

Mr C. Ball

70 Chesterfield Rd, Tibshelf

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

April 2021



Revision Schedule

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

April 2021

Doc Ref: CSB-1547-01-LVIA-001

Rev	Date	Status	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by
-----	------	--------	-------------	-------------	-------------

-	April 2021	Final	Calum Reford PGDip, BSc (hons)	Lee Barnes BSc(hons) MCIHT	Lee Barnes BSc(hons) MCIHT

This document has been prepared in accordance with the scope of Inspire Design & Development Ltd's (Inspire) appointment with its client and is subject to the terms of that appointment. It is addressed to and for the sole and confidential use and reliance of Inspire's client. Inspire accepts no liability for any use of this document other than by its client and only for the purposes for which it was prepared and provided. No person other than the client may copy (in whole or in part) use or rely on the contents of this document, without the prior written permission of the Company Secretary of Inspire. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole. The contents of this document do not provide legal or tax advice or opinion.

© Inspire Design & Development Ltd 2021

Inspire Design & Development Ltd
Unit 2A
Church View Business Park
Coney Green
Clay Cross
Chesterfield
Derbyshire
S45 9HA

Tel: 01246 852985

www.inspiredesigngroup.co.uk

CONTENTS	Page
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2.0 INTRODUCTION.....	3
3.0 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	4
4.0 THE DEVELOPMENT.....	7
5.0 SITE LOCATION AND CONTEXT.....	7
6.0 VISUAL IMPACT	9
7.0 MITIGATION	15
8.0 CONCLUSION	15
9.0 GLOSSARY.....	15

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 This LVIA has been undertaken to support a retrospective planning application to retain four former shipping containers that have been installed within the grounds of No 70 Chesterfield Road, Tibshelf, Derbyshire. The shipping containers have been installed to provide storage for various domestic items including garden machinery, bicycles and an array of Christmas lighting and decorations. The screening provided by the existing tall mixed species hedge and newly installed dark brown timber close boarded fencing is in-keeping with the locality. The installation of the containers and fencing has had no impact on the visual amenity of the street scene or local landscape. To maintain the street scene and screening, the boundary hedge should be retained and managed to a height at least the same as the close boarded fence. Green living roofs installed atop the containers will provide screening to the containers from elevated positions.

2.0 Introduction

- 2.1 This document presents the findings of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that has been undertaken to inform, accompany and support the retrospective planning application to retain four former shipping containers within the grounds of No 70 Chesterfield Road, Tibshelf. The shipping containers have been installed to provide storage for various domestic items including garden machinery, bicycles and an array of Christmas lighting and decorations.
- 2.2 The purpose of a LVIA is to assess how a development will affect a landscape at various levels ranging from an individual street scene to its context within the wider landscape over many square kilometres.
- 2.3 The term 'landscape' refers to the relationship between people and place. A landscape is the cumulative effects of the interactions of its component parts both visually and physically, the amenity they provide and how these are perceived by people. A landscape can be at any size or scale from a small patch of derelict land to a mountain range that crosses continents.
- 2.4 The LIVA has been undertaken in accordance with the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition* (GLVIA), landscape 'appraisal' protocol (LI and IEMA, 2013, p.27, Table 3.1).

3.0 Assessment Methodology

- 3.1 The methodology for this landscape 'appraisal' is based on those set out within Table 3.1 of the GLVIA, (LI and IEMA, 2013 p.27). Due to the small scale of this proposal and negligible impact on the local and wider landscape, which is discussed later within this document, a desk study has not been undertaken.
- 3.2 Viewpoints were identified by visiting the site along with local knowledge, however, a visual envelope map has not been produced due to the small scale and low height of the development. The identified viewpoints were visited and the impact of the development on each viewpoint assessed.
- 3.3 It was not considered necessary to produce a ZTV (Zone of Theoretical Visibility) map due to the low-rise nature of the development. The surrounding buildings are all taller than the containers and the dwelling of No 70, which is large in comparison to the surrounding houses, is not visible from the local road network until the viewer is within close proximity *circa* 100 metres.
- 3.4 Photography was undertaken on the 23th April 2021 at 1.65m above ground level using a Sony *a*6000 with 16-50mm zoom lens, the photographs have been taken with the zoom set to 33mm. The APS-C sensor of the *a*6000 has a crop factor of 1.5 which gives the resultant photographs an equivalent focal length of 50mm. This is in line with guidance within the Landscape Institute Advice Note 01/11 – *Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual assessment* (2011) which advises that a fixed 50mm lens be used on a full frame [digital] camera.
- 3.5 The sensitivity of the landscape and visual receptors were based on the indicative criteria shown in Table 1. Duration of exposure was also taken into account when assessing the effect on visual receptors.
- 3.6 The magnitude of change was assessed using indicative criteria shown in Table 2.

