse landscape and/or visual effects.

2. The importance of cultural associations, historic elements in the landscape and the setting of settlements and heritage assets.

3. The opportunity to contribute towards positive restoration of landscapes, particularly in the urban fringe, achieve greater habitat connectivity, enhancement of characteristic semi-natural vegetation and accessible natural greenspace.

In circumstances where impacts can be managed and the degree of change made acceptable, contributions need to relate to the scale of the project under consideration, and the significance of any assets affected.

Where there is potential for adverse landscape and/ or visual effects, a landscape and visual impact assessment or appraisal will be required. Proposals also need to fulfil the criteria set out in Policy DS2 Working with the Landscape.”

- 5.4. The outcome of the Policy is noted as: ***“Locally distinctive landscape character and quality will have been safeguarded and enhanced. Proposals make a positive contribution to the management and enhancement of landscapes within the district.”***
- 5.5. The appeal scheme would introduce a degree of change. However, this would be almost inevitable in any proposal for the extraction of dimension stone, for which there is a recognised need. Moreover, minerals can only be worked where they are found, and – as the other sites referred to in para 3.60 above demonstrate – the northern part of Rombalds Ridge which includes the appeal site is one such area. In the case of the appeal site, however, the changes would be highly localised with the change geographically limited to the appeal site itself. A degree of visual influence would occur across the host landscape, but this would be limited given the characteristics of the appeal site and proposed nature of works. The character of the local landscape would prevail.
- 5.6. The tree vegetation along the western edge of the appeal site would be retained and managed to ensure its longevity and to provide continuous screening. This can be strengthened with additional tree planting.
- 5.7. The change would be time limited, temporary, and reversible. Residual effects would be negligible. The characteristics of the host LCA are such that the restoration proposal aims to restore the dome undulating profile of the appeal site with scrub low height vegetation to aid biodiversity. This would help manage the current character of the local landscape and contribute to its biodiversity.
- 5.8. Policy DS2 Working with the Landscape states:

“Planning Decisions including Plans and development proposals should take advantage of existing features, integrate development into the wider landscape and create new quality spaces. Wherever possible designs should:

A. Retain existing landscape and ecological features and integrate them within developments as positive assets.

B. Work with the landscape to reduce the environmental impact of development.

C. Take opportunities to link developments into the wider landscape and green space networks.

D. Ensure that new landscape features and open spaces have a clear function, are visually attractive and fit for purpose, and have appropriate management and maintenance arrangements in place.

E. Use plant species which are appropriate to the local character and conditions.”

- 5.9. The appeal scheme takes advantage of the natural resource which has to be extracted where it occurs and is readily available – a constraint accepted in the Council’s *Minerals Background Report & Evidence Report* (February 2021) paragraph 1.3: ***“A key aspect of mineral development is that working can only take place where resources occur naturally”*** and within the area already affected by former quarry work – thus partially degraded.
- 5.10. The overwhelming majority of the existing tree vegetation would be retained.
- 5.11. The existing perimeter stone wall, which is characteristic of the local landscape would be retained with additional sections created to provide safe PRow route. This would be wholly in keeping with the character of the local landscape.
- 5.12. The restoration scheme and proposed planting would echo the former profile of Horn Crag and its emerging vegetation, and this would act as a link between the vegetation around Cringles and the wider upland.
- 5.13. This would help integrate the appeal scheme, once the remediation works have been completed, reduce the level of harm to negligible scale, and create an area reflective of the local landscape.
- 5.14. Policy DS5 Safe and Inclusive Places states:

“Plans and development proposals should make a positive contribution to people’s lives through high quality, inclusive design. In particular they should:

A. Be designed to ensure a safe and secure environment and reduce the opportunities for crime.

B. Allow flexibility to adapt to changing needs and circumstances.

C. Be designed to ensure buildings and places provide easy access for all, including those with physical disabilities.

D. Encourage social interaction and where appropriate provide opportunities for members of the community to meet and come into contact with each other.

E. Include appropriate design arrangements for servicing, waste handling, recycling and storage.

F. Not harm the amenity of existing or prospective users and residents.”

5.15. The appeal scheme would bring about some limited sequential and incremental harm, which would be highly localised, and time limited. The harm would be reversible in a relatively short span of time.

