3.0 Planning Context

3.1 This section summarises relevant local landscape planning policy. Information on landscape character and landscape designations is described under the landscape baseline at Section 4.0 below.

3.2 The following polices from the Ribble Valley District wide Local Plan- Adopted June 1998 relevant to the application site are as follows:

Policy G1- Development Control

'All development proposals will be expected to provide a high standard of building design and landscape quality. Development which does so will be permitted, unless it adversely affects the amenities of the surrounding area.'

The proposed development is an extension to the existing caravan park and will not adversely affect the character and visual appearance of the surrounding area. There will be no impacts from the proposed development on designated sites. No existing trees will be lost as a result of the development. The proposed lodges are low in height and small in scale and finishes will be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area. The development will be heavily landscaped and screened with native species plants to further integrate the development within its surroundings and provide privacy. The layout of the development will include generous spacing between lodges and a wide landscape screen planting buffers between the lodges and the site boundaries. The existing public footpath and playing field within the site will be retained.

Policy ENV3- Development in Open Countryside

3.3 'In the open countryside outside the AONB and areas immediately adjacent to it, development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape area and should reflect local vernacular, scale, style, features and building materials. Proposals to conserve, renew and enhance landscape features, will be permitted, providing regard has been given for the characteristic landscape features of the area.'

3.4 The effect of the proposed development on the character of the surrounding area is negligible. The scale and finishes of the lodges will be appropriate to the character of the local area. Existing trees and hedgerows will also be retained on the site; native species planting will further integrate the development within the surrounding area. Once the proposed screen planting around the site matures the effects would reduce to none.

3.5 Policy RT1- Recreation and Tourism

3.6 'The Borough Council will approve development proposals which extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the Borough. This is subject to the following criteria being met: i) the proposal must not conflict with other policies of this plan; ii) the proposal must be physically well related to an existing main settlement or village or to an existing group of buildings; iii) the development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design; iv) the proposal should be well related to the existing highway network. It should not generate
additional traffic movements of a scale and type likely to cause undue problems or disturbance. Where possible the proposals should be well related to the public transport network; v) the site should be large enough to accommodate the necessary car parking, service areas and appropriate landscaped areas.'

3.7 The development is an extension to the existing caravan park and will be physically well related to it and accessed by the road network within the existing caravan park. The scale, siting, materials and design of the development will not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area. The site will be landscaped with dense buffer planting along the site boundaries and internally with woodland areas and specimen trees, all planting will be native species appropriate to the local character of the area.

Policy RT5 - New Static Caravan Sites and Extensions to Existing Sites

3.8 'The Council will normally approve proposals for the siting of new static holiday caravan sites, and the extension of existing sites providing the development: i) is not intrusive in the landscape; ii) has a safe access or is capable of being improved to a safe standard.'

3.9 The development will not be intrusive in the landscape; there would be no additional impact on the key characteristics of the surrounding landscape and overall landscape character as a result of the development. The site will be accessed through the existing caravan park.

3.10 The following polices from the Emerging Ribble Valley Core Strategy (including proposed main modifications) - relevant to the application site are as follows;

Key Statement EN3 - Sustainable Development and Climate Change

3.11 'The Council will seek to ensure that all development meets an appropriate recognised sustainable design and construction standard where viable to do so, in order to address both the causes and consequences of climate change. In particular, all development will be required to demonstrate how it will contribute towards reducing the Borough’s carbon footprint. In adapting to the effects of climate change it is expected that proposals for development will demonstrate how sustainable development principles and sustainable construction methods, such as the use of sustainable drainage systems, will be incorporated. New development in vulnerable areas should ensure that risks can be managed through suitable measures, including through the conservation of biodiversity, improvement of ecological networks and the provision of green infrastructure. All development should optimise energy efficiency by using new technologies and minimising the use of energy through appropriate design, layout, material and landscaping and address any potential issues relating to flood risk.'

3.12 No trees or hedgerows will be lost as a result of the proposed development. Existing trees and hedgerows will be retained. The additional new planting will make a positive contribution to the environment and act as a carbon sink and improve the green infrastructure and ecological networks of the area. The additional planting will also provide shelter to the development from prevailing winds.
Key Statement EN4- Biodiversity and Geodiversity

3.13 ‘The Council will seek wherever possible to conserve and enhance the area’s biodiversity and geodiversity and to avoid the fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats and help develop green corridors. Where appropriate, cross-Local Authority boundary working will continue to take place to achieve this. Negative impacts on biodiversity through development proposals should be avoided. Development proposals that adversely affect a site of recognised environmental or ecological importance will only be permitted where a developer can demonstrate that the negative effects of a proposed development can be mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for. It will be the developer’s responsibility to identify and agree an acceptable scheme, accompanied by appropriate survey information, before an application is determined. There should, as a principle, be no net loss of biodiversity.’

3.14 No trees or hedgerows will be lost as a result of the proposed development. Existing trees and hedgerows will be retained. The additional new planting will make a positive contribution to the environment and biodiversity.

Policy DMG1- General Considerations

3.15 ‘In determining planning applications, all development must:

• be of a high standard of building design which considers the Building in context principles (from the CABE/English Heritage building on context toolkit).

• be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials.

• consider the potential traffic and car parking implications.

• ensure safe access can be provided which is suitable to accommodate the scale and type of traffic likely to be generated.

• consider adequate day lighting and privacy distances.

• consider the environmental implications such as SSSIs, County Heritage sites, local nature reserves, Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitats and species, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protected Areas, protected species, green corridors and other sites of nature conservation.

• consider the protection and enhancement of public rights of way and access.

• all development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings.

• with regards to possible effects upon the natural environment, the council propose that the principles of the mitigation hierarchy be followed. this gives sequential preference to the following: 1) enhance the environment 2) avoid the impact 3) minimise the impact 4) restore the damage 5) compensate for the damage 6) offset the damage.

• all new development proposals will be required to take into account the risks arising from former coal mining and, where necessary, incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address them.'
• achieve efficient land use and the re use and remediation of previously developed sites where possible.

• have regard to public safety and secured by design principles.

• consider the density, layout and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities.

• not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.

• not prejudice future development which would provide significant environmental and amenity improvements.

• not result in the net loss of important open space, including public and private playing fields without a robust assessment that the sites are surplus to need.

• use sustainable construction techniques where possible and provide evidence that energy efficiency has been incorporated into schemes where possible.

• consider air quality and mitigate adverse impacts where possible.

• the code for sustainable homes and lifetime homes should be incorporated into schemes.

• have regard to the availability to key infrastructure with capacity. where key infrastructure with capacity is not available it may be necessary to phase development to allow infrastructure enhancements to take place.