Table 1 Sensitivity

Sensitivity	Nature of Landscape	Nature of Visual Receptors
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good, strong or excellent example of the landscape character type • Good, strong or excellent example of local character and distinctiveness • Strong sense of place. • Areas of designation including Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens and National Parks • Landscapes that provide a complimentary context to any associated designated features e.g., listed buildings, Scheduled monuments, Sites of Special Scientific Interest • Overall, aesthetically pleasing landscape • Landscape features generally worthy of conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential properties with views across the Site from areas of the property that are regularly occupied or are occupied for long periods e.g., windows in main rooms and gardens. • Users of locations where enjoyment of the landscape is a primary purpose e.g., viewpoints, vantage points and beauty spots • Visitors to or users of local monuments, historic buildings designated buildings where the landscape is an integral part of the visitor experience. • Visitors to designated landscapes e.g., National Parks
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good or fair example of the landscape character type, possibly containing several notably uncharacteristic or detracting features. • A reasonably good example of local character and distinctiveness with some prominent detracting features which possibly reduces its cohesion • Generally, in good/moderate condition • Landscapes that provide context to any associated designated features e.g., listed buildings, Scheduled monuments, Sites of Special Scientific Interest but with a reduced sense of the association between the two. • Landscapes that contain some features generally worthy of conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational users of Public Rights of Way • Recreational users of local amenities e.g. parks and open space where the main focus is on the activity and less on landscape • Users of rural roads • Users of educational or health facilities where open views over a landscape with green infrastructure can be beneficial
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • poor example of the landscape character type • uninspiring or negative local character and distinctiveness • Little or no sense of place. • Aesthetically uninspiring landscape • Contains multitude of features that are uncharacteristic within its landscape type • Minor or minimal landscape features worthy of conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in their workplace • People involved in activities where the focus is on the activity and not the landscape • Users of main roads

Table 2 Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of Change	Landscape impact	Visual impact
High	Would result in the loss of a major character feature or characteristic that would alter how the landscape was perceived and described. Or, Would introduce a feature that would be prominent and appear wholly out of character within the context of the landscape	The development would occupy a large proportion of the view
Medium	Would result in the partial loss of a character feature or characteristic. Or, Could be substantial but would not be out of character within the landscape	Would introduce a new feature that may not look out of place or be prominent, but it would be notable and noticed
Low	Would result in the small loss of a character feature or characteristic. Or, would not be out of character within the landscape	Would introduce a new feature into the view however it would potentially go unnoticed.
Negligible	Minor or minimal loss of a character feature or characteristic. Or, Any changes would be small scale and not out of character within the landscape	Would introduce a change at such a small scale to the rest of the view that it would practically be unnoticeable.
None	The development would not change the perceived landscape	The development would not change the perceived view

3.7 The level of effect is expressed as a function of the sensitivity and magnitude of change as shown in Table 3. The nature of change can be; positive, neutral or negative.