5.16. Policy EC4 (F) Sustainable Economic Growth point F), states:

“F. Encouraging economic enterprises which develop or enhance the viability of tourism, culture and leisure based activities, and the built and natural environment, whilst having regard to accessibility and sustainable transport local character and design.”

5.17. The emphasis here is on ‘encouraging’ and given the characteristics of the appeal site and the appeal scheme, it would not have any material or lasting harm upon the local natural environment, with the identified limited harm being reversible. As noted above, locally sourced dimension stone is needed both for the repair of existing buildings in the area and to ensure that new buildings are in keeping with the character of the area. Stone taken from the appeal site will therefore assist in developing and enhancing the built environment of the surrounding area.

5.18. Policy EN9 New and Extended Minerals Extraction Sites, Point (3), states:

“3. The development would not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on people or the environment in terms of pollution, flooding or land stability risks, or harm to amenity, heritage assets or their settings, or harm the character of the landscape, taking into account the cumulative effects associated with all existing or approved developments affecting the area and the environmental criteria set out in other Local Development Plan Policies, ...”

5.19. As I have explained above, any harm arising as a consequence of the appeal scheme would be limited, highly localised, and non-material. Highly localised material harm would occur upon the closest visual receptors, and would include private views.

5.20. Most importantly, the harm would be time limited, of relatively short duration and not experienced throughout the whole 20 years of operation of the appeal scheme. In any case such harm would be wholly reversible.

5.21. Policy EN1 Protection and improvements in provision of Open Space and Recreation Facilities states:

“Open Space

A. Land identified as recreation open space, or which is currently or was formerly used for recreation open space will be protected from development. Recreation open space includes the following range of typologies; parks and gardens, natural and semi-natural greenspaces, green corridors, amenity and local greenspace, outdoor



sports facilities, provision for children, allotments, civic spaces and also areas of water which offer opportunities for sport and recreation.

Exceptions will only be made where:

- 1. The proposal includes alternative equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity, quality, accessibility and management arrangements, and*
- 2. The loss of open space does not lead to a deficiency in the area, taking into account the most recent assessments of existing provision and future proposals for growth, and*
- 3. The site is not suitable to meet any identified deficiency in other types of open space.*

Provision of Open Space and Recreation Facilities

B. Housing developments will be required to provide for new or improved open space, sport and recreational facilities through:

- 1. The provision of new open space, preferably on-site,*
- 2. A contribution to the provision of new open space off-site; or*
- 3. The enhancement of existing open space nearby.*

When identifying land for development involves the release of greenfield or green belt land, identified deficiencies in recreation open space within the local area will need to be addressed, in addition to meeting the needs of future residents.

Green Infrastructure, recreation facilities and open space, including playing pitches and natural greenspace, to meet existing and future needs will be identified in the proposals maps of Local Plan documents.

Mitigating Recreational Pressure on the South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC

C. Residential developments which contribute to recreational pressure upon the South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC will be required to mitigate these effects through provision of new recreational natural greenspaces or improvements to existing open spaces.

Local Greenspace

D. The Council will work with local communities to identify areas of Local Green Space in the local plan and neighbourhood plans. Local greenspace which is valued for amenity, recreation and wildlife or contributes towards character, distinctiveness and visual quality will be protected from development, other than in very special circumstances which are supported by the local community.

Built Recreation Facilities

E. Where major development is proposed in an area with a clearly identified deficiency, in either the quality or quantity, of built recreation facilities, contributions may be required to secure provision of new or enhanced facilities.

Standards of Provision and Maintenance

F. Standards of provision relating to quantity, quality and accessibility, for open space and recreation facilities and requirements for future maintenance will be developed as part of the evidence base and identified in the Local Plan.”