• consider the potential impact on social infrastructure provision. In assessing this, regard must be had to the level of provision and standard of public open space in the area, the importance of playing fields and the need to protect school playing fields to meet future needs. Regard will also be had to the landscape or townscape of an area and the importance the open space has on this. This policy helps deliver the vision for the area and gives an overarching series of considerations that the council will have regard to in achieving quality development.’

The proposed development is an extension to the existing caravan park and will not adversely affect the character and visual appearance of the surrounding area. There will be no impacts from the proposed development on designated sites. No existing trees will be lost as a result of the development. The lodges are low in height and small in scale and finishes will be of high quality and sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area. The development will be heavily landscaped with native species plants to further integrate the development within its surroundings and provide privacy. The layout of the development will provide generous spacing between lodges and wide screen planting buffers between the lodges and the site boundaries. The existing public footpath and playing field within the site will be retained and enhanced.

Policy DME2- Landscape and Townscape Protection
3.16 'Development proposals will be refused which significantly harm important landscape or landscape features including: traditional stone walls, ponds, characteristic herb rich meadows and pastures, woodlands, copses, hedgerows and individual trees (other than in exceptional circumstances where satisfactory works of mitigation or enhancement would be achieved, including rebuilding, replanting and landscape management), townscape elements such as the scale, form, and materials that contribute to the characteristic townscape of the area, upland landscapes and associated habitats such as blanket bog botanically rich roadside verges (that are worthy of protection).'

3.17 There will be no significant harm as a result of the proposed development on important landscape or important landscape features.

Policy DMB3- Recreation and Tourism Development

3.18 'Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the borough. This is subject to the following criteria being met: the proposal must not conflict with other policies of this plan; the proposal must be physically well related to an existing main settlement or village or to an existing group of buildings, except where the proposed facilities are required in conjunction with a particular countryside attraction and there are no suitable existing buildings or developed sites available; the development should not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design; the proposals should be well related to the existing highway network. It should not generate additional traffic movements of a scale and type likely to cause undue problems or disturbance. Where possible the proposals should be well related to the public transport network; the site should be large enough to accommodate the necessary car parking, service areas and appropriate landscaped areas; and the proposal must take into account any nature conservation impacts using suitable survey information and where possible seek to incorporate any important existing associations within the development. Failing this then adequate mitigation will be sought.'

3.19 The proposed development is an extension to the existing caravan park and will be physically well related to it and accessed by the road network within the existing park. The scale, siting, materials and design of the development will not undermine the character, quality or visual amenities of the plan area. The site will be landscaped with dense buffer planting along the site boundaries and internally with woodland areas and specimen trees, all planting will be native species appropriate to the local character of the area.
4.0 Baseline Study-Landscape

4.1 The aim of the landscape baseline is to provide an understanding of the landscape in the area that may be affected, its constituent elements, its character and way it varies spatially, its geographic extent, its history, its condition and the way the landscape is experienced, and the value attached it.' Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013).

National and Regional Landscape Character Assessments

4.2 The study area is within the Natural England, National Character Area 33, Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill published in 2012 and National Character Area 35 Lancashire Valleys published in 2013. The national character area provides a broad scale context for understanding the landscape within the study area. The key characteristics described and also apparent in the study area are as follows:

4.3 National Character Area 33, Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill

- This is an undulating, rolling landscape, with local variation created by numerous river valleys and by the moorland outliers of Beacon Fell, Longridge Fell and Pendle Hill.

- The Bowland Fells provide a dramatic backdrop to the north.

- Semi-natural woodland, much of which is ancient, occurs in the main valley bottoms, side valleys and ridges, and is dominated by oak, ash and alder.

- Small- to medium-sized fields are defined by hedgerows with mature hedgerow trees. Drystone walls are also common in some areas.

- Land use is mainly permanent, improved pasture for livestock and dairy farming.

- There are species-rich hay meadows.

- Rough grazing, rushy pasture and traditionally managed meadows at higher elevations are of national importance for breeding waders such as redshank, lapwing, curlew and snipe. These are also important habitats for breeding skylark.

- There are numerous rivers of importance for many protected species, including bullheads, salmon, trout, eels, otters, kingfishers and dippers. There are also many Brooks and small reservoirs.

- There are many archaeological sites, particularly on the moorland fringes and in valleys where agriculture has been less intensive.

- A network of winding, hedge-lined lanes connect small, often linear, villages, hamlets and scattered farmsteads, mostly in local stone. Traditional stone barns
are commonplace on higher ground, and are of stone with slate or stone flag roofs.

- Isolated country houses set in formal parkland are typical of the area, and may be enclosed by belts of woodland and estate fencing.

4.4 National Character Area 35, Lancashire Valleys

- Broad valleys of the rivers Calder and Ribble and their tributaries run northeast to south-west between the uplands of Pendle Hill and the Southern Pennines.

- A Millstone Grit ridge extends between the Ribble and Calder catchments (including the Mellor Ridge and part of Pendle Hill).

- A broad trough underlain by Carboniferous Coal Measures provided the basis for early industrialisation.

- Field boundaries are regular to the west and more irregular to the east. They are formed by hedges with few hedgerow trees and by stone walls and post and-wire fences at higher elevations.

- Farmed land is predominantly pasture for grazing livestock, with areas of acid and neutral grassland, flushes and mires. There is some upland heath and rough pasture on Pendle Hill and the higher land to the south.

- Small, often ancient, broadleaved woodlands of oak, alder and sycamore extend along narrow, steep-sided cloughs on the valley.

- There are numerous large country houses with associated parklands, particularly on the northern valley sides away from major urban areas.

- There are many examples of proto-industrial heritage, including lime hushings, important turnpike and pack-horse routes involved in the early textile trade, and rural settlements with handloom weavers' cottages.

Local Landscape Character Assessment

4.5 The study area is within the Landscape Character Assessment of Lancashire, published in 2000. This county and local level character assessment provides more detail on the type of landscape that occurs within the study area. The study area is within; 13a Gargrave Drumlin Field, 5e Lower Ribblesdale, 2e Pendle Hill, 2f White Moor/ Burn Moor and 4i North Pendle Fringe Landscape Character Areas. The key characteristics described and also apparent in the study area are as follows:

4.6 13a Gargrave Drumlin Field
- This distinctive landscape type is characterised by a "field" of rolling drumlins. The consistent orientation of the hills gives the landscape a uniform grain, which is sometimes difficult to appreciate from within the field. The regular green hillocks are between about 100m and 200m high with steep sides and broad rounded tops.

- Pasture predominates and fields are bounded by clipped hedges or, more often, stone walls, which rise up over the hillocks accentuating the relief of the hills. Narrow streams wind through the drumlins draining the field. This area of drumlins occurs to the east of Ribblesdale. It is a typical drumlin field consisting of large scale regular hillocks reaching over 200m AOD.