Table 3 Effect

	High	Medium	Low	Negligible	None
High	Major	Moderate/ major	Moderate	Minor	None
Medium	Moderate/ major	Moderate	Minor/ Moderate	Minor/ Negligible	None
Low	moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible	None

4.0 The Development

- 4.1 The planning application seeks permission to retain four former shipping containers that have been installed within the grounds of No 70 Chesterfield Road, Tibshelf, Derbyshire. The containers have been installed to provide storage for various domestic items including garden machinery, bicycles and an array of Christmas lighting and decorations.
- 4.2 All of the containers are located within the front grounds of No 70, two along and parallel to the boundary with Chesterfield Road and two along and parallel to the boundary with the neighbouring property to the south. The containers have been screened on both the road side and garden side by the installation of an approximately 2.4 metre tall, dark brown close boarded fence. The fencing is screened from Chesterfield Road by the existing 2+ metre tall mixed species boundary hedge and from the dwelling of No 70 and views from Hawthorne avenue, via the access gate, by ornamental shrub planting.
- 4.3 It is proposed to install green roofs, also known as living roofs to each of the containers to provide screening, biodiversity benefits and as part of the drainage control within the site. It is also proposed to include nest boxes and hibernacula to benefit fauna and improve biodiversity.

5.0 Site Location and Context

- 5.1 The Site is a domestic garden located at the junction of Hawthorn Avenue and Chesterfield Road, Tibshelf, within the local government district of Bolsover. The frontage of the property is along Chesterfield Road, however, access to the property is via a gated entrance from Hawthorne Avenue.
- 5.2 Chesterfield Road is one of the main routes into and through the village of Tibshelf. The perceived village boundary on Chesterfield Road is approximately 270 metres north of the Site and is defined by a change in landscape from agricultural fields to the north to domestic housing to the south of this point. However, the signage for the village of Tibshelf is located a further [approximately] 470 metres north of this perceived or visual edge of the village.
- 5.3 The houses that are on either side of Chesterfield Road when entering the village from the north up to Woodstock Cottages approximately 210 metres to the south of the Site, are all individual in appearance, varying in materials, style and scale. They are all set

back from the road with the majority being between 10 to 25 metres from the road kerb with occasional dwellings set back in excess of 30 metres from the road kerb.

- 5.4 Front boundaries along Chesterfield Road are a mix of timber fences, masonry walls, stone walls and hedging with a few properties having only partial or no defining boundary structure to the highway. With the exception of hedging the boundaries are general low to medium in height, up to approximately 1.5 metres. Some are simple with no decorative detailing whereas others are more formal in appearance with decorative detailing e.g. corbeling or the inclusion of metal panel in-fills in the case of some of the masonry walls. However, many of the walls and fences have been supplemented with hedging.
- 5.5 The hedgerow boundaries along this section of Chesterfield Road, whether they are the only boundary feature or supplementary to fencing or walling vary considerably in height, width, plant species and management style. Some are neat and regularly cropped other are in excess of 2.5 metres high and have the appearance of being less intensely managed. With possibly a few exceptions, the hedgerows are all mature and have been established for many years. Mature, well established hedgerows are the visually prominent boundary feature along Chesterfield Road; however, no single style of management or plant species predominates.
- 5.6 The majority of the houses along this section of Chesterfield Road have mature and well tended front gardens with driveways that provide off-road parking for multiple cars.
- 5.7 The combination of the above features gives this section of Chesterfield Road a distinctive character. The individually styled houses set back from the road with mature well managed gardens often fronted by mature hedging provides an open, green and semi-rural character to the road. Moreover, it is the gardens and not the buildings that are the predominant feature along this section of Chesterfield Road. The absence of cars parked on the highway is notable as this is a feature that can detract from similar street scenes at other locations.



Figure 1: Site Location

6.0 Visual Impact

6.1 From the site visit the following viewpoints were selected to assess if and to what extent the development has had an impact on the visual amenity from each.

Viewpoint 1	Chesterfield Road, approx. 200 metres north-northwest of the Site
National Grid reference	SK44446188
Receptors	Road users and pedestrians
Sensitivity	Medium
Magnitude of change	None
Effect and Nature	None

Existing View

The view that can be seen from this location as illustrated in Figure 2 is along Chesterfield Road looking south-southeast, illustrating the semi-rural character provided by the mature and varied vegetation that front the houses along this section of Chesterfield Road. Housing is not the predominant feature.

Impact of the Development

None

Mitigation - As per paragraph 7.0 Mitigation



Figure 2 Chesterfield Road, approx. 200 metres north-northwest of the Site, looking south-southeast. Focal length 50mm equivalent.