- 5.22. I begin with the observation that, although RfR2 alleges conflict with Policy EN1, neither it nor the Council’s Statement of Case identifies the part of the policy which is alleged to be relevant. Parts B, C, E and F clearly have no application. The appeal site has not been identified as a Local Green Space which qualifies for protection under part D. This leaves Part A, which is concerned with “recreation open space”. The appeal site is not a “recreation open space”, and it is far from clear from the list of typologies that Part A is intended to cover footpaths in rural areas. However, in so far as Part A may be applicable with the route of the existing PRoW has been disrupted by the former quarry work, and use of the current access would constitute trespass. The appeal scheme has the ability to formalise the PRoW, whilst creating a safe and attractive route. I do not consider there is any conflict with EN1.

Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden Neighbourhood Development Plan Made Plan (June 2011)

- 5.23. Policy SWES5 Airedale’s Valued Landscape states:

“New development proposals, where appropriate, will be required to incorporate the following landscape design principles in order to protect and enhance the valued landscape character of the area:

a) Layout and design should be appropriate to the area and should create a good quality-built environment which integrates with the distinctive local built form and landscape.

b) Development proposals likely to result in significant visual impacts are required to be supported by a landscape visual impact assessment setting out how the design aims to respect and respond positively to the character of the site and its surrounding area.

c) Retention and conservation of existing field boundaries, especially in areas of enclosed pasture.

d) Retention of trees, areas of woodland, hedgerows, and stonewalling. Any additional planting should be of suitable native species, well related to existing woodland and be concentrated in areas where it will have a suitable visual impact.

f) Protection and enhancement of important views by limiting the height or visibility of large vertical structures. In assessing impacts on such views particular regard should be had to:

i. Views of, and from, the wooded incline and tower above Steeton.

ii. Views of Rombalds Ridge.

iii. Views of Airedale from Silsden Road and Holden Lane.

iv. Views along the floodplain pastures in Silsden.

v. Views along and from the Leeds and Liverpool Canal.

vi. Views from the towns of upper valley slopes and pastures.”

g) Careful siting, design, and screening of any development on upper slopes.

h) Strict control of urban influences on upper slopes and the Aire floodplain, including infrastructure and lighting; and

i) Conservation and retention of historic, narrow lanes.”

- 5.24. As outlined above, the Neighbourhood Plan does not clearly identify the extent of the “valued landscape” to which it refers. If and so far as these words are intended to reflect the NPPF concept of a “valued landscape”, I do not consider they apply to the appeal site.
- 5.25. In any event, the layout and phasing of the extraction works has been informed by the LVA (CD 01-14). I consider the proposed extraction phasing and restoration phasing to be well thought out and to considerably reduce the degree of landscape character and visual harm. The part retained landform and retained vegetation along the western edge of the appeal site act to restrict views into the appeal site, and the modest incremental change acts to reduce the degree of harm. The existing approximately 1.2m high stone wall that marks the edge of the appeal site would be retained. This key feature of the local landscape would not be directly affected and would act to restrict views into the extraction works from the surrounding countryside.
- 5.26. I also consider the appeal scheme to be compatible with point d) with the tree vegetation largely retained and continuing to influence the local landscape, whilst acting to screen and restrict views into the appeal site. This treed area would be subject to active management, while allowing self seeded trees to emerge, and increasing the amount of tree cover, which would be wholly reflecting of the well treed lower and upper slope around Cringles. With reference to point f) of the policy, as evidence in my analysis, the appeal scheme would not be visible, or views would be largely inconsequential and not materially harmful to the appreciation of the above identified natural assets and views, and not materially harmful to the overall perception of the Rombalds Ridge. The extraction works would be partially screened by the retained trees, and the phasing and shallow extraction benches collectively act to reduce the visibility of the appeal scheme with plant and movement highly localised to relatively small areas within the overall appeal site, and temporary. Any light spill, which would be limited, would be seen in direct context of the traffic along the A6034 and dwellings in Cringles. With regard to point i) and conservation and retention of historic, narrow lanes, the appeal scheme would not have any direct effects upon such features.
- 5.27. Policy SWES6 Access To The Countryside, Countryside Sport And Countryside Recreation states:

“To support access to the countryside, countryside sport and countryside recreation the following development of appropriate scale will be supported provided there are no



***detrimental impacts due to noise, visual impact, landscape impact or traffic generation:
a) Creation of new access points in to, and routes through the countryside unless this would lead to additional pressures on the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC.***

b) Open land uses.