- Although the drumlins have been formed from boulder clay, the underlying limestone geology is evident in the stone walls and local stone buildings which punctuate the scenery.

- Whilst the settlement pattern is dominated by farms, hamlets and villages, the small towns of Barnoldswick and Earby also lie on the edge of this area.

- There are long distance views from the highest hills.

4.7 5e Lower Ribblesdale

- Generally below 150m, the Undulating Lowland Farmland lies between the major valleys and the moorland fringes. The underlying geology is largely masked by heavy boulder clays and hedgerows predominate over stone walls.

- This lowland landscape is traversed by deeply incised, wooded cloughs and gorges. There are also many mixed farm woodlands, copses and hedgerow trees, creating an impression of a well wooded landscape from ground level and a patchwork of wood and pasture from raised viewpoints on the fells.

- The area also has many country houses whose boundary walls and designed landscapes add to the species diversity and visual appeal.

- There is a high density of farms and scattered cottages outside the clustered settlements, linked by a network of minor roads.

- This area follows the southern valley side of the Ribble, between Capster Green and Gisburn, on the lowland fringes of Pendle Hill. It is a particularly well settled area and provides a corridor for communication routes along the Ribble Valley. The A59(T) runs the length of the area, linking the settlements of Copster Green, Whalley, Clitheroe, Chatburn and Gisburn. The railway links the valley to Blackburn and Yorkshire.

4.8 2e Pendle Hill
• Pendle Hill is a millstone grit outcrop with a particularly distinctive landform; its steep scarp to the north and flat plateau top gives rise to a profile which is a landmark for many miles around; a 16th century beacon was also sited on Pendle Hill at ‘Big End’.

• The flat summit supports deep deposits of raw peat solis which infills hollows and produces a smooth undulating surface of blanket bog.

• The area is free from development pressure; no conifer plantations, quarries or communication masts detract from the visual appeal of the landscape.

• Erosion of the vegetation as a result of heavy grazing and recreational pressure is severe in places. It is only accessible by foot and there are a number of routes to the summit of this famous landmark. Views from the top at 557m are stunning.

4.9 2f White Moor/ Burn Moor

• An area of rounded hills to the east of Pendle Hill. The higher summits Burn Moor of White Moor, Burn Moor and Twiston Moor support heather moorland, with acid grassland on the lower slopes.

• There are occasional isolated stone farmsteads together with a network of footpaths crossing the hills, including the Pendle Way. Views from the slopes and summits are dramatic and contrasting, with the rural Ribble Valley and hills of Yorkshire stretching away to the north and east and the industrial towns of the Calder Valley with the backdrop of the South Pennines to the south.

4.10 4i North Pendle Fringe

• The North Pendle Fringe has a much smoother landform and more rural Fringe character than the South Pendle Fringe.

• Although the main features of the moorland fringe are all present, this area is sheltered from the impacts of the urban conurbations by the dramatic grit outcrop of Pendle Hill.

• The difference in topography may be attributed to its geology; layers of limestone and sandstone and boulder clay overlie the millstone grit on this edge producing a relatively smooth profile.

Site Description

4.11 The site consists of one field with an area of approximately 2.6 hectares. The site includes a sports field, public footpath, grassland, water tank and reed bed sewage system.

4.12 The site falls from the southeast at circa 195m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) to circa 187m AOD at the southwest.
4.13 The western boundary of the site is defined by a dense hedgerow and includes some existing mature trees. The eastern and southern boundary is defined by a hedgerow which is fragmented and in declining condition. The northern boundary is open and connects to the existing adjacent caravan park. There are some mature trees within the northernmost areas of the site.

**Landscape Designations and Value**

4.14 There are no international or national landscape designations such as National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) immediately adjacent to the site.

4.15 Within the wider study area, there is one AONB (Forest of Bowland) which also includes Pendle Hill. The boundary of the AONB is located approximately 2.5km from the site.

4.16 There are numerous listed buildings located within the wider study area. There are four scheduled monuments; a Romano-British Farmstead located 1.3km north west of the site at Bomber; a medieval settlement located 4km north west of the site at Bracewell; a lead mines and limestone clamp located 2.3km south west of the site at Rimmington; Twiston lime klin and associated tramway located 3.1km south west of the site near Twiston Mill. There would be no negative landscape and visual effects resulting from the development on listed buildings and scheduled monuments. There are no local landscape designations.

4.17 From the field survey it was noted that the landscape in the area is generally in good condition, with intact characteristics such as hedgerows, clumps of trees, historic field patterns, lanes and distinctive local built vernacular contributing to character. There would be no additional adverse effects on the key characteristics of the surrounding landscape and overall landscape character as a result of the development.
5.0 Baseline Study-Visual

5.1 This aim of the visual baseline is 'to establish the area in which the development may be visible, the different groups of people who may experience views of the development, the places where they will be affected and the nature of the views and visual amenity at those points.' Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013).

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

5.2 The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) or areas of land from which the development may be potentially visible were identified and mapped, refer to the Visibility drawing Appendix 3.

5.3 The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was undertaken using Ordnance Survey Terrain 5 data, OS 25K Explorer Mapping and site layout plan. A 3D model was constructed of both the existing and proposed caravan park development, using multiple 4.75m high target points located across the terrain 5 data. The height of 4.75m was derived from cross section information for the height of the proposed lodges.

5.4 The GIS software used a viewing height of 1.65m across the 5km study area to calculate the areas of potential visibility of both the existing and proposed development. The calculation was purely a bare earth calculation and therefore shows maximum theoretical visibility, and does not include the screening effects of intervening buildings or vegetation.

5.5 The results were separated into 3 different colour bands to illustrate areas of variation of visibility of; the existing caravan park only, the proposed extension only, both the existing caravan park and proposed extension combined. The result of the study shows that the proposals will only lead to a very insignificant increase in the potential visibility of the caravan park in the surrounding landscape. Furthermore once the screening effects of intervening vegetation in the wider landscape and landscape planting in the site is considered these theoretical areas themselves would be much smaller in extent. Section 7.0 and Appendix 3 and 4 below describe the visual effects of the development on selected viewpoints from within the ZTV study area.

Visual Receptors

Public Rights of Way

5.6 One public right of way crosses the site itself. There are numerous public rights of way within the wider study area, the following paragraph describes those located within 1km of the site.

5.7 There are two public rights of way in the lands to the immediate north of the site. A public footpath commences near Eel Beck and travels east and south-east through What Close Park and past Great Great Park. From What Close a public footpath travels north-east towards New Ing Hill. East and south-east of the site there are three public rights of way,
one footpath commences at Hesketh House Farm runs east and through the site itself towards Cross Hill Lane. Another path also commences at Hesketh House Farm and also runs east through Great Todber and emerges at Howgill Lane. A short footpath commences at Howgill Lanes and runs east towards Lower Clough. West of the site a footpath runs from Howgill in a north-east direction to Widow Hill.