Viewpoint 2	Chesterfield Road, approx. 35 metres northwest of the Site
National Grid reference	SK44506174
Receptors	Road users, pedestrians and residential properties
Sensitivity	Medium
Magnitude of change	None
Effect and Nature	None

Existing View

As illustrated in Figure 3, the view towards the containers from this location is screened by the mixed species hedgerow boundary of the Site. The vegetative screening has been supplemented by the provision of a close boarded fence located between the hedge and containers to compensate for a reduction in screening during winter when the deciduous vegetation loses its leaf cover. For people traveling in vehicles along Chesterfield Road this view is fleeting. The most sensitive receptors are the residents of the neighbouring properties who may be able to see the tops of the containers from elevated positions, e.g. first floor windows.

Impact of the Development

The proposal has no impact on this view as it is screened by existing vegetation

Mitigation - As per paragraph 7.0 Mitigation



Figure 3 Chesterfield Road, approx. 35 metres northwest of the Site (SK44506174) looking southeast, illustrating the view as seen by road users and pedestrians and the screening provided by the existing boundary vegetation. Focal length 50mm equivalent.

Viewpoint 3	Chesterfield Road, approx. 11 metres west of the Site
National Grid reference	SK44526169
Receptors	Road users, pedestrians and residential properties
Sensitivity	Medium
Magnitude of change	None
Effect and Nature	None

Existing View

The view illustrated by Figure 4 is looking at the site, one of the containers and the timber fencing that has been installed to screen them. Primary screening is provided by the existing hedgerow.

Impact of the Development

None

Mitigation - As per paragraph 7.0 Mitigation



Figure 4 Chesterfield Road, approx. 11 metres west of the Site (SK44526169) looking east, the containers and screening fence are behind the existing hedgerow. Focal length 50 mm equivalent.

Viewpoint 4	Chesterfield Road, approx. 20 metres south-southwest of the Site
National Grid reference	SK44536166
Receptors	Road users, pedestrians and residential properties
Sensitivity	Medium
Magnitude of change	None
Effect and Nature	None

Existing View

The existing view as described in Viewpoint 2

Impact of the proposal

None

Mitigation - As per paragraph 9.0



Figure 5 Chesterfield Road, approx. 20 metres south-southwest of the Site (SK44536166) looking north-northeast to the southwestern corner of the site. Focal length 50mm equivalent.

Viewpoint 5	Chesterfield Road, approx. 260 metres south of the Site
National Grid reference	SK44516142
Receptors	Road users, pedestrians and residential properties
Sensitivity	Medium
Magnitude of change	None
Effect and Nature	None

Existing View

The view of the site from this location is screened by mature vegetation both within the grounds of the Site and within neighbouring properties. The terrace housing and cottages on the right of Figure 6 are the most prominent feature when viewing from this location as they abut the road and reduce the field of view compared to the wider views that can be seen further north around the location of the site.

Impact of the proposal

None

Mitigation - As per paragraph 7.0



Figure 6 Chesterfield Road, approx. 260 metres south of the Site (SK44516142) looking north. Focal length 50mm equivalent.

7.0 Mitigation

- 7.1 The existing screening provided by the tall mixed species hedge and dark brown timber close boarded fencing is in-keeping with the locality. The hedge should be retained and managed to maintain its height at least the same as the close boarded fence. Cutting the road side of the hedge with a steeply inclined face, so that the base of the hedge is slightly wider than the top will allow more light to the lower half of the hedge and will assist in maintain or improving the density of the hedge and therefore the screening it provides to the site.
- 7.2 The proposal to install green living roofs atop the containers would replace the visually uniform manmade surface with vegetation that would have the appearance of a garden when viewed from elevated positions. The green roofs will also provide seasonal change and the potential to have environmental benefits including management of rainwater run-off and improved biodiversity within the site.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 The containers have not altered the street scene or had a negative impact on the context of the local landscape. Providing the mitigation measures are undertaken and maintained as discussed in section 7.0 Mitigation then this should continue to be the case.

9.0 Glossary

Landscape Appraisal	- a LVIA undertaken when an EIA is not required.
Development (the)	- everything within the Site boundary.
Proposal (the)	- used interchangeably with development