In particular, development proposals should seek to protect the following routes (shown on Policies Map 1):

c) Sykes Lane for its relative tranquility, green infrastructure, and hedgerows

d) The remaining sections of the original turnpike road, including Pot Lane, the bridleway at rear of Airedale Hospital, from Thornhill Road to Lyon Road, and the track north of the bridleway, running at the side of the Hospital sports field.

- 5.28. The appeal scheme would not directly affect any of the above identified assets and would formalise the current access across the appeal site. The diverted PRow would continue to be available and offer attractive views of the local landscape.

6. Summary and Conclusions

- 6.1. In the light of the findings of my own landscape character and visual assessment, and also my own review and analysis of published assessments verified on site, and having considered these with regard to the Statement of Case, I have come to the following conclusions.
- 6.2. I have considered the appeal site and its landscape context, with reference to the published assessments and my own site visit, and have concluded that the appeal site and the local landscape are of medium value and medium susceptibility to the appeal scheme. Consequently, I have determined that the sensitivity of the host landscape to the appeal scheme would be medium.
- 6.3. I have also concluded that the appeal site is not prominent in local or long range views, and cannot be regarded as local landmark. During my site visit my eyes were drawn towards the highly elevated and dramatic Addingham High Moor and the valley landscape, particularly that to the south east where the contrast between the moorland and valley landscape was the strongest, and south towards Silsden, backclothed by the undulating pastoral landscape.
- 6.4. I have considered the landscape character of the locality and concluded that the appeal scheme can be accommodated in the receiving landscape without any undue harm to its character, landscape attributes and landscape criteria. The appeal scheme is small scale, concealed by the landform and vegetation, when visible views would be transient and geographically localised or seen as part of a wide expansive panorama which would act to reduce the degree of change. The characteristics of the appeal site and nature of the appeal scheme would result in limited change to the baseline character, and the phased operational stage of the appeal scheme would create limited incremental change over the course of some 20 years, which would be temporary and reversible.
- 6.5. With regard the visual amenity, I have considered all of the LVA viewpoints (**CD 01-14**) and have walked the associated PRoWs. Subsequently, I have concluded that the overwhelming majority of the visual receptors would not experience material harm with the visual effects at the lower end of the spectrum, temporary and time limited, and reversible. I have concluded, however, that the residential receptors within Cringles and those associated with the closest PRoWs located in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site would be subject to temporary material visual harm, which would be temporary and reversible. Such harm, however, can be mitigated against.
- 6.6. For the reasons stated above and those set out in my evidence, my view as an independent expert witness to this inquiry, is that the local undesignated landscape and its perception, and the visual amenity of recreational receptors is not affected, or effects are limited and highly localised and largely non material. Following the restoration proposals, the appeal scheme would positively contribute the conservation, management, and enhancement of the local landscape.



Appendix 1 Pegasus' LVIA Methodology

1. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

- 1.1 The Analysis is based on this methodology which has been undertaken with regards to best practice as outlined within the following publications:
- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition, 2013) - Landscape Institute / Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment;
 - Visual Representation of Development Proposals (2019) - Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19;
 - An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (2014) - Natural England;
 - An Approach to Landscape Sensitivity Assessment - To Inform Spatial Planning and Land Management (2019) - Natural England.
 - Reviewing Landscape Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs and Landscape and Visual appraisals (LVAs) Technical Guidance Note 1/20 Landscape Institute.
 - Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations, Technical Guidance Note 02/21 - Landscape Institute (2021).
- 1.2 GLVIA3 states within paragraph 1.1 that "Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is a tool used to identify and assess the significance of and the effects of change resulting from development on both the landscape as an environmental resource in its own right and on people's views and visual amenity."¹
- 1.3 GLVIA3 also states within paragraph 1.17 that when identifying landscape and visual effects there is a "need for an approach that is in proportion to the scale of the project that is being assessed and the nature of the likely effects. Judgement needs to be exercised at all stages in terms of the scale of investigation that is appropriate and proportional."²
- 1.4 GLVIA3 recognises within paragraph 2.23 that "professional judgement is a very important part of LVIA. While there is some scope for quantitative measurement of some relatively objective matters much of the assessment must rely on qualitative judgements"³ undertaken by a landscape consultant or a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI).
- 1.5 GLVIA3 notes in paragraph 1.3 that "LVIA may be carried out either formally, as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), or informally, as a contribution to the 'appraisal' of development proposals and planning applications."⁴ Although the proposed development is not subject to an EIA requiring an assessment of the