Public Highways

5.8 The A682 Road travels adjacent to the western boundary of the site. Further west is Crosshill Lane, Martin Top Lane, Stopper Lane, Stoop Lane and Rimmington Lane. Howgill Lane is located circa. 500m to the south of the site. Further south are Stocks Lane and Whythwa Road. Coal Pit Lane is located to the north of the site. East of the site is Brogden Lane. The A59 is located 2km to the north and west of the site. The site is not visible from nearly all roads due to dense hedgerows and intervening topography; there would be some glimpsed views from the A682 Road as it passes the site, but again views are limited by existing roadside hedgerows.

Settlements

5.9 The site is located circa. 2.5km south of Gisburn, and would not be visible from here due to the effect of distance and intervening vegetation. The closest residential properties (within 1km of the site) are those located along Howgill Lane and Cross Hill Lane to the south and west of the site. Intervening vegetation and topography screens the site from these properties, however there may be some partial views from second floor windows. Further (beyond 1km) to the south and west of the site the effect of distance and intervening vegetation screens the site, however some properties may have some long range distance views to the site especially from elevated areas. Further (beyond 1km) to the east and north of the site, intervening topography, and vegetation screens the site.

Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments

5.10 There are numerous listed buildings located within the wider study area. There are four scheduled monuments; a Romano-British Farmstead located 1.3km north west of the site at Bomber; a medieval settlement located 4km north west of the site at Bracewell; a lead mines and limestone clamp located 2.3km south west of the site at Rimmington; Twiston lime kiln and associated tramway located 3.1km south west of the site near Twiston Mill. Intervening vegetation and topography indicates that development would not be visible from these locations.

Tourist Facilities

5.11 The adjacent caravan park at Todber is located to the north of the site. Rimmington Caravan Park is located 700m to the north west. The site is predominantly screened by intervening topography and vegetation from both the adjacent caravan park and Rimmington Caravan Park.
6.0 Landscape Effects

6.1 This section describes the effects of the proposed development on landscape receptors, and assesses the significance of the effects identified.

Topography

6.2 The proposed development will follow the existing contours of the site, to accommodate the development some localised ground modelling will be required. Overall the effect on topography is judged to be No Change.

Trees and Hedgerows

6.3 Trees will remain unaffected by the development. Existing hedges, hedgerows and trees will be incorporated within the development and augmented with additional planting for screening purposes. Overall the effect on trees and hedgerows is judged to be No Change.

Farmland

6.4 Land-use will change from grassland to lodges within woodland. There will be no loss of farmland. Overall the effect on farmland is judged to be No Change.

6.5 Landscape Character

6.6 The effect of the proposals will be to extend the caravan park into the immediately adjacent site. The design of the lodges and layout of the development including landscaping will be of high quality and be appropriate to the local rural character. Existing hedges and trees within and to the boundaries of the site will be retained. The provision of new screen planting within and to the boundaries of the site will improve the appearance of the site and as this planting matures it will screen the proposed and existing development within the local landscape.

6.7 The landscape character of the study area is judged be tolerant of the type of changes arising from the proposals. The boundary of the Forest of Bowland AONB is located circa. 2.5km from the site, and from this distance the proposals would have no significant effects. No national or regional landscape designations apply to the landscape located within 2.5km from the site. The local landscape character is judged to be in good condition have value for its importance for tourism. The landscape character of the areas outside the AONB is therefore judged to have moderate sensitivity to the proposals.

6.8 The type and scale of the development reduces the size of the change likely to be experienced, the retention of hedgerows and additional screen planting will also visually screen much of the development from the surrounding countryside. The majority of existing hedgerows will also be retained within the site. The development is an extension to an existing caravan park and will be heavily screened with planting; as this planting matures there will be no appreciable increase in the size or change in the type of the
development within the local landscape. This is also evidenced by the ZTV study which shows a very limited potential increase in the theoretical visibility of the caravan park as a result of the development. It is judged there would be no additional impact on the key characteristics of the surrounding landscape. The screen planting within and around the site as it matures will further improve landscape character over time. The geographical extent over which the landscape effects will be felt will be at the level of the site and the immediate setting of the site. Further away from the site the changes would be generally imperceptible, due to the type and limited scale of the development, the retention of existing screen planting, and intervening vegetation in the wider landscape; as a consequence the magnitude of change to landscape character is judged to be Negligible to No Change.

6.9

The combination of medium sensitively and magnitude of negligible to no change suggests the significance of the effects on landscape character within the study area is judged to be Neutral.
7.0 Visual Effects

7.1 This section describes the effects of the proposed development on visual receptors, and assesses the significance of the effects identified.

7.2 The visual receptors most likely to be affected by the development include; residential properties and users of footpaths and bridleways in the countryside surrounding the site.

7.3 Following desktop and field survey, viewpoints were selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptor. The viewpoints chosen do not cover every view but have been selected to represent the different users from a range of directions and distances from the site.

7.4 The viewpoint locations are illustrated on the Visibility drawing, Appendix 3. The viewpoint images are illustrated in Appendix 4.

Viewpoint 1

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.5 From opposite the entrance to the public footpath at Howgill Lane, 196m from the site. There are large scale views over rolling farmland and distant hills to the north. The site itself is visible, and partially screened by a fragmented hedgerow to the sites eastern boundary. Some lodges in the existing caravan park are partially visible. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the road and adjacent public footpath.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.6 People using the adjacent footpath and Howgill Lane would have views to the development partially restricted by intervening vegetation, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.7 The development will comprise lodges low in height and will be partially screened by earth mounding and screen planting to the boundaries of the site. Only the upper parts of the development including lodge roofs would be perceptible. As the screen planting within the site matures after 10 years from planting, the site and the proposed development would not be visible. The numbers of receptors affected would be few with occasional leisure users of Howgill Lane and people accessing local farms. The development will be perceptible but only comprise a small part of the existing overall large scale view, and with low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be minor.

Significance

7.8 The combination of moderate sensitivity and minor magnitude, the significance of the visual effect is judged to be slight adverse on opening year. Once the proposed screen planting matures the significance would reduce to neutral effect.
Viewpoint 2

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.9 From the public footpath adjacent to Great Todber and 318m from the development site. There are distant views towards the site and higher ground further to the north west. The views are large in scale and the site only comprises a small element within the overall view. The site itself is screened by intervening topography and boundary vegetation. Existing structures on the site are not visible. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include users of the public footpath.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.10 People using the footpath would have views to the development restricted by intervening topography and vegetation, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.11 The development would be barely discernable, at most only the tips of some lodge roofs would be visible. As the screen planting within the site matures after 10 years from planting no structures would be visible. The numbers of receptors affected would be few with residents and occasional leisure users of the footpath. The combination of only a minor part of the development being discernable in views and low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be negligible.

Significance

7.12 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 3

7.13 From the public footpath south of Howgill Lane and 688m from the development site. The site is not visible, intervening vegetation screens the site. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the public footpath.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.14 People using the footpath would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.15 The development would be barely discernable, and in summer months completely screened. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of no views of the development and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

Significance

7.16 The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 4
7.17 From a gap in the hedgerow along Coal Pit Lane, 1.05km from the site. There are views over rolling farmland, with occasional trees. The site is not visible, views are screened by intervening topography. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include users of Coal Pit Lane and nearby dwellings.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**

7.18 People using Coal Pit Lane would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation and topography, and would therefore have **moderate sensitivity**.

7.19 The development would be not be visible, intervening topography and vegetation screens the site. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of no views of the development and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be **no change**.

**Significance**

7.20 The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be **neutral effect**.

**Viewpoint 5**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

7.21 From Coal Pit Lane, 1.16km from the site. There are large scale views over rolling farmland and to Pendle Hill, the adjacent caravan park is visible and comprises a small part of the overall view. The development site is barely discernable. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using Coal Pit Lane and nearby public footpaths.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**

7.22 People using Coal Pit Lane and nearby public footpaths would have views to the development partially restricted by intervening vegetation and built development, and would therefore have **moderate sensitivity**.

7.23 The development would be barely perceptible, some outline of lodges to the north of the site may be visible. The effect of distance, intervening vegetation and built development screen views of the development. The number of receptors at and close to this viewpoint would be low and include people using Coal Pit Lane and nearby public footpaths.

7.24 The combination of only a small part of the development being barely perceptible in views and low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be **negligible**.

**Significance**

7.25 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be **neutral effect**.

**Viewpoint 6**
Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

From the A682 Road near the junction with Coal Pit Lane, 1.52km from the site. There are views over farmland and to elevated lands in the distance. Some built development within the adjacent caravan park is barely discernable and forms only a small part of the overall view. The development site is not visible and is screened by the effect of distance and intervening vegetation. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include users of the A682 Road.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.26 People using the road would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.27 The development would not be discernable. Intervening vegetation and topography in combination with the effect of distance would screen views of the development. The numbers of receptors affected would be few. The combination of the development not being discernable in views and low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be negligible.

Significance

7.28 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 7

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

This viewpoint is located at the junction of the A682 Road and Stocks Lane, 1.33km from the site. There are views over rolling farmland, the site is not visible, intervening topography and vegetation screens views towards the site. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include users of A682 Road, Stocks Lane and adjacent dwellings.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.29 People using the road would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.30 The development would not be visible. Intervening vegetation and topography in combination with the effect of distance would screen views of the development. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of the development not being discernable in views and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be negligible.

Significance

7.31 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral.

Viewpoint 8
Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.32 This viewpoint is located on Coal Pit Lane and near Cowdale Clough Farm, approximately 1.67km from the site. The existing site is not discernable, due to the effect of distance, intervening vegetation and built development. The receptors at this viewpoint would include users of Coal Pit Lane and adjacent dwellings.

7.33 People using the road would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.34 The development would not be visible. Intervening vegetation and topography in combination with the effect of distance would screen views of the development. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of the development not being discernable in views and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be negligible.

Significance

7.35 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 9
Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.36 From Howgill Lane looking through a gap in the roadside hedgerow, approximately 248m from the site. Intervening hedgerows and trees filter views to the site. The receptors at this viewpoint would include people travelling on Howgill Lane and the nearby public footpath, where views would be partially restricted.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.37 The development would be perceptible from this location; the effect of intervening vegetation will filter views of the site. As the screen planting within the site matures after 10 years from planting the site and the proposed development would not be visible.

7.38 People using the road would have views to the development partially restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.39 The numbers of receptors affected would be few with occasional leisure users of Howgill Lane and the nearby public footpath. The development will be perceptible but only comprise a small part of the existing view, and with low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be minor.

Significance

7.40 The combination of moderate sensitivity and minor magnitude, the significance of the visual effect is judged to be slight adverse on opening year. Once the proposed screen planting matures the significance would reduce to neutral effect.
Viewpoint 10

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.41 From the public footpath at Martin Top approximately 1.56km from the site. There are long distance views over rolling farmland. The site itself is barely perceptible due to the effect of distance. The view is large in scale and the area of the site only comprises a very small element within the overall view. The site itself is also partially screened by intervening vegetation. Existing structures on the site are not visible. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include users of the public footpath and the adjacent dwelling at Martin Top.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.42 People using the footpath and residents of the nearby dwelling would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.43 The development would be barely discernable, and no outlines of lodges clearly visible. As the screen planting within the site matures after 10 years from planting no structures would be visible. The numbers of receptors affected would be few including residents of the nearby dwelling, and occasional leisure users of the footpath. The combination of only a minor part of the development being barely discernable in views and low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be negligible.

Significance

7.44 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

7.45 Viewpoint 11

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.46 This viewpoint is located at the public footpath close to Whytha Farm, 1.72km from the site. There are large scale long distant views over open rolling fields and elevated lands in the distance. The existing site is partially visible, but only forms a very small component of the overall large scale view. The site is partially screened by intervening vegetation. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the public footpath and residents at nearby Whytha Farm.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.47 People using the footpath and residents of Whytha Farm would have views to the development partially restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.48 The development would be partially visible from this location; but not change the overall balance of features and elements that comprise the overall view. Once the screen planting within the site matures the site would not be visible. The numbers of receptors
affected would be few with residents of nearby dwelling, and occasional leisure users of the footpath. The combination of only a part of the development being barely discernable in views and low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be negligible.

Significance

7.49 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 12

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

This viewpoint is located at Howgill Lane, 932m from the site. The site is not visible, intervening built development, topography and vegetation screens views towards the site. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include users of Howgill Lane, and adjacent dwellings.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.50 People using the lane and residents in dwellings would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.51 The development would not be visible. Intervening vegetation and topography in combination with the effect of distance would screen views of the development. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of the development not being discernable in views and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

Significance

7.52 The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 13

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.53 From a public footpath at a local high point in lands near Middop Hall, 940m from the site. There are large scale long distant views over open rolling fields and elevated lands in the distance. The existing site is partially visible, but only forms a very small component of the overall large scale view. The site is partially screened by intervening vegetation. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the public footpath once it crosses the elevated areas.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.54 People using the public footpath would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.
7.55 The development would be perceptible from this location, but not change the overall
balance of features in the view; intervening vegetation will filter views of the site. As the
screen planting within the site matures after 10 years from planting the site and the
proposed development would not be visible.

7.56 The numbers of receptors affected would be few with occasional leisure users of the
public footpath. The development will be perceptible but only comprise a small part of the
existing view, and with low numbers of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is
judged to be minor.