¹ Para 1.1, Page 4, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

² Para 1.17, Page 9, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

³ Para 2.23, Page 21, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

⁴ Para 1.3, Page 4, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

likely significance of effects, this assessment is also titled as an LVIA rather than an 'appraisal' in the interests of common understanding with other planning consultants.

1.6 The effects on cultural heritage and ecology are not considered within this LVIA.

Study Area

1.7 The study area for this LVIA covers a 3km radius from the site. However, the main focus of the assessment was taken as a radius of 1km from the site as it is considered that even with clear visibility the proposals would not be perceptible in the landscape beyond this distance.

Effects Assessed

1.8 Landscape and visual effects are assessed through professional judgements on the sensitivity of landscape elements, character and visual receptors combined with the predicted magnitude of change arising from the proposals. The landscape and visual effects have been assessed in the following sections:

- Effects on landscape elements;
- Effects on landscape character; and
- Effects on visual amenity.

1.9 Sensitivity is defined in GLVIA3 as "a term applied to specific receptors, combining judgments of susceptibility of the receptor to a specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor."⁵ Various factors in relation to the value and susceptibility of landscape elements, character, visual receptors or representative viewpoints are considered below and cross referenced to determine the overall sensitivity as shown in Table 1:

Table 1, Overall sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors				
	VALUE			
		HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
SUSCEPTIBILITY	HIGH	High	High	Medium
	MEDIUM	High	Medium	Medium
	LOW	Medium	Medium	Low

⁵ Glossary, Page 158, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

- 1.10 Magnitude of change is defined in GLVIA3 as “a term that combines judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short or long term in duration.”⁶ Various factors contribute to the magnitude of change on landscape elements, character, visual receptors and representative viewpoints.
- 1.11 The sensitivity of the landscape and visual receptor and the magnitude of change arising from the proposals are cross referenced in Table 11 to determine the overall degree of landscape and visual effects.

2. EFFECTS ON LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS

- 2.1 The effects on landscape elements includes the direct physical change to the fabric of the land, such as the removal of woodland, hedgerows or grassland to allow for the proposals.

Sensitivity of Landscape Elements

- 2.2 Sensitivity is determined by a combination of the value that is attached to a landscape element and the susceptibility of the landscape element to changes that would arise as a result of the proposals – see pages 88-90 of GLVIA3. Both value and susceptibility are assessed on a scale of high, medium or low.
- 2.3 The criteria for assessing the value of landscape elements and landscape character is shown in Table 2:

Table 2, Criteria for assessing the value of landscape elements and landscape character	
HIGH	<p>Designated landscape including but not limited to World Heritage Sites, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty considered to be an important component of the country’s character or non-designated landscape of a similar character and quality.</p> <p>Landscape condition is good and components are generally maintained to a high standard.</p> <p>In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution and absence of major built infrastructure, the landscape has an elevated level of tranquillity.</p> <p>Rare or distinctive landscape elements and features are key components that contribute to the landscape character of the area.</p>

⁶ Glossary, Page 158, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

MEDIUM	<p>Undesignated landscape including urban fringe and rural countryside considered to be a distinctive component of the national or local landscape character.</p> <p>Landscape condition is fair and components are generally well maintained.</p> <p>In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution and some major built infrastructure, the landscape has a moderate level of tranquillity.</p> <p>Rare or distinctive landscape elements and features are notable components that contribute to the character of the area.</p>
LOW	<p>Undesignated landscape including urban fringe and rural countryside considered to be of unremarkable character. Landscape condition may be poor and components poorly maintained or damaged.</p> <p>In terms of seclusion, enclosure by land use, traffic and movement, light pollution and significant major built infrastructure, the landscape has limited levels of tranquillity.</p> <p>Rare or distinctive elements and features are not notable components that contribute to the landscape character of the area.</p>