Significance

7.57 The combination of moderate sensitivity and minor magnitude, the significance of the
visual effect is judged to be slight adverse on opening year. Once the proposed screen
planting matures the significance would reduce to neutral effect.

Viewpoint 14

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.58 This viewpoint is located at a public footpath just off Cross Hill Lane, 582m from the site.
The site is not visible, intervening topography and vegetation screens the site. The
receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include users of the public footpath.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.59 People using the footpath would have views to the development restricted by intervening
topography, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.

7.60 The development would not be visible from this location; intervening vegetation and
topography will screen the site. The change in view would be none. The numbers of
receivers affected would be none. The combination of no change in view and no people
affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

Significance

7.61 The combination of medium sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the
visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 15

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.62 This viewpoint is located along Stopper Lane, 1.45km from the site. There are views over
rolling countryside. Only a small part of the southern part of the site is barely perceptible;
the other areas are screened by intervening topography and vegetation. The site only
forms a very small proportion of the overall view. The receptors at and close to this
viewpoint would include people using Stopper Lane.

Sensitivity and Magnitude
7.63 People using Stopper Lane for leisure purposes will have views to the proposed development restricted and have **moderate sensitivity**.

7.64 The development would be largely invisible from this location; intervening topography and vegetation will screen most of the site. There may be some long distant views to parts of the development to the southern area of the site, but the effect of distance would mean these will be difficult to distinguish clearly. Once the proposed screen planting matures there would be no views to the development. The change in view would be barely noticeable. The numbers of receptors affected would be few. The combination of barely noticeable change in view and low number of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be **negligible**.

**Significance**

7.65 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be **neutral effect**.

**Viewpoint 16**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

7.66 From Stoops Lane, 2.31km from the site. The site is not visible, intervening vegetation screens views towards the site. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using Stoops Lane.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**

7.67 People using Stoops Lane will have views to the proposed development restricted and have **moderate sensitivity**.

7.68 The development would not be visible from this location; intervening vegetation will screen the site. There would be no change in view. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of no change in view and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be **no change**.

**Significance**

7.69 The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be **neutral effect**.

**Viewpoint 17**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

7.70 This viewpoint is located at the junction of Rimmington Lane and the A682 Road, 1.1km from the site. There are views back towards part of the adjacent caravan park, the development site is not visible. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using Rimmington Lane and the A682 Road.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**
People using Rimmington Lane and the A682 Road will have views to the proposed development restricted by effect of distance and have moderate sensitivity.

The development would be not be visible from this location. The effect of distance and screening by intervening vegetation will mean the proposals are not visible. The numbers of receptors affected would be few. The combination of no change in view and low number of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

**Significance**

The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

**Viewpoint 18**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

From public footpath north of Little Todber Hill, 200m from the site. Views over pasture farmland and trees at the adjacent caravan park. The development site is not visible, intervening topography screens the site. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the public footpath.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**

People using the public footpath will have views to the proposed development restricted and have moderate sensitivity.

The development would not be visible from this location; intervening topography screens the site. There would be no change in view. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of no change in view and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

**Significance**

The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

**Viewpoint 19**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

From Pendle Road at the foothills to Pendle Hill, approximately 4.4km from the site. There are large scale views over rolling farmland below. The existing site is barely discernable, due to the effect of distance and intervening vegetation. The receptors at this viewpoint would include users of Pendle Road and adjacent dwellings.

People using the road and nearby dwellings would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation and effect of distance, and would therefore have moderate sensitivity.
7.80 The effect of distance and intervening vegetation suggests that the development would be barely noticeable. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of the development being barely discernable in views and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be negligible.

Significance

7.81 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 20

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.82 From the minor road in Twiston, approximately 3.12km from the site. Views to dense roadside vegetation. The development site is not visible, intervening vegetation screens the site. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the minor road and nearby dwellings.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.83 People using the public footpath and people in nearby dwellings will have views to the proposed development restricted and have moderate sensitivity.

7.84 The development would not be visible from this location; intervening vegetation screens the site. There would be no change in view. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of no change in view and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

Significance

7.85 The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

Viewpoint 21

Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View

7.86 This viewpoint is located on the public footpath just off Stopper Lane, 2.2km from the site. There are views over rolling countryside. Only a small part of the southern part of the site is barely perceptible; the other areas are screened by intervening topography and vegetation. The site only forms a very small proportion of the overall view. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the public footpath.

Sensitivity and Magnitude

7.87 People using the public footpath for leisure purposes will have views to the proposed development restricted and have moderate sensitivity.

7.88 The development is mostly not visible from this location; intervening topography and vegetation will screen most of the site. There may be some long distant views to parts of the development to the southern area of the site, but the effect of distance would mean
these will be difficult to distinguish clearly. Once the proposed screen planting matures there would be no views to the development. The change in view would be barely noticeable. The numbers of receptors affected would be few. The combination of barely noticeable change in view and low number of people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be **negligible**.

**Significance**

7.89 The combination of moderate sensitivity and negligible magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be **neutral effect**.

**Viewpoint 22**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

7.90 From the A682 Road looking, approximately 214m from the site. Intervening hedgerows and trees filter views to the site. The receptors at this viewpoint would include people travelling on the A682 Road and the nearby public footpath, where views would be partially restricted.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**

7.91 The development would only be partially visible from this location; the effect of intervening vegetation will filter views of much of the site. The generous set back of the lodges from the boundaries of the site will make it difficult to see the lodges from this location especially in summer months. As the screen planting within the site matures after 10 years from planting the site and the proposed development would not be visible.

7.92 People using the road would have views to the development restricted by intervening vegetation, roadside hedgerows and effect of distance, and would therefore have **moderate** sensitivity.

7.93 The numbers of receptors affected would be some with users of the A682 Road and the nearby public footpath. The development will be perceptible but only comprise a small part of the existing view, and with some people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be **minor**.

**Significance**

7.94 The combination of moderate sensitivity and minor magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be **slight adverse**, but once screen planting matures the significance would reduce to **neutral effect**.

**Viewpoint 23**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

7.95 From the A59 Road, approximately 2.3km from the site. There are views over rolling countryside, some elements of the adjacent caravan park are barely noticeable within the overall view. The development site is not visible, intervening vegetation screens the site.
The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the road and nearby public footpath.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**

7.96 People using the A69 Road and people using the nearby public footpath will have views to the proposed development restricted and have moderate sensitivity.

7.97 The development would not be visible from this location; intervening vegetation screens the site. There would be no change in view. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of no change in view and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

**Significance**

7.98 The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.

**Viewpoint 24**

**Nature and Characteristics of Baseline View**

7.99 From Gisburn Road within the Forest of Bowland AONB, approximately 4.6km from the site. Views over rolling countryside, and woodland. The development site is not visible, intervening vegetation and effect of distance screens the site. The receptors at and close to this viewpoint would include people using the road.

**Sensitivity and Magnitude**

7.100 People using Gisburn Road will have views to the proposed development restricted and have moderate sensitivity.

7.101 The development would not be visible from this location; intervening vegetation screens the site. There would be no change in view. The numbers of receptors affected would be none. The combination of no change in view and no people affected, the magnitude of the effect is judged to be no change.

**Significance**

7.102 The combination of moderate sensitivity and no change magnitude the significance of the visual effect is judged to be neutral effect.
Appendix 1 - Methodology
1.0 Methodology

1.1 The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was undertaken with reference to the following guidelines:


1.2 The two components of LVIA as defined by Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) are:

- Assessment of landscape effects: assessing effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right;
- Assessment of visual effects: assessing effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people.

Project description/ specification

1.3 The project description was checked to make sure that the essential aspects of the scheme that give rise to effects on landscape and visual amenity has been described. Mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the scheme to avoid, reduce or offset adverse landscape and visual effects are also described.

Baseline studies

1.4 The baseline landscape and visual conditions were established.

Landscape Baseline

1.5 The aim of the landscape baseline is to provide an understanding of the landscape in the area that may be affected, its constituent elements, its character and way it varies spatially, its geographic extent, its history, its condition and the way the landscape is experienced, and the value attached to it. Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013).

1.6 The baseline study was undertaken by a mix of desktop study and fieldwork to identify and record the character of the landscape and the elements, features and aesthetic and perceptual factors which contribute to it. The baseline study also considered the landscape condition and the value attached to landscape. Sources of information
included for the desktop study included; ordnance survey maps, aerial maps of the site and surrounding area, existing landscape character assessments and relevant planning policy.

Visual Baseline

1.7 The aim of the visual baseline is 'to establish the area in which the development may be visible, the different groups of people who may experience views of the development, the places where they will be affected and the nature of the views and visual amenity at those points.' Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013). The baseline study was undertaken by desktop study followed by a field survey. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) or areas of land from which the development may be potentially visible were identified and mapped.

1.8 The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was undertaken using Ordnance Survey Terrain 5 data, OS 25K Explorer Mapping and site layout plan. A 3D model was constructed of both the existing and proposed holiday park development, using multiple 4.75m high target points located across the terrain 5 data. The height of 4.75m was derived from cross section information for the height of the proposed lodges.

1.9 The GIS software used a viewing height of 1.65m across the 5km study area to calculate the areas of potential visibility of both the existing and proposed development. The calculation was purely a bare earth calculation and therefore shows maximum theoretical visibility, and does not include the screening effects of intervening buildings or vegetation. Therefore there are areas within the ZTV which do not have views of the scheme due to local variations in vegetation, built form and topography. The ZTV is not always precise and is an indication only of the area within which the most significant visual effects may be expected.

Landscape Assessment Criteria

1.10 The overall significance of effects is established by combining the separate judgements about sensitivity and magnitude of effects.

1.11 Sensitivity includes an assessment of the landscape receptors susceptibility to change and value.

1.12 Magnitude includes an assessment of the impact on landscape receptors in terms of size or scale, geographical extent of the area influenced.

1.13 The criteria for assessing sensitivity of landscape effects are described in Table 1.1 below.

1.14 The criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact are described in Table 1.2 below.

1.15 The separate assessments of sensitivity and magnitude are then combined to determine the significance of effect on each receptor. The results of sensitivity and magnitude are compared against the matrix at Table 1.3 which in combination with professional
judgement guides the assessment of overall significance. These levels of significance can either be beneficial or adverse and are described in Table 1.4.

Visual Assessment Criteria

1.16 The overall significance of effects is established by combining the separate judgements about sensitivity and magnitude of effects.

1.17 Sensitivity includes an assessment of the visual receptors susceptibility to change and the value attached to views.

1.18 Magnitude includes an evaluation of the visual impact identified in terms of size or scale and geographical extent of the area influenced.