2.4 The criteria for assessing the susceptibility of landscape elements and landscape character is shown in Table 3:

Table 3, Criteria for assessing landscape susceptibility	
HIGH	<p>Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a low capacity to accommodate the type of development being proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form, etc.</p> <p>Nature of land use – landscapes with no or little existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed.</p> <p>Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are not easily replaced or substituted (e.g. ancient woodland, mature trees, historic parkland, etc).</p> <p>Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features, major infrastructure or industry is not present or where present has a limited influence on landscape character.</p>
MEDIUM	<p>Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a medium capacity to accommodate the type of development being proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form, etc.</p> <p>Nature of land use – landscapes with some existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed.</p>

	<p>Nature of existing elements – landscapes with components that are easily replaced or substituted.</p> <p>Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features, major infrastructure or industry is present and has a noticeable influence on landscape character.</p>
LOW	<p>Scale of enclosure – landscapes with a high capacity to accommodate the type of development being proposed owing to the interactions of topography, vegetation cover, built form, etc.</p> <p>Nature of land use – landscapes with extensive existing reference or context to the type of development being proposed.</p> <p>Nature of existing features – landscapes where detracting features or major infrastructure is present and has a dominating influence on the landscape.</p>

2.5 Various factors in relation to the value and susceptibility of landscape elements are assessed and cross referenced to determine the overall sensitivity as shown in Table 1.

2.6 Sensitivity is defined in GLVIA3 as “a term applied to specific receptors, combining judgments of susceptibility of the receptor to a specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor.”⁷ The definitions for high, medium, low landscape sensitivity are shown in Table 4:

Table 4, Criteria for assessing landscape sensitivity	
HIGH	<p>Landscape element or character area defined as being of high value combined with a high or medium susceptibility to change.</p> <p>Landscape element or character area defined as being of medium value combined with a high susceptibility to change.</p>
MEDIUM	<p>Landscape element or character area defined as being of high value combined with a low susceptibility to change.</p> <p>Landscape element or character area defined as being of medium value combined with a medium or low susceptibility to change.</p> <p>Landscape element or character area defined as being of low value combined with a high or medium susceptibility to change.</p>

⁷ Glossary, Page 158, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

LOW	Landscape element or character area defined as being of low value combined with a low susceptibility to change.
------------	---

Magnitude of Change on Landscape Elements

2.7 Professional judgement has been used to determine the magnitude of change on individual landscape elements within the site as shown in Table 5:

Table 5, Criteria for assessing magnitude of change for landscape elements	
HIGH	Substantial loss/gain of a landscape element.
MEDIUM	Partial loss/gain or alteration to part of a landscape element.
LOW	Minor loss/gain or alteration to part of a landscape element.
NEGLIGIBLE	No loss/gain or very limited alteration to part of a landscape element.

3. EFFECTS ON LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

3.1 Landscape character is defined as the “distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse.”⁸

3.2 The assessment of effects on landscape character considers how the introduction of new landscape elements physically alters the landform, landcover, landscape pattern and perceptual attributes of the site or how visibility of the proposals changes the way in which the landscape character is perceived.

Sensitivity of Landscape Character

3.3 Sensitivity is determined by a combination of the value that is attached to a landscape and the susceptibility of the landscape to changes that would arise as a result of the proposals – see pages 88-90 of GLVIA3. Both value and susceptibility are assessed on a scale of high, medium or low.

3.4 The criteria for assessing the value of landscape character is shown in Table 2.

⁸ Glossary, Page 157, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

3.5 The criteria for assessing the susceptibility of landscape character is shown in Table 3.

3.6 The overall sensitivity is determined through cross referencing the value and susceptibility of landscape character as shown in Table 1.

Magnitude of Change on Landscape Character

3.7 Professional judgement has been used to determine the magnitude of change on landscape character as shown in Table 6:

HIGH	Introduction of major new elements into the landscape or some major change to the scale, landform, landcover or pattern of the landscape.
MEDIUM	Introduction of some notable new elements into the landscape or some notable change to the scale, landform, landcover or pattern of the landscape.
LOW	Introduction of minor new elements into the landscape or some minor change to the scale, landform, landcover or pattern of the landscape.
NEGLIGIBLE	No notable or appreciable introduction of new elements into the landscape or change to the scale, landform, landcover or pattern of the landscape.