1.19 The criteria for assessing sensitivity of visual effects are shown at Table 1.1 below.

1.20 The criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact are shown at Table 1.2 below.

1.21 The separate assessments of sensitivity and magnitude are then combined to determine the significance of effect on each receptor. The results of sensitivity and magnitude are compared against the matrix at Table 1.3 which in combination with professional judgement guides the assessment of overall significance. These levels of significance can either be beneficial or adverse and are described in Table 1.4.
### Table 1.1: Criteria for assessing sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Key features and characteristics of landscape of distinctive character,</td>
<td>• Residential properties with views towards the proposals from ground floor and first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>susceptible to relatively small changes. Likely to be designated such as</td>
<td>floor windows,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Areas of Great Landscape Value</td>
<td>• Public footpaths or other recreational trails (e.g. national trails,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AGLV) and National Parks.</td>
<td>footpaths, bridleways, etc.) with open views of the scheme proposals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Users of recreational facilities where the purpose of that recreation is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enjoyment of the countryside (e.g. National Parks or other access land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.). Highly valued views (e.g. from heritage assets, views featured in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>art and literature).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderately significant features and characteristics in a distinctive</td>
<td>• Residential properties with limited views due to partial obstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landscape or a landscape of moderately distinctive character reasonably</td>
<td>towards the proposed scheme,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tolerant of changes.</td>
<td>• Public footpaths or other recreational trails (e.g. national trails,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>footpaths, etc.) with restricted views of the scheme proposals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Outdoor workers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Users of lower speed passenger railways,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Users of scenic roads, railways or waterways or users of designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourist routes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools and other institutional buildings, and their outdoor areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unimportant features or characteristics or indistinct landscape character</td>
<td>• Indoor workers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>types potentially tolerant of substantial change.</td>
<td>• Users of main roads (e.g. trunk roads) or passengers in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transport on main arterial routes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Users of higher speed passenger or freight railways,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Users of recreational facilities where the purpose of the recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is not related to the view (e.g. sports facilities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.2: Magnitude of Impact Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Total loss or large scale damage to existing character or distinctive features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic conspicuous features and elements. Large scale improvement of character by the restoration of features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic and conspicuous features and elements, or by the addition of new distinctive features.</td>
<td>The project, or a part of it, would become the dominant feature or focal point of the view. Majority of viewers affected. Major alternation of baseline view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Partial loss or noticeable damage to existing character or distinctive features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic noticeable features and elements. Partial or noticeable improvement of character by the restoration of existing features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic and noticeable features and elements, or by the addition of new characteristic features.</td>
<td>The project, or a part of it, would form a noticeable feature or element of the view which is readily apparent to the receptor. Many/some viewers affected. Partial alternation of baseline view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Slight loss or damage to existing character or features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic features and elements. Slight improvement of character by the restoration of existing features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic features and elements, or by the addition of new characteristic elements.</td>
<td>The project, or a part of it, would be perceptible but not alter the overall balance of features and elements that comprise the existing view. Few viewers affected. Minor alternation of baseline view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Barely noticeable loss or damage to existing character or features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic features and elements Barely noticeable improvement of character by the restoration of existing features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic features and elements, or by the addition of new characteristic elements.</td>
<td>Only a very small part of the project would be discernable, or it is at such a distance that it would form a barely noticeable feature or element of the view. Few viewers affected. Very minor alternation of baseline view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No noticeable loss, damage or alternation to character or features or elements.</td>
<td>No part of the project, or work or activity associated with it, is discernible. No viewers affected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.3: Significance of effect categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape/Visual Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.4: Typical descriptions of significance of effect categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large Beneficial Effect</td>
<td><strong>enhance the character</strong> (including quality and value) of the landscape; create an iconic high quality feature and/or series of elements; enable a sense of place to be created or greatly enhanced.</td>
<td><strong>The project would create an iconic new feature that would greatly enhance the view.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Beneficial Effect</td>
<td>The project would enhance the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; enable 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.</td>
<td>The project would lead to a major improvement in a view from a highly sensitive receptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Beneficial Effect</td>
<td>The project would improve the character (including quality and 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.</td>
<td>The proposals would cause obvious improvement to a view from a moderately sensitive receptor, or perceptible improvement to a view from a more sensitive receptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Beneficial Effect</td>
<td>The project would complement the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; maintain or enhance characteristic features and elements; enable some sense of place to be restored.</td>
<td>The project would cause limited improvement to a view from a receptor of medium sensitivity, or would cause greater improvement to a view from a receptor of low sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Effect</td>
<td>The project would maintain the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; blend in with characteristic features and elements; enable a sense of place to be</td>
<td>Difficult to distinguish. barely perceptible change in view. No perceptible change in view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Adverse Effect</td>
<td>The project would not quite fit the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; be at variance with characteristic features and elements; detract from a sense of place.</td>
<td>The project would cause limited deterioration to a view from a receptor of medium sensitivity or cause greater deterioration to a view from a receptor of low sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Adverse Effect</td>
<td>The project would conflict with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; have an adverse impact on characteristic features or elements; diminish a sense of place</td>
<td>The project would cause obvious deterioration to a view from a moderately sensitive receptor, perceptible damage to a view from a more sensitive receptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Adverse Effect</td>
<td>The project would be at considerable variance with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; degrade or diminish the integrity of a range of characteristic features and elements; damage a sense of place.</td>
<td>The project would cause major deterioration to a view from a highly sensitive receptor, and would constitute a major discordant element in the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Large Adverse Effect</td>
<td>The project would be at complete variance with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; cause the integrity of characteristic features, elements and sense of place to be lost.</td>
<td>The project would cause the loss of views from a highly sensitive receptor, and would constitute a dominant discordant feature in the view.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 4 - Viewpoints
Viewpoint 1
Viewpoint 2

Date: 18/06/2015
WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude = 53.913463
Longitude = -2.249451
View point elevation = 203M AOD
Height above ground = 1.0M
Range = 31RM
Direction = North West
Viewing distance at A3 = 400MM

PROPOSED LODGE DEVELOPMENT - TODDER CARAVAN PARK
VIEWPOINTS
PARK RESORTS LIMITED, TODDER CARAVAN PARK, BURNLEY ROAD, GISBURN

© Copyright 2015 Eamonn Byrne Landscape Architects
54 King's Court, Shambles, York, YO1 7BD, UK
T 44 (0) 1904 620 444  F emb@ebl Rendering
Viewpoint 4
Approximate site location

Viewpoint 5
Date: 19/06/2015

WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude: 53.928493
Longitude: -2.082888

View point elevation:
Height above ground: 1.6M
Range: 1.52KM
Direction: South East
Viewing distance at A3: 400MM

Approximate site location

Viewpoint 6
Viewpoint 7

Approximate site location
Approximate site location

Date: 18/06/2015

WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude: 53.305965
Longitude: -2.2328122

View point elevation:
Height above ground: 1.6M

Range: 1.67KM
Direction: North West

Viewing distance at A3: 400MM

Viewpoint 8
Approximate site location

Viewpoint 9

Data: 18/06/2015

WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude: 53.911293
Longitude: -2.255852

View point elevation: 187M AOD

Height above ground: 1.6M

Range: 248M

Direction: North East

Viewing distance at A3: 400MM
Approximate site location

Date: 18/06/2015
WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude: 53.502367
Longitude: -2.290771

View point elevation: 297M AOD
Height above ground: 1.6M
Range: 1.56KM
Direction: North East

Viewing distance at A3: 400MM

Viewpoint 10
Approximate site location

Viewpoint 11

Date: 18/08/2015
WGS 84 Co-ordinates:
Latitude= 53.89050
Longitude= -2.209857

View point elevation: 215M AOD
Height above ground: 1.6M
Range: 1.72KM
Direction: North East
Viewing distance at A3: 400MM
Viewpoint 14

Date: 16/06/2015

WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude = 53.81444
Longitude = -2.28009

View point elevation:
153M AOD

Height above ground:
1.6M

Range:
502M

Direction:
East

Viewing distance at A3:
400MM
Viewpoint 15
Viewpoint 16
Viewpoint 17

Date: 18/08/2015

WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude: 53.923569
Longitude: -2.263600

View point elevation: 167M AOD

Height above ground: 1.6M

Range: 1.1KM

Direction: South East

Viewing distance at A3: 400MM
Viewpoint 19

Data: 18/08/2015
WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude= 53.884377
Longitude= -2.300198
View point elevation: 274M AOD
Height above ground: 1.9M
Range: 4.4KM
Direction: North East
Viewing distance at A3: 400MM
Viewpoint 20

Date: 18/00/2015

WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude: 53.897712
Longitude: -2.286598

View point elevation: 224 AOD

Height above ground: 1.6M

Range: 3.12KM

Direction: North East

Viewing distance at A3: 400MM
Viewpoint 21
Viewpoint 22
Viewpoint 23
Viewpoint 24

Approximate site location

Date: 18/06/2015
WGS 84 Coordinates:
Latitude= 53.946026
Longitude= -2.30288
View point elevation:
Height above ground: 1.6M
Range: 4.6KM
Direction: South East
Viewing distance at A3: 400MM
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**Urban Design**

Through our urban design services we aim to integrate projects into their urban context and create valuable places for people.

**Landscape Planning**

Our landscape planning principles and practices consider the integration of topography, infrastructure and natural systems to achieve the optimum balance between the built and natural environment.
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