4. EFFECTS ON VISUAL AMENITY

4.1 Visual amenity is defined within GLVIA3 as 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.”⁹

4.2 The effects on visual amenity considers the changes in views arising from the proposals in relation to visual receptors including settlements, residential properties, transport routes, recreational facilities and attractions; and

⁹ Page 158, Glossary, GLVIA3

representative viewpoints or specific locations within the study area as agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

4.3 Sensitivity is determined by a combination of the value that is attached to a view and the susceptibility of the visual receptor to changes in that view that would arise as a result of the proposals – see pages 113-114 of GLVIA3. Both value and susceptibility are assessed on a scale of high, medium or low.

4.4 The criteria for assessing the value of views are shown in Table 7:

Table 7, Criteria for assessing the value of views	
HIGH	Views with high scenic value within designated landscapes including but not limited to World Heritage Sites, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, etc. Likely to include key viewpoints on OS maps or reference within guidebooks, provision of facilities, presence of interpretation boards, etc.
MEDIUM	Views with moderate scenic value within undesignated landscape including urban fringe and rural countryside.
LOW	Views with unremarkable scenic value within undesignated landscape with partly degraded visual quality and detractors.

4.5 The criteria for assessing the susceptibility of views are shown in Table 8:

Table 8, Criteria for assessing visual susceptibility	
HIGH	Includes occupiers of residential properties and people engaged in recreational activities in the countryside using public rights of way (PROW).
MEDIUM	Includes people engaged in outdoor sporting activities and people travelling through the landscape on minor roads and trains.
LOW	Includes people at places of work e.g. industrial and commercial premises and people travelling through the landscape on major roads and motorways.

4.6 Sensitivity is defined in GLVIA3 as “a term applied to specific receptors, combining judgments of susceptibility of the receptor to a specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that receptor.”¹⁰ The definitions for high, medium, low visual sensitivity are shown in Table 9:

Table 9, Criteria for assessing visual sensitivity	
HIGH	Visual receptor defined as being of high value combined with a high or medium susceptibility to change. Visual receptor defined as being of medium value combined with a high susceptibility to change.
MEDIUM	Visual receptor defined as being of high value combined with a low susceptibility to change. Visual receptor defined as being of medium value combined with a medium or low susceptibility to change. Visual receptor defined as being of low value combined with a high or medium susceptibility to change.
LOW	Visual receptor defined as being of low value combined with a low susceptibility to change.

Magnitude of Change on Visual Receptors

4.7 Professional judgement has been used to determine the magnitude of change on visual receptors as shown in Table 10:

Table 10, Criteria for assessing magnitude of change for visual receptors	
HIGH	Major change in the view that has a substantial influence on the overall view.
MEDIUM	Some change in the view that is clearly visible and forms an important but not defining element in the view.
LOW	Some change in the view that is appreciable with few visual receptors affected.
NEGLIGIBLE	No notable change in the view.

¹⁰ Glossary, Page 158, GLVIA, 3rd Edition

5. SIGNIFICANCE OF LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS

- 5.1 The likely significance of effects is dependent on all of the factors considered in the sensitivity and the magnitude of change upon the relevant landscape and visual receptors. These factors are assimilated to assess whether or not the proposed development will have a likely significant or not significant effect. The variables considered in the evaluation of the sensitivity and the magnitude of change is reviewed holistically to inform the professional judgement of significance.
- 5.2 Within Table 11 below, the major effects highlighted in grey are considered to be significant in terms of the EIA Regulations. It should be noted that whilst an individual effect may be significant, it does not necessarily follow that the proposed development would be unacceptable in the planning balance. The cross referencing of the sensitivity and magnitude of change on the landscape and visual receptor determines the significance of effect as shown in Table 11:

Table 11, Significance of landscape and visual effects				
		Sensitivity		
		HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
Magnitude of Change	HIGH	Major	Major	Moderate
	MEDIUM	Major	Moderate	Minor
	LOW	Moderate	Minor	Minor
	NEGLIGIBLE	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

6. TYPICAL DESCRIPTORS OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS

6.1 The typical descriptors of the landscape effects are detailed within Table 12:

Table 12, Typical Descriptors of Landscape Effects	
MAJOR BENEFICIAL	<p>Substantially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enhance the character (including value) of the landscape; - enhance the restoration of characteristic features and elements lost as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development; - enable a sense of place to be enhanced.
MODERATE BENEFICIAL	<p>Moderately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enhance the character (including value) of the landscape; - enable the restoration of characteristic features and elements partially lost or diminished as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development; - enable a sense of place to be restored.
MINOR BENEFICIAL	<p>Slightly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - complement the character (including value) of the landscape; - maintain or enhance characteristic features or elements; - enable some sense of place to be restored.
NEGLIGIBLE	<p>The proposed changes would (on balance) maintain the character (including value) of the landscape and would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be in keeping with landscape character and blend in with characteristic features and elements; - Enable a sense of place to be maintained.
NO CHANGE	<p>The proposed changes would not be visible and there would be no change to landscape character.</p>
MINOR ADVERSE	<p>Slightly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not quite fit the character (including value) of the landscape; - be a variance with characteristic features and elements; - detract from sense of place.
MODERATE ADVERSE	<p>Moderately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conflict with the character (including value) of the landscape; - have an adverse effect on characteristic features or elements; - diminish a sense of place.
MAJOR ADVERSE	<p>Substantially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be at variance with the character (including value) of the landscape; - degrade or diminish the integrity of a range of characteristic features and elements or cause them to be lost; - change a sense of place.

7. TYPICAL DESCRIPTORS OF VISUAL EFFECTS

7.1 The typical descriptors of the visual effects are detailed within Table 13:

Table 13, Typical Descriptors of Visual Effects	
MAJOR BENEFICIAL	Proposals would result in a major improvement in the view.
MODERATE BENEFICIAL	Proposals would result in a clear improvement in the view.
MINOR BENEFICIAL	Proposals would result in a slight improvement in the view.
NEGLIGIBLE	The proposed changes would be in keeping with, and would maintain, the existing view or where (on balance) the proposed changes would maintain the general appearance of the view (which may include adverse effects which are offset by beneficial effects for the same receptor) or due to distance from the receptor, the proposed change would be barely perceptible to the naked eye.
NO CHANGE	The proposed changes would not be visible and there would be no change to the view.
MINOR ADVERSE	Proposals would result in a slight deterioration in the view.
MODERATE ADVERSE	Proposals would result in a clear deterioration in the view.
MAJOR ADVERSE	Proposals would result in a major deterioration in the view.

8. NATURE OF EFFECTS

8.1 GLVIA3 includes an entry that states "*effects can be described as positive or negative (or in some cases neutral) in their consequences for views and visual amenity.*"¹¹ GLVIA3 does not, however, state how negative or positive effects should be assessed, and this therefore becomes a matter of professional judgement supported by site specific justification within the LVIA.

¹¹ Para 6.29, Page 113, GLVIA 3rd Edition




**Appendix 2 Optional Landscape Mitigation Proposals
Plan (drawing number 232/5 – 16, Revision 1.0, prepared
by The Mineral Planning Group Ltd)**



Proposed 'legacy' oak trees



Drawing Title:
Optional Landscape Mitigation Proposals
Plan

Key:
 Sacrificial fast growing tree planting

Notes:

Drawn by:	JG
Checked by:	CH
Approved by:	CH

The Mineral Planning Group Ltd.
 The Rowan Suite
 Oakdene House
 Cottingley Business Park
 Bingley, West Yorkshire
 BD16 1PE
 Tel: 01274 884599
 headoffice@mpgyorks.co.uk
 www.mpgyorks.co.uk



Scale:
1:1500 @ A3

Client:
A. D. Calvert Architectural Stone Supplies Ltd.

Site:
Horn Crag Quarry

Drawing Number:	232/5 - 16	Rev:	1.0
-----------------	------------	------	-----

Date:
18/01/2024

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Expertly Done.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.
Registered office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



Pegasus_Group



pegasusgroup



Pegasus_Group

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK