Dear Mr Kemp

HEARING STATEMENT – MATTER 12 ‘NATURAL ENVIRONMENT’

KETTERING LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy has been instructed by [redacted] to submit this Statement in relation to Matter 12. This should be read in conjunction with the representations that Harris Lamb submitted on behalf of [redacted] to the pre-submission consultation undertaken by the Council (User ID: 77; Comment ID 197).

[Redacted] maintains his strong objection to the proposed designation of his land as HVI057a. This designation relates to Policy NEH3 and is shown on Figure 18.6 ‘Burton Latimer Policy Map’ in Appendix 3. It is our view that this designation is not justified and places an unnecessary restriction on the site. Figure 18.6 should be amended to remove HVI057a. No changes are required to Policy NEH3 to address this matter because the HVI designations are not listed in the policy.

19. What is the methodology for their selection? Are there any factors that indicated that any of the proposed local green spaces should not have been designated? If so what evidence is there to support this position?

Yes, there are several clear factors that demonstrate that HVI057a should not be designated as proposed. [Redacted] representation to the Publication Plan sets out reason for this. These reasons can be summarised as follows:

- The site to which HVI057a relates did not even make the Council’s list when they undertook their initial filter of potential sites to be considered for a HVI designation. At this time, the Council reviewed numerous sites around the towns and villages, before concluding which ones should be taken forward with proposed HVI designations. HVI057a did not even make the Council’s broader list of sites to be considered against the HVI criteria, which
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demonstrates the Council did not consider that HVI057a warranted further consideration at that time.

- The proposed designation of HVI057a is entirely inconsistent with the Council’s consideration of HVI072. HVI072 adjoins HVI057a and it is more sensitive than HVI057a. The Council concluded that a HVI designation was not justified for HVI072.

- The proposed designation of HVI057a is entirely inconsistent with the Council’s consideration of an Outline Application for a residential development on the site. The LVIA submitted with the outline (which the Council raised no objection to), along with the email exchange with the Case Officer following the refusal of the application, confirms the site was not considered visually sensitive, beyond the harm that would occur on the intrinsic beauty of the countryside owing the location of the site outside the existing settlement boundary, or historically important (see Appendix 1 and 2).

- The Council’s only justification for the significant change in their position in relation to HVI057a is a single representation to the Draft Plan consultation. This sole representation consisted of a single line query as to whether HVI057a and HVI072 should be included with HVI057 in the proposed HVI designation to the south west. This does not support the Council’s sudden conclusion that the site in question is demonstrably special to the local community or that it holds a particular local significance.

In setting out their response to our representation in the ‘Regulation 20 Consultation Comments with Council’s response11.6.20’, the Council provide a generic response and do not address the important matters raised above or the clear inconsistencies in their consideration of this site. ■

We tried to set up a meeting with the Council to discuss this matter following the Regulation 20 Consultation; however, our request was denied.

The assessment of this site in the ‘The Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space: Background Paper (Update October 2019)’ is vague and does not support the conclusion reached that this site should be given a Local Green Space designation in accordance with the criteria set out in Paragraph 100 of the Framework. The receipt of a solitary, one-line representation from a resident does not constitute justification or demonstrate the site is of particular local importance to the community.

The Council’s assessment of the site in the 2019 update to the HVI Local Green Space Background Paper, actively ignores the built context of the site and its own consideration of the capacity of the site to accommodate development in the Outline Application. These are important considerations.

That said, the Council’s assessment does acknowledge that it makes no contribution from a historical perspective to any listed buildings or conservation areas – para 2.18. The assessment does not identify HVI057a as being important to the setting of the Town in more general terms and
the assessment correctly concludes there is limited views of the site from land to the west due to the topography and the intervening landscaping – para 2.19.

So why is HVI057a proposed for a Local Green Space designation?

The Council’s conclusion on this site are set out in Paragraph 2.20 of the 2019 update:

“The character of the site is similar to HVI057, the designation of this land as Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space was discussed at Planning Policy Committee on 5th November 2019. It was felt this land is important to local residents who make regular recreational use of the area. At this committee resolved that this area of land should be included as Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space for its amazing views and the contribution it makes towards the neighbouring designation and access to the River Ise”.

The first statement is only correct in so far that like HVI057, HVI057a is used for the grazing of animals. Thereafter, the location of the land and its relationship with the town and the River Ise is fundamentally different. HVI057 extends beyond the existing confines of the town and is far more visible from the surround vantage points, namely the open space to the north and views from the west.

The Council conclusion that they “felt this land is important to local residents who make regular recreation use of the area” (our emphasis), is not supported by any evidence (i.e. there was only one, one-line representation in the three consultations undertaken by the Council and Burton Parish Council have questioned the purpose of identify any land with this designation).

Furthermore, the suggestion that the site provides recreational use shows a fundamental misunderstanding of how the site operates. The site is currently used for the grazing animals and public access is limited to the short stretch of PRoW that crosses the site, linking the public open space to the north east and north west of the site, along with providing a link down to the River Ise. Even if developed, the PRoW would be retained (albeit potentially realigned) and the public open space either side of the site unaffected. Residents would still be able to walk through the site following a residential development to access the open space and River Ise beyond. Furthermore, if the site was developed, it could provide further open space, which would provide a betterment for residents in terms of their recreational enjoyment of the site.

The final comment from the Council is that the Committee concluded the site has amazing views, that is contributes towards the neighbouring designation and provides access to the River Ise. Firstly, it is important to note that the Council have concluded that only glimpses of the site can be achieved from the west because of the topography and intervening vegetation (Paragraph 2.19 of the 2019 update), but they have not provided details of views from the site back into the valley.
That said, if the site is not readily visible from the west, then views out of the site back in that direction will also be limited to particular points on the site. Views out to the surround area could be retained as part of the residential scheme. Secondly, the criteria for designating Local Green Space is not about its relationship with more important sites next door. It is about the value of the site itself. In other words, for a designation to be justified, the site in question needs to meet the criteria, rather than the site being next to a site that meets the criteria.

The Council are currently arguing that sufficient housing allocations exist for Burton Latimer and so sites such as HVI057a are not needed to meet the housing requirement in the JCS. However, in time this situation is likely to change, and more housing sites will need to be identified in Burton Latimer. When this time comes, we consider that HVI057a should be top of the list for sites to accommodate this housing. The site is well contained, does not encroach further into the countryside than the existing extremities of the town and the impact of its development would only be appreciated from short range views. The site has a strong urban context and the Outline application, although refused, demonstrates the site is deliverable in all other respects. Local Green Space designations should not be used as a tool to hinder development on sites such as this.

[Redacted] has provided clear and robust justification as to why HVI057a does not meet the criteria for designating Local Green Spaces. There is nothing unique or particularly special about the site, and no evidence has been provided to support the conclusion that it is particularly important for the local community.

It is our view that the proposed HVI designation of the site should be removed from the Part 2 Plan to make the plan Sound.

Yours sincerely

Sam Silcocks BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI
Director - Planning
sam.silcocks@harrislamb.com
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1.0 Non-Technical Summary

1.1 The aim of this report is to provide a full assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects of a proposed development upon the receiving landscape, in line with current legislation and guidance.

1.2 This report provides a landscape and visual impact assessment of the proposed development for 84 residential units, open space, play facilities, retention of existing trees and vegetation, access road and parking provision.

1.3 A number of landscape character assessments have been undertaken including Nationwide Character Assessment prepared by Natural England, Kettering Borough Character Assessment and on site observations.

1.4 The site and its surrounding landscape were assessed during October 2017 and the visual impact assessment identified a total of four viewpoints with significant visual effects.

1.5 The impact on the landscape character has been assessed as moderate due to the minor loss of existing grassland and the introduction of residential elements that may be prominent but may not be considered to be uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. This assessment of landscape effect is not classified as ‘significant’

1.6 Following mitigation measures, vegetation growth and weathering, significant visual impacts would remain from one of the ten viewpoints. For the remaining receptors the views of the development will remain largely unchanged or have only glimpsed views at such a distance that it would be difficult for the casual viewer, visually blending in with the surrounding urban fringe of Burton Latimer.

1.7 Set within the context of residential development, overall this site offers a natural infill for appropriate development. The residual significant viewpoint would be expected given the close proximity to the site and any change would be appreciated at that distance. This development is not considered inappropriate given the context of the surrounding built form.
2.0 Introduction

2.1 Landscape and visual impact assessments can be defined as a mechanism by which the landscape can be assessed against its capacity to accommodate change.

2.2 The aim of this report is to provide a full assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects of a proposed development upon the receiving landscape, in line with current legislation and guidance. It comprises two main assessments, the first for landscape and the second for visual effects. ‘Landscape effects derive from changes in the physical landscape, which may give rise to changes in its character and how this is experienced. This may in turn affect the perceived value ascribed to the landscape. Due to the inherently dynamic nature of the landscape, change arising from a development may not necessarily be significant.’

2.3 ‘Visual effects relate to the changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, to people’s responses to the changes and to the overall effects with the respect of visual amenity’ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd edition published by The Landscape Institute and Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment 2013.

2.4 This report provides a landscape and visual impact assessment of the proposed development for 84 residential units, open space, play facilities, retention of existing trees and vegetation, access road and parking provision.
2.5 The site is located to the south of Bridle Road, Burton Latimer and adjacent to two recent residential developments. This document includes an appraisal of the following:

Landscape Impacts, including:

- direct impacts upon specific landscape elements within and adjacent to the site;
- effects on the overall pattern of the landscape elements which give rise to the landscape character of the site and its surroundings; and
- impacts upon any special interests in and around the site.

Visual Impacts:

- direct impacts of the development upon views in the landscape; and
- overall impact on visual amenity.
3.0 Assessment Methodology and Uncertainty

3.1 As a matter of best practice the assessment will be undertaken in accordance with the methods outlined in the following best practice guidance:

3.2 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Third Edition), published by the Landscape Institute and the IEMA (2013) (GLVIA); and


3.4 In accordance with the GLVIA and other best practice guidance noted above, both the landscape and visual assessments will include baseline studies that describe, classify and evaluate the existing landscape and visual resources, focusing on their sensitivity and ability to accommodate change.

3.5 The assessment has been based on a desk-based review of relevant published guidance, including legislation and policy, baseline information production, and information followed by a number of detailed site appraisals.

3.6 The principal objectives of the LVIA are:

- to identify and classify the existing landscape likely to be affected by the construction and operation of the proposal and ancillary works;

- to identify the ‘visual receptors’ with views of the proposed development; and

- to assess the significance of effects on the prevailing landscape character and visual amenity, taking into account the measures proposed to mitigate any impacts identified.
4.0 Legislation and Policy Context

Landscape Planning Policies

4.1 Guidelines, legislation and planning policy documents provide the framework for the protection and conservation of landscape within the study area, the most relevant of which are outlined below.

4.2 Of these, statutes exist to ensure both direct and indirect protection of our most valued and important landscapes, their intrinsic visual qualities and the individual elements and components that constitute their appeal. Those with direct relevance to the assessment comprise the following:

- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000;
- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981;
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
- Hedgerow Regulations 1997;
- Environment Act 1995;
- Countryside Act 1968; and

4.3 At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

4.4 The Development Plan for Kettering Borough Council includes the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (Part 1 Local Plan), Area Action Plans and the emerging Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. A number of policies from the 1995 Local Plan have been saved and form part of the Development Plan.

4.5 Landscape policies can be found within Appendix C and from the Joint Core Strategy the site sits within the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area (Policy 4) and Sub Regional Green Infrastructure Corridors (Policy 19).

4.6 The open space south of the residential proposals also lies within a Historically and Visually Important Open Space (HVI057), as part of the Development Plan.
5.0 Baseline Study

5.1 Both the landscape and visual assessment include baseline studies that describe, classify and evaluate the existing landscape and visual resources, focusing on their sensitivity and ability to accommodate change. The initial study area was set to a radius of approximately 2.5km from the centre of the site (N52°21.39, W00°41’31”) on the basis that, at this distance, this form of development, when seen by the human eye, would be hardly discernible or not legible.

5.2 Following an initial desk based assessment of aerial photography, Ordnance Survey mapping a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was prepared.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

5.3 In order to assist in the assessment of the potential visual effects of any development, a computer-generated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is normally modelled. The computer ZTV is used as a working tool to inform the assessment team of the extent of the zone within which the proposed development may have an influence or effect on landscape character and visual amenity and the areas within which the study area together with site survey work should be concentrated. It should be noted that this is a topographical information based exercise with no account being taken of the visual barrier effects of vegetation or buildings.

5.4 A computer generated ZTV was established and a study area together with a number of representative viewpoints determined. All these viewpoints are at various distances from the scheme and cover all main points of the compass.

5.5 The extent of study area and viewpoints were selected as being representative and having the potential to offer significant landscape and visual effects.
6.0 Method of Assessment

6.1 The landscape and visual impact assessments have been based on an evaluation of the sensitivity of the receiving landscape and visual receptors, and the magnitude of change associated with the introduction of the proposed scheme into the landscape and visual context of the study area.
7.0 Landscape Character Assessment Criteria

7.1 Description and classification of existing landscape character has involved a review of published regional and sub-regional landscape character assessment information.

7.2 Local landscape character and landscape sensitivity has been defined by taking account of landform, hydrology, vegetation, settlement, land use pattern, and cultural and historic features and associations, consequently the landscape character has been categorised as follows.

Quality

7.3 Quality or condition relates to the physical state of the landscape and its intactness from the visual, functional and ecological perspectives, together with the state of repair of its constituent features or elements (e.g. hedgerows, woodlands, field pattern etc.). Local landscape quality within the study area has been considered based on the criteria described in the following table.

Table 1. Landscape Quality (or Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Quality (or Condition)</th>
<th>Typical Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>All landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Buildings are in local vernacular and materials. No detracting elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Most landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Most buildings are in local vernacular and materials. Few detracting elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Some landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Some buildings are in local vernacular and materials and some detracting elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Few landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Few buildings are in local vernacular and materials. Many detracting or incongruous elements are evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>No landscape elements remain intact and in good repair. Buildings are not in local vernacular and materials. Detracting or incongruous elements are much in evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value

7.4 The value attributed to an area of landscape reflects communal perception at a local, regional, national or, occasionally, international scale. It is informed by a number of factors including scenic beauty, wildness, tranquillity and particular cultural associations. Cultural associations may be widely held at a national scale or more local in nature. Landscapes considered to be of the highest value would generally be formally designated at the national level, whereas those considered of lowest value would generally be undesignated, degraded landscapes, perhaps identified as being in poor condition and requiring either restoration or re-creation. Although value is largely determined by reference to statutory and planning policy designations, an absence of such designation does not necessarily imply the absence of value, as other factors such as scarcity or cultural associations can establish an area of otherwise unremarkable landscape as a valued local resource. The value of landscape character areas and designations has been determined using the criteria described in the following table.

Table 2. Landscape Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Value</th>
<th>Typical Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Areas comprising a clear composition of valued landscape components in robust form and health, free of disruptive visual detractors and with a strong sense of place. Areas containing a strong, balanced structure with distinct features worthy of conservation. Such areas would generally be internationally or nationally recognised designations, e.g. National Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Areas primarily containing valued landscape components combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition and lacking prominent disruptive visual detractors. Areas containing a strong structure with noteworthy features or elements, exhibiting a sense of place. Such areas would generally be national statutory designated areas, such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Such areas may also relate to the setting of internationally or nationally statutory designated areas, e.g. National Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Areas primarily of valued landscape components combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition with low levels of disruptive visual detractors, exhibiting a recognisable landscape structure. Such areas would generally be non-statutory locally designated areas such as Areas of Great Landscape Value. Such areas may also relate to the setting of national statutory designated areas, such as AONB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Areas containing some features of landscape value but lacking a coherent and aesthetically pleasing composition with frequent detracting visual elements, exhibiting a distinguishable structure often concealed by mixed land uses or development. Such areas would be commonplace at the local level and would generally be undesignated, offering scope for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Areas lacking valued landscape components or comprising degraded, disturbed or derelict features, lacking any aesthetically pleasing composition with a dominance of visually detracting elements, exhibiting mixed land uses which conceal the baseline structure. Such areas would generally be restricted to the local level and identified as requiring recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Character sensitivity

7.5 Each landscape character area or designation is assessed for the sensitivity of its character to the introduction of the proposed development, taking into account its key characteristics, landscape elements, composition and cultural associations. Certain aspects of landscape character are particularly important indicators of the degree to which a landscape is likely to be able to successfully accommodate development. These include the general scale and complexity of its landforms and elements; the degree of enclosure or openness; the degree and nature of manmade influences upon it; and whether it offers particular experiences such as remoteness or tranquillity. The criteria used to determine the sensitivity of landscape character are set out in the following table.

Table 3. Character Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Sensitivity</th>
<th>Typical Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Very High**         | **Landscape elements**: Important elements of the landscape susceptible to change and of high quality and condition.  
**Scale and Enclosure**: Small-scale landform/land cover/ development, human scale indicators, fine grained, enclosed with narrow views, sheltered.  
**Manmade influence**: Absence of manmade elements, traditional or historic settlements, natural features and 'natural' forms of amenity parkland, perceived as natural 'wild land' lacking in man-made features, land use elements and detractors  
**Remoteness and Tranquillity**: Sense of peace, isolation or wildness, remote and empty, no evident movement.  |
| **High**              | Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Very High criteria but exceed those for Medium.  |
| **Medium**            | **Landscape elements**: Important elements of the landscape of moderate susceptibility to change and of medium quality and condition.  
**Scale and Enclosure**: Medium-scale landform/land cover/ development, textured, semi-enclosed with middle distance views.  
**Manmade influence**: Some presence of man-made elements, which may be partially out of scale with the landscape and be of only partially consistent with vernacular styles.  
**Remoteness and Tranquillity**: some noise, evident, but not dominant human activity and development, noticeable movement.  |
| **Low**               | Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Medium criteria but exceed those for Very Low.  |
| **Very Low**          | **Landscape elements**: Important elements of the landscape insusceptible to change and of low quality and condition.  
**Scale and Enclosure**: Large-scale landform/land cover/ development, Featureless, coarse grained, open with broad views.  
**Manmade influence**: Frequent presence of utility, infrastructure or industrial elements, contemporary structures e.g. masts, pylons, cranes, silos, industrial sheds with vertical emphasis, functional man-made land-use patterns and engineered aspects.  
**Remoteness and Tranquillity**: Busy and noisy, human activity and development, prominent movement. |
Visual Sensitivity of Landscape Areas:

7.6 The visual sensitivity of an area of landscape relates to its general level of openness, the nature and number of visual receptors present within a landscape, and the probability of change in visual amenity due to the development being visible. It should be noted that landscape visual sensitivity refers to the visual sensitivity of the entire landscape that is being assessed, rather than an assessment of the visual effects of a specific, individual development.

7.7 The following table provides an overview of the typical indicators of visual sensitivity, which can be used to give a transparent, reasoned judgement regarding landscape visual sensitivity.

Table 4. Landscape Visual Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Sensitivity</th>
<th>Visual Sensitivity</th>
<th>Typical Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Visual interruption: Flat or gently undulating topography, few if any vegetative or built features. Nature of views: Densely populated, dispersed pattern of small settlements, outward looking settlement, landscape focused recreation routes and/or visitor facilities, distinctive settings, gateways or public viewpoints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Very High criteria but exceed those for Medium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Visual interruption: Undulating or gently rolling topography, some vegetative and built features. Nature of views: Moderate density of population, settlements of moderate size with some views outwards, routes with some degree of focus on the landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Where, on the whole, indicators do not meet the Medium criteria but exceed those for Very Low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Visual interruption: Rolling topography, frequent vegetative or built features. Nature of views: Unpopulated or sparsely populated, concentrated pattern of large settlements, introspective settlement, inaccessible, indistinctive or industrial settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.8 The overall landscape sensitivity is derived by combining the assessed values attributed to landscape condition, landscape value, character sensitivity and effects on landscape elements and landscape visual sensitivity, to define an overall value within the range of Very High, High, Medium and Low.

7.9 Since each criterion has a varying weight in its contribution to sensitivity the overall value is determined by professional judgement.
7.10 For the purposes of this assessment greater weight is attributed to Landscape Value and Landscape Character Sensitivity since these factors have greater defining criteria in the description of the landscape characterisation.

Magnitude of Change

7.11 Magnitude of change has been predicted by considering the anticipated loss or disruption to character forming landscape elements (e.g. tree planting, landform, buildings, and watercourses etc.), which would arise through introduction of the proposed scheme.

Table 5: Definition of Magnitude of Landscape Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Total loss of or major alteration to key valued elements, features, and characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements considered being prominent and totally uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Would be at a considerable variance with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape. Would cause a high quality landscape to be permanently changed and its quality diminished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Partial loss of or alteration to one or more key elements, features, characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Would be out of scale with the landscape, and at odds with the local pattern and landform. Will leave an adverse impact on a landscape of recognised quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements, features, characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. May not quite fit into the landform and scale of the landscape. Affect an area of recognised landscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Very minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements, features, and characteristics of the baseline or introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Maintain existing landscape quality, and maybe slightly at odds to the scale, landform and pattern of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of Landscape Effects

7.12 The significance of the landscape character effects is determined by the assessment of landscape sensitivity set against the magnitude of change as indicated by the matrix in Table 5.

7.13 For the purposes of this assessment and with reference to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended 2017), ‘Significant’ landscape effects would be those effects assessed to be major or major/moderate and are indicated by shading in the following table.

Table 6: Significance of Landscape Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Minor/moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.0 Visual Assessment Criteria

8.1 In conjunction with the landscape character impact assessment, a visual impact assessment has been undertaken in order to assess any potential visual impact arising as a result of the proposed development.

8.2 In order to evaluate what the visual impact of the development will be and, if appropriate, what can be done, to ameliorate the impact, it is necessary to describe the existing situation to provide a basis against which any change can be assessed. The assessment of visual impact from any one location takes into account the:

- Sensitivity of the views and viewers (visual receptor) affected;
- Nature, scale or magnitude and duration of the change
- Extent of the proposed development that will be visible;
- Degree of visual intrusion or obstruction that will occur;
- Distance of the view;
- Change in character or quality of the view compared to the existing.
Visual Receptors

8.3 Visual impact assessment considers the sensitivity to change of visual receptors within the study area, and the magnitude of change associated with the introduction of the proposed development into the existing visual context.

8.4 A range of fixed visual receptors was initially considered, with emphasis placed on identification and selection of locations with a clear relationship to the proposed scheme where potential visual implications were deemed to be greatest. The key visual receptors normally include statutory and non-statutory designated or protected areas, cultural heritage resources, residential properties and farmsteads, recreational/tourist resources, panoramic hilltop views, focused or directed views, and cumulative views. Viewpoints were selected to be representative of these visual receptor types.

8.5 These preliminary viewpoints locations were assessed in terms of visibility during field investigation resulting in some preliminary viewpoints either being repositioned to locations offering improved visual representation or discounted as not offering any views. In addition, field investigation identified a number of other closer viewpoints.

8.6 For the field assessment, a Canon EOS 600D camera with an 18-55mm lens was used, set at 35mm focal length. This is in line with best practice as shown in the Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual impact assessment advice notes issued by the Landscape Institute (Advice note 01/11).

8.7 Field investigation from the preliminary viewpoints was used to assess the actual visibility of the proposed development within the study area, taking into account the visual barrier effect of vegetation and buildings.
Site Appraisal/ Photographic Studies

8.8 The initial photographic study was undertaken in October 2017 at a time when deciduous vegetation had started leaf fall. Viewpoints at varying close distance from the site were selected to represent the typical views of the site. ACD figure 4 shows the location of these viewpoints. In determining the viewpoints, whether in the immediate locality or further away, the main public highways, sections of public footpaths, and some of the publicly available spaces within the study area were visited. It is acknowledged that from public places, more viewers are likely to be affected thereby adding to the significance of the impact upon receptors in those locations.

8.9 The locations from which the proposed development will be visible are known as visual receptors. In accordance with the “Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition”, for the purposes of the visual assessment the visual receptors have been graded according to their sensitivity to change.

8.10 From the results of the initial desk study and site appraisal it is clear that the proposed development will be visible from a limited number of locations, at varying but close distances, and from both public and private areas.

8.11 In order to evaluate what the visual impact of the development will be and, if appropriate, what can be done to ameliorate the impact, it is necessary to describe the existing situation to provide a basis against which any change can be assessed. Each assessment of visual impact has therefore been made taking into consideration the character and quality of the existing view. The assessment of the significance of effect is a result of the assessment of magnitude of the impact related to the assessment of sensitivity of the receptor.
Visual Receptor Sensitivity

8.12 The locations from which the proposed development will be visible are known as visual receptors. The assessment of visual sensitivity considers both the category of visual receptor and the nature of their existing view. It takes account of the location of the receptor or viewpoint; the expectations, occupation or activity of the people present; the quality of the existing visual context; and the importance or value likely to be attributed by them to the available view. It is therefore the case that not all receptors within a given category are deemed to display equal sensitivity.

8.13 In accordance with the GLVIA, for the purposes of the visual assessment, the visual receptors have been graded according to their sensitivity to change against criteria set out in the table below.

Table 7: Visual Receptor sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Sensitivity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Occupiers of residential properties. Users of outdoor recreational facilities, including public rights of way, whose attention or interest may be focused on the landscape. Communities where the development results in changes in the landscape setting or valued views enjoyed by the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>People travelling through or past the affected landscape in cars, on trains or other transport routes where higher speeds are involved and views sporadic and short-lived. People engaged in outdoor recreation where enjoyment of the landscape is incidental rather than the main interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>People at their place of work, Industrial facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.14 The number of people likely to be present and the duration of time that a view is likely to be experienced may also influence the visual sensitivity of a particular location.

8.15 It is sometimes the case that different categories of visual receptor might be present at a selected representative viewpoint (e.g. a selected location may include both residential properties and workplaces suggesting different levels of sensitivity). In such cases the primary receptor category is identified (usually the more sensitive).
Visual Magnitude of Change

8.16 The visibility of the proposals and the magnitude of their change upon a view and the resulting significance of visual effect are dependent on the range of factors already outlined, together with, the angle of the sun, the time of year and weather conditions. Of equal importance will be whether the site is seen completely, or in part; whether the site appears on the skyline; whether it is viewed with a backcloth of land or vegetation; or with a complex foreground; and whether the site forms part of an expansive landscape or is visible within a restricted view. The aspect of dwellings and whether the view is from a main window or a secondary window, which may be used less frequently, is also a consideration. From highways, the direction and speed of travel are also a consideration. In the assessment magnitude of change is ranked in accordance with the follow table.
### Table 8: Definition of Magnitude of Visual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>The development would result in a dramatic change in the existing view and/or would cause a dramatic change in the quality and/or character of the view. The development would appear large scale and/or form the dominant elements within the overall view and/or may be in full view the observer or receptor. Commanding, controlling the view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>The development would result in a prominent change in the existing view and/or would cause a prominent change in the quality and/or character of the view. The development would form prominent elements within the overall view and/or may be easily noticed by the observer or receptor. Standing out, striking, sharp, unmistakeable, easily seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The development would result in a noticeable change in the existing view and/or would cause a noticeable change in the quality and/or character of the view. The development would form a conspicuous element within the overall view and/or may be readily noticed by the observer or receptor. Noticeable, distinct, catching the eye or attention, clearly visible, well defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>The development would result in a perceptible change in the existing view, and/or without affecting the overall quality and/or character of the view. The development would form an apparent small element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer or receptor. Visible, evident, obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view, and/or without affecting the overall quality and/or would form an inconspicuous minor element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer or receptor. Lacking sharpness of definition, not obvious, indistinct, not clear, obscure, blurred, indefinite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Only a small part of the development would be discernible and/or it is at such a distance that no change to the existing view can be appreciated. Weak, not legible, near limit of acuity of human eye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of Visual Effect

8.17 The significance of the visual effects is determined by the assessment of receptor sensitivity set against the magnitude of change as indicated by the matrix in Table 9.

8.18 For the purposes of this assessment and with reference to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended 2017), ‘Significant’ landscape effects would be those effects assessed to be major or major/moderate and are indicated by shading in the following table.

Table 9: Significance of Visual Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representative Viewpoint Assessment

8.19 Viewpoint selection has been chosen by a review of visual receptors within the vicinity of the site as well as the presence of landscape designations. The choice of representative viewpoints has been limited due to the location of the scheme and surrounding industrial form. The baseline description of each view is contained within the visual impact assessment.

8.20 The following viewpoints in Table 10 were selected as being representative of the potential visual issues associated with the proposed development.

Table 10: Viewpoint Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Distance (km) and direction of view</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Westing</th>
<th>Rationale for selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New residential estate accessed from Kingfisher Way</td>
<td>0.01km, E</td>
<td>52°21'42</td>
<td>00°41'36</td>
<td>Residents close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRoW adjacent River Ise</td>
<td>0.33km, NE</td>
<td>52°21'35</td>
<td>00°41'44</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dearlove Road</td>
<td>0.05km, SW</td>
<td>52°21'42</td>
<td>00°41'26</td>
<td>Residents close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW within open space, north of site</td>
<td>0.0km, SW</td>
<td>52°21'41</td>
<td>00°41'29</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PRoW to the rear of Diana Way</td>
<td>0.27km, WNW</td>
<td>52°21'33</td>
<td>00°41'14</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finedon Station Road</td>
<td>1.59km, N</td>
<td>52°20'46</td>
<td>00°41'42</td>
<td>Road users within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRoW on bridge over railway</td>
<td>0.24km, NE</td>
<td>52°21'33</td>
<td>00°41'43</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PRoW east of Isham</td>
<td>0.57km, NE</td>
<td>52°21'21</td>
<td>00°41'45</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>0.62km, E</td>
<td>52°21'39</td>
<td>00°42'09</td>
<td>Road users within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A509 Kettering Road</td>
<td>1.30km, SE</td>
<td>52°22'02</td>
<td>00°42'35</td>
<td>Road users within ZTV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of Assessment

8.21 The initial field study and photographic appraisal was undertaken during October 2017 at a time when views do not have the benefit of vegetation in full leaf. In summer months when deciduous species have their foliage, less views of the landscape will be available due to vegetation forming visual barriers. Photographs at the end of each viewpoint indicate the general outlook for receptors.

8.22 In determining the viewpoints, whether in the immediate locality or further away, the main public highways, sections of public footpaths, and some of the publicly available spaces within the study area were visited. It is acknowledged that from public places, more viewers are likely to be affected, thereby adding to the significance of the impact upon receptors in those locations.

8.23 For the purposes of this report, the assessment has been based on development proposals illustrated in the planning application. The proposals include a series of elevations and sections for the various heights of buildings and a series of detailed development plans.
9.0 Establishment of Baseline Environment

Landscape Character Baseline

‘Countryside Character Initiative’ – Natural England

9.1 Natural England has published a study on its website entitled ‘Countryside Character Initiative’. This initiative is concerned with the management of England's countryside through an understanding of its character. It aims to guide policy developments, national decision making, and give a context to local planning, action and development. This initiative is based on ‘The Character of England: landscape, wildlife and natural features’ map, first published in 1997, which divides England into National Character Areas (NCA’s). These character areas were updated and republished in April 2014.

The NCA of relevance to the study area, the site and its vicinity is NCA 89 – Northamptonshire Vales.

9.2 The key characteristics of this area are:

- An open landscape of gently undulating clay ridges and valleys with occasional steep scarp slopes. There is an overall visual uniformity to the landscape and settlement pattern.

- Diverse levels of tranquillity, from busy urban areas to some deeply rural parts.

- Mixed agricultural regime of arable and pasture, with arable land tending to be on the broader, flat river terraces and smaller pastures on the slopes of many minor valleys and on more undulating ground.

- Relatively little woodland cover but with a timbered character derived largely from spinneys and copses on the ridges and more undulating land, and from waterside and hedgerow trees and hedgerows, though the density, height and pattern of hedgerows are varied throughout.

- A strong field pattern of predominantly 19th-century and – less frequently – Tudor enclosure.
- Distinctive river valleys of the Welland and the Nene, with flat flood plains and gravel terraces together with their tributaries (including the Ise). Riverside meadows and waterside trees and shrubs are common, along with flooded gravel pits, open areas of winter flooded grassland, and wetland mosaics supporting large numbers of wetland birds and wildfowl.

- Frequent large settlements that dominate the open character of the landscape, such as Northampton and Wellingborough, and associated infrastructure, including major roads, often visually dominant.

- Frequent small towns and large villages often characterised by red brick buildings and attractive stone buildings in older village centres and eastern towns and villages. Frequent imposing spired churches are also characteristic, together with fine examples of individual historic buildings.

- Relatively frequent, prominent historic parklands and country houses towards the outer edges and close to more wooded areas. Other characteristics include ridge and furrow and nationally important townships such as Sutton Bassett and Clipston.

- Localised high concentrations of threshing barns and high status timberframed farm buildings from the 18th century or earlier.
9.3 Statements of environmental opportunity for the area include the following:

- **SEO 1**: Appropriately manage the flood plains of the River Nene and River Welland, their tributaries, and the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area, and deliver the most beneficial restoration of sand and gravel extraction sites, to enhance associated habitats and biodiversity and connections with the farmed environment; to regulate water flow, water quality and water availability; to enhance landscape character; and to increase the opportunities for informal recreation.

- **SEO 2**: Sustainably manage the soils, productive farming, woodlands, coverts and spinneys that contribute to the sense of place, maintaining viable long-term food production and protecting historical and cultural assets such as the ridge-and-furrow sites found in the Nene and Welland valleys, the historic parklands and the variety of field patterns.

- **SEO 3**: Plan ongoing strategic growth and development within the area so that it strengthens the sense of place and increases biodiversity, incorporating extended and restored hedgerow networks, open spaces and the conservation, management and promotion of geological features as part of green infrastructure planning.
Sub-Regional Character

Northamptonshire County Council Character Assessment

9.4 In April 2003, the Built and Natural Environment Service of Northamptonshire County Council appointed LDA Design (formerly Landscape Design Associates) to carry out a ‘Current Landscape Character Assessment’ of Northamptonshire.

9.5 The ‘Current Landscape Character Assessment’ forms part of a wider project that delivers an integrated, robust and transparent landscape characterisation of the county: the Northamptonshire Environmental Characterisation Process (ECP). This provides a comprehensive characterisation of the county by integrating the three primary environmental aspects comprising the historic, the biodiversity and the current landscape character, and the delivery of the county’s Environmental Character Assessment (ECA).

9.6 The site and the study area fall within the River Valley Floodplain character type and specifically within 17D River Ise Floodplain character area. The key characteristics are reproduced below:

- Valleys principally underlain by Lias Group mudstone geology, with alluvium along tributaries that drain each of the floodplains, together with areas of sand and gravel;
- Rivers follow a central course within the floodplain landscape;
- Flat floodplain landscapes that vary in width, surrounded by gently rising valley sides;
- Wide views over the predominantly open floodplain, contained by woodland and rising landform of surrounding landscape types;
- A productive agricultural landscape with varying cover of both arable and pastoral land, with a predominance of arable in the valleys of the Cherwell and Tove;
• Areas of neutral and calcareous grassland evident, often closely associated with areas of improved pasture;
• Woodland cover is generally sparse, although limited small linear copses are evident along the course of rivers, railways and canals;
• Concentrations of small woodlands and large parkland trees apparent around designed parklands;
• Hedgerows often gappy and grown out, with reinforcing post and wire fences frequent, in particular around pastoral fields;
• Limited semi-mature and mature hedgerow and river edge trees provide important vertical elements;
• Settlement extremely limited within the floodplain, confined to small village settlements and isolated farms and dwellings;
• Significant urban influences on floodplain landscapes from surrounding large scale settlements and associated infrastructure elements;
• Few heritage features evident, confined primarily to fields of ridge and furrow. The outer edges of parkland landscapes are evident in many valleys;
• Roads across the floodplains vary from minor country lanes crossing the floodplain to busier ‘A’ roads, and on occasions motorways; and
• Recreational opportunities confined mainly to a network of footpaths, including numerous sections of national trails and leisure parks such as Wicksteed Park and Cosgrove Park.

9.7 The characteristics above cover a wide area, but many of these are relevant to our study area.
LOCAL CHARACTER AREA

The site is currently laid out as semi-improved grassland, with mature Hawthorn hedgerow and occasional tree planting to the eastern, western and southern boundaries, with breaks in the vegetation for Public Rights of Way (PRoW) access through the site. The northern boundary has more fragmented Hawthorn hedgerow. Recently constructed residential dwellings sit to the immediate north and west of the site. To the east, lies an agricultural field, surrounded by residential dwellings forming the edge of Burton Latimer and woodland. The south of the site leads to grassland floodplain with PROW's crossing through the landscape, towards the River Ise and railway.

The river and railway form a strong north-south linear barrier within the landscape. There are also wind turbines to the east of Burton Latimer which are visible amongst the local landscape.

The site is rural in feel, but noise from the local railway line can be felt through the landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Landscape Sensitivity of Local Character Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape visual sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, Weighted Landscape Sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9.8 This section describes in detail, the site and its surroundings. The section also discusses in brief the issue of visual amenity from certain areas within the landscape.

Land to the North of the site

To the north of the site, lies immediately a small open space, overlooked by new residential estate. This forms the edge of the settlement of Burton Latimer. Beyond the dens suburban development, lies large industrial buildings, before the A14 dissects Burton Latimer from the larger town of Kettering.

Land to the East of the site

The eastern boundary is defined by a dense 4.5m high Hawthorn hedge with occasional large Ash trees. Immediately beyond this lies a field in agricultural use. Beyond this lies the residential suburbs of Burton Latimer. To the south of the field is a woodland copse which limits views outwards. Beyond the town, many wind turbines are found, clearly visible from the west.

Land to the South of the site

The southern boundary is defined by a broken 5m high Hawthorn hedge. There are a few large gaps in the hedge for PRoW and other tracks. South of the site are grassed floodplains forming an open space with scattered Hawthorn and other native scrub and shrub planting with footpaths transecting throughout the space. This open space transects north-south alongside the River Ise, which sits alongside a railway. Beyond the railway line to the south west, lies the small settlement of Isham. The landscape undulates beyond the River Ise to the south west with small hills visible amongst the landscape.
Land to the West of the site

To the west of the site, a dense mature 5m high Hawthorn hedgerow forms a barrier to a recently constructed residential development, with the rears of the properties overlooking the site. This new residential estate is on the western edge of Burton Latimer. The floodplain open space lies along the western edge of Burton Latimer with the River Ise and the railway forming a strong north-south barrier in the landscape. Further east is an agricultural landscape with the A509 also running north-south through the landscape.
Identification and Assessment of Potential Impacts

9.9 This section aims to identify the Landscape and Visual effects of the proposed development during construction and operation.

9.10 For the purposes of this report the assessment is based on the effects encompassed by the zone of theoretical visibility within the extent of the 2.5km radius study area.

9.11 For the purposes of this report and as ‘worst case’, the construction and operational stages are assessed at peak construction and fully operational periods.

9.12 The characteristics of the proposed development that have been considered as part of this assessment are described below.
Characteristics of the Proposed Development

9.13 The proposed development is for 84 residential units, open space, play facilities, retention of existing trees and vegetation, access road and parking provision.

9.14 There is an existing PRoW which runs through the site and this route will be maintained but re-routed through the site to ensure a safe passage with natural surveillance of the route from the proposed properties.

9.15 The proposed height of the differing buildings and structures are expected to be up to a maximum of 9m in height.

9.16 It can be anticipated that taller features on site, such as rooftops and eaves have the chief potential to contribute to the most significant effects.

9.17 Landscape and visual impacts may result during both the temporary construction phase and the permanent operational period of the proposed development, including:

- Site establishment works including temporary spoil mounds;
- Construction activities, including the location of site compound areas, laydown areas and the use of cranes and task lighting;
- Permanent features introduced as part of the operational stage development proposals, including the principal visual features of the phased development which are proposed to be:
  - Raised ground levels to form building platforms;
  - Amended road infrastructure and associated car parking together with external lighting;
  - Development set within the consented and agreed framework of landscape structure planting;
  - Consented and agreed ecological conservation landscaping as part of the development.
10.0 Assessment of Effects

10.1 This section aims to identify the issues relating to the impacts of the proposed development during construction and operation.

10.2 The characteristics of the proposed development that have been considered as part of this assessment are described below. The potential visual impact of the proposed development is assessed from the photographic viewpoints (See ACD Figure 4: photo viewpoint locations).

Landscape Character Impacts during Construction

10.3 While the current use of the site is primarily given over to semi-improved grassland, the site contains no landscape features in the way of woodland or hedges that act as visual focal points other than those forming the boundary.

10.4 The phased and gradual removal of the existing land use of open grassland, to be replaced with the storage of spoil, laydown areas full of materials, construction compounds and buildings under construction will form part of a perceived loss of localised landscape elements.

10.5 While the above description explains the changes to the localised site landscape features, the assessment of landscape character impacts must be seen in the wider context of landscape elements that contribute and make up the character area within the study area.

10.6 Landscape quality, value, character sensitivity and visual sensitivity as it relates to the individual LCA has been determined. Taking into account the perceived alteration to landscape character that the scheme will bring, it is assessed that the study area overall, will have a medium landscape character sensitivity to this form of development.

10.7 When seen as part of an essentially extended residential area, the character for this part of the study areas landscape character will continue to have medium sensitivity during the construction period.
10.8 In summary, both the proposed site itself and the local landscape in general, are assessed as having medium landscape sensitivity. For the proposed site itself, it is assessed to be subject to a small magnitude of change, due to the minor loss of key elements such as the grassland, and the introduction of elements such as the residential housing that are not uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Consequently, the significance of landscape effect for the construction period is assessed to be minor. This assessment of landscape effect is not classified as ‘significant’.

Visual Impacts during Construction

10.9 The potential for visual impact will fluctuate throughout the period of construction, particularly during specific construction operations relating to rooftops. As construction progresses on these elements there will be a gradual change in the visual ‘environment’ as the working height increases.

10.10 The intermittent but temporary introduction of prominent features such as cranes used during the construction phases would have some short term, temporary visual effects on the visual amenity of both nearby and to a lesser degree longer distance sensitive receptors. In particular for short distance visual receptors, the cranes will be obvious, distinct and clearly visible (temporary) features within the landscape that may be readily noticed by the receptors.

10.11 Additional temporary visual effects will be caused as a result of construction vehicle movements to and from the construction site and for general construction operations.
10.12 During the construction phases, some temporary lighting will be required. It is not anticipated that there will be any activities requiring work on a 24-hour basis, however, the use of lighting to ensure safe working will probably be required particularly during the winter months. For the highest structures lighting at higher elevations will be required, consequently the greatest potential for visual impact from construction lighting for receptors will result primarily, (but not solely from), from the construction of these particular structures.

10.13 As part of the extended residential area for this part of Burton Latimer, the introduction of prominent construction features and facilities, construction lighting, together with general construction activities for medium scale projects will not be unfamiliar or uncommon features in the local landscape.

10.14 With the introduction of all these construction activities, given that the scheme would occur over a relatively short period, it would result in a noticeable change in the existing view, and would cause a noticeable change in the quality and character of the view. The development would form a conspicuous element within the overall view and may be readily noticed by the receptor. This would result in a medium magnitude of change.

10.15 The sensitivity of the large majority of visual receptors in closest proximity to the proposed construction activities can be classified as high (residents and users of PRoW). Consequently, with a high receptor sensitivity set against a medium magnitude of visual change, the temporary visual effect during the construction period would, as a worst case, result in a significance of effect that can be assessed as Major/ Moderate (i.e. ‘Significant’).
Operation Stage Impacts

*Landscape Effects*

10.16 The introduction of residential development within a substantial landscape framework will not be uncharacteristic when set within the existing attributes of the local receiving landscape. It can be determined that the introduction of features that are not in the local vernacular would be similar to more recent buildings found adjacent to the site. The magnitude of change on landscape character is determined to be small – (minor loss or alteration to one or more key elements and the introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape).

10.17 Based on a medium landscape sensitivity of both the local and wider landscape rather than of the site itself, the significance of effect on the landscape character resulting from the proposed development is therefore assessed to be minor.

*Visual Effects*

10.18 The introduction of residential development within the existing landscape framework would not be considered out of character when considered as part of the wider setting. This includes the road network, existing development and infrastructure.

*Viewpoint Analysis*

10.19 The viewpoints have been selected to be representative of the types of views experienced by a range of sensitive receptors such as those listed in the preceding Table 10 and should be read in conjunction with ACD figure 4.
10.20 A full list of viewpoints are listed in Table 11 (this continues on from Table 10).

*Table 11: Viewpoint Locations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>Direction of view</th>
<th>Distance to site (Km)</th>
<th>Receptor sensitivity at viewpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New residential estate accessed from Kingfisher Way</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Residents close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRoW adjacent River Ise</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dearlove Road</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Residents close to site boundary within ZTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW within open space, north of site</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PRoW to the rear of Diana Way</td>
<td>WNW</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finedon Station Road</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>Road users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRoW on bridge over railway</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PRoW east of Isham</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Road users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A509 Kettering Road</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Road users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 1: View from new residential estate accessed from Kingfisher Way

Baseline Description

This is a view from the new residential estate accessed from Kingfisher Way looking east. This view is representative of the potential views of residents within the estate. The landscape is suburban in feel, dominated by red brick detached and semi-detached residential dwellings. The houses have small front gardens with shrub planting, whilst brick walls and close board fences are visible, defining garden boundaries. There are street lights within the estate. The railway is nearby and the effects of trains can be felt when they travel past. Most views are enclosed, with some distant views possible between the houses. The view in the photo is through to the site, with the close board fence forming the boundary of the site. The trees beyond sit within the site. A glimpsed view of the woodland to the east is possible.

Predicted change

From this viewpoint the proposals will be set to the rear of the existing residential dwellings and will be visible beyond the close board fence and boundary trees. There exists the potential for greater views for residents to see the proposals from the rear of their properties facing the site. Far distant views are not possible, with any views foreshortened by the existing woodland and urban edge of Burton Latimer to the east.

Magnitude of Change

The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect

For the residents immediately adjacent the site, the development would result in a noticeable change in the existing view and would cause a noticeable change in the quality of the view. The development would form a conspicuous element within the overall view that may be readily noticed by the receptor.

Assessment

Sensitivity: Residents - High
Magnitude: Medium

Significance of Effect: Major/Moderate – Significant
Viewpoint 2: View from PRoW adjacent River Ise

![View from PRoW adjacent River Ise](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp2</th>
<th>Panoramic View</th>
<th>(Distance 0.33km looking north east)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from the open space floodplain landscape alongside the River Ise looking north east. This view is representative of the potential views of the users of the PRoW. The landscape is largely rural in feel, but there are many elements visible within the landscape. Much of the foreground is dominated by grassland with scattered trees and shrubs and broken hedgerows, with animals grazing. There is the river and its associated riparian habitat. There is a metal footbridge over the river. The railway is visible, along with the signals and bridges associated with it. The houses along the edge of Burton Latimer (and Isham to the rear of the viewpoint) are also visible amongst the landscape, as it rises towards the north. Wind turbines in the distance and the telegraph poles also add man-made elements with a vertical emphasis on the view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint the proposals will be set in the mid-distance, beyond the hedgerow beyond the telegraph poles. From this location, the interceding vegetation prevents views of the site where the southern boundary has gaps in the hedgerow. The upper parts of the proposed housing would be visible beyond the boundary hedgerow and would appear slightly closer to the viewer than the existing view of housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>The development would result in a perceptible change in the existing view, without affecting the overall quality or character of the view. The development would form an apparent small element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Sensitivity</td>
<td>Users of PRoW - High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Moderate – Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 3: View from Dearlove Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp3</th>
<th>Panoramic View (Distance 0.05km looking south west)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from the new residential estate at Dearlove Road looking south west. This view is representative of the potential views of residents within the estate. The landscape is suburban in feel, dominated by red brick detached and semi-detached residential dwellings in the setting of the viewpoint. There are also clear views of the recent residential development in viewpoint 1, as well as the settlement of Isham beyond the river valley. There is an open space in the foreground before the site boundary. The northern boundary of the site is fragmented with some planting allowing views to the south and west towards the undulating landscape beyond the river valley in the distance. The site will be accessed from this estate, at the far right edge of the panorama photograph above. The bridge over the railway is visible, along with telegraph poles which add a man-made element with a vertical emphasis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint the proposals will be set immediately beyond the vegetation in the foreground. In some areas the housing will be set back to allow for open space as well as a setting for the PRoW. Although the proposals will be clearly visible and foreshorten views of the landscape, the layout of the housing will allow for some views through to the distant landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>For the residents immediately adjacent the site, the development would result in a noticeable change in the existing view and would cause a noticeable change in the quality of the view. The development would form a conspicuous element within the overall view that may be readily noticed by the receptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Sensitivity: Residents - High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnitude: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Major/ Moderate – Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viewpoint 4: View from PRoW within open space north of site

Baseline Description
This is a view from a PRoW within the open space associated with the new residential estate at Dearlove Road looking south west. This viewpoint is directly on the site boundary, within the view of viewpoint 3. This view is representative of the potential views of the users of the PRoW.

The landscape is suburban in feel, dominated by red brick detached and semi-detached residential dwellings in the setting of the viewpoint. There are also clear views of the recent residential development in viewpoint 1, as well as the settlement of Isham beyond the river valley. There is an open space in the foreground before the site boundary. The northern boundary of the site is fragmented with some planting allowing views to the south and west towards the undulating landscape beyond the river valley in the distance. From this location, the vegetation is scrubby with brambles, but allows for clearer views over the river valley. The train and the bridge over the railway are visible, along with telegraph poles which add a man-made element with a vertical emphasis.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set immediately beyond the vegetation in the foreground. The housing will be set back from the boundary at this location to create an open space to form a setting for the PRoW. The character of the setting of the PRoW will change from a scrubby, rural feel to a more formal approach, whilst it will still remain open at this location. Although the proposals will be clearly visible and foreshorten views of the landscape, the layout of the housing will allow for some views through to the distant landscape.

Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape and will reinforce its residential character.

Type of Effect
The development would result in a prominent change in the existing view. The development would form a prominent element within the overall view that will be easily noticed by the receptor.

Assessment
Sensitivity: Users of PRoW - High
Magnitude: Large
Significance of Effect: Major– Significant
Viewpoint 5: View from PRoW to the rear of Diana Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp5</th>
<th>Panoramic View</th>
<th>(Distance 0.27km looking west north west)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from a PRoW to the rear if the houses along Diana Way looking west north west. This view is representative of the potential views of the users of the PRoW and the residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The landscape is in transition at this location, with the suburban housing clearly visible to the east, and the rural landscape evident through the trees to the west. The landscape around this PRoW is heavily overgrown with scrub and bramble. There is also a dense row of trees and understorey, leading to woodland further south.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>The trees and understorey, to the left of the image, filter views of the landscape towards the site. The agricultural field is evident through the filtered views, and this will remain unchanged. Due to the filtered views it is difficult to clearly discern anything beyond this. It must be noted that in winter months, when the trees have lost the leaves, then there would likely be more views available. Due to the height of the tree planting, the filtered views would remain similar for the residents of the houses of Diana Way, as well as the users of the PRoW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view, without affecting the overall quality or character of the view. The development would form an inconspicuous minor element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Users of PRoW - High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Minor – Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Baseline Description**

This is a view from Finedon Station Road looking north. This view is representative of the potential views of road users heading towards Burton Latimer. The landscape is rural in feel, set within a largely agricultural landscape. There are a few houses to the rear of the viewpoint. A managed hedgerow defines the road to the north and limits some views northwards. The hedge is currently without leaf and at a low level, and as such views are currently at their most exposed. In summer months, and when the hedge has grown, views would be more limited. As the land falls away to the east, there are views beyond the hedge towards the large agricultural sheds and buildings. There are also clear views of the housing along the western fringes of Burton Latimer. Parts of the railway and the railway bridges can be seen, whilst parts of Isham are also visible. The woodland to the south east of the site is visible, breaking up the urban fringe. There are also distant trees forming the skyline beyond the rooftops of Burton Latimer. Church spires and large wind turbines also form man made elements with a vertical emphasis on the view.

**Predicted change**

From this viewpoint the proposals will be set in front of the existing housing visible in the view. The proposed development would not break the skyline of the existing view and would not increase the quantum of housing elements in the existing view.

**Magnitude of Change**

The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the landscape.

**Type of Effect**

The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view without affecting the quality or character of the view. The development would form an inconspicuous element within the overall view and at such a distance that it may be missed by the receptor.

**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Road users - Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance of Effect**

*Minor – Not Significant*
Viewpoint 7: View from PRoW on bridge over railway

Baseline Description
This is an elevated view from the PRoW from the railway bridge looking north east. This view is representative of the potential views of the users of the PRoW.

The landscape is largely rural in feel, but there are many elements visible within the landscape. Much of the foreground is dominated by grassland with scattered trees and shrubs and broken hedgerows, with animals grazing. There is the river and its associated riparian habitat. There is a metal footbridge over the river. The railway is visible, along with the signal towers. The houses along the edge of Burton Latimer (and Isham to the rear of the viewpoint) are also visible amongst the landscape, as it rises towards the north. The houses form much of the skyline, with occasional trees punctuating through the rooftops. Woodland clumps are visible amongst the wider view of the landscape. Wind turbines in the distance and the telegraph poles also add man-made elements with a vertical emphasis on the view.

Predicted change
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set in the mid-distance, beyond the hedgerow beyond the telegraph poles. From this location, the interceding vegetation foreshortens some views of the site where the southern boundary has gaps in the hedgerow. The upper parts of the proposed housing would be visible beyond the boundary hedgerow and would appear slightly closer to the viewer than the existing view of housing, but would not impact on any distant views.

Magnitude of Change
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape.

Type of Effect
The development would result in a noticeable change in the existing view, without affecting the overall quality or character of the view. The development would form a conspicuous element that may be readily noticed by the observer.

Assessment
- Sensitivity: Users of PRoW - High
- Magnitude: Medium

Significance of Effect
Major / Moderate – Significant
Viewpoint 8: View from PRoW east of Isham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp8</th>
<th>Panoramic View</th>
<th>(Distance 0.57km looking north east)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from the PRoW through a field just east of the village of Isham looking north east. This view is representative of the potential views of the users of the PRoW. The landscape is largely rural in feel, but there are many elements visible within the landscape. Much of the foreground is dominated by grassland with isolated trees and woodland clumps. The railway is visible, along with the signals, telegraph poles and bridges associated with it. The houses along the edge of Burton Latimer (and Isham to the left of the viewpoint) are also visible amongst the landscape. Wind turbines in the distance are visible beyond the housing adding man-made elements with a vertical emphasis on the view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint the proposals will be set in the mid-distance, beyond the hedgerow beyond the telegraph poles on the other side of the valley. Parts of the site are visible and the proposals would introduce further residential development within the setting of the existing residential settlement, appearing slightly closer to the viewer. The proposals would not impact on the existing skyline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the local landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view, without affecting the overall quality or character of the view. The development would form an inconspicuous minor element in the wider landscape that may be missed by the observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Users of PRoW - High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Minor – Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Viewpoint 9: View from Station Road**

This is a view from Station Road, north of Isham, heading towards Burton Latimer looking east. This view is representative of the potential views of road users heading towards Burton Latimer.

The landscape is rural in feel, set within a largely agricultural landscape. To the right of the image there are large agricultural buildings and residential dwellings forming the edge of the village of Isham. The field in the foreground is bound by hedgerow and mature trees with further mature trees visible in the mid-distance. Beyond this lies a corridor of woodland along the railway and river. Parts of the railway are visible at the foot of the valley. Beyond this, the residential suburbs of the western fringe of Burton Latimer are visible, including the houses of the estate north of the site. The rooftops form much of the skyline, along with the broken canopies of the associated residential tree planting. There are more distant views across the valley to the south. Telegraph poles, tall masts and wind turbines also form man made elements with a vertical emphasis on the view.

**Predicted change**
From this viewpoint the proposals will be set within the existing housing visible in the view. The proposed development would not break the skyline of the existing view and would not increase the quantum of housing elements in the existing view.

**Magnitude of Change**
The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the landscape.

**Type of Effect**
The development would result in a barely perceptible change in the existing view without affecting the quality or character of the view. The development would form an inconspicuous element within the overall view and at such a distance that it may be missed by the receptor.

**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Road users - Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance of Effect**
Minor – Not Significant
Viewpoint 10: View from A509 Kettering Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vp10</th>
<th>Panoramic View (Distance 1.30km looking south east)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Description</td>
<td>This is a view from a layby on the A509 Kettering Road looking south east. This view is representative of the potential views of road users. The landscape is rural in feel, set within a largely agricultural landscape. However, the tranquil feel one might expect to experience is eroded by the busy A509. The large Weetabix factory on the northern edge of Burton Latimer is evident in the mid-ground and creates a dominant feature in the landscape. Beyond this some of the suburban housing within Burton Latimer is visible within a wooded backcloth. The wind turbines are visible beyond this forming man made elements with a vertical emphasis on the view. To the left of the image, the residential development and railway elements on the fringes of Kettering are visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted change</td>
<td>From this viewpoint the proposals will be set within the existing housing visible in the view. The proposed development would not break the skyline of the existing view and would not increase the quantum of housing elements in the existing view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Change</td>
<td>The introduction of the proposed building types would be comparable to the type of development that already exists in the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Effect</td>
<td>Only a small part of the development would be discernible and at such a distance that no change to the existing view would be appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Sensitivity - Road users - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnitude - Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Effect</td>
<td>Negligible – Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Visual Impacts and Significance

**Table 12 Summary of Visual Significance of Effect for Operational Stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Viewpoints</th>
<th>Receptor Type</th>
<th>Receptor Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Significance of Visual Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New residential estate accessed from Kingfisher Way</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRoW adjacent River Ise</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dearlove Road</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW within open space, north of site</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PRoW to the rear of Diana Way</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finedon Station Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRoW on bridge over railway</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PRoW east of Isham</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A509 Kettering Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance of Effects indicated in bold are considered Significant’ in Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended 2017)*
11.0 Mitigation and Recommendations for Development

11.1 The scale of the development should be limited to 2.5 storey to retain the same skyline to views from the local landscape.

11.2 Development should also be kept back from the site boundaries to allow for retention of existing vegetation and additional boundary planting and visual barrier elements to minimise the potential impact of built form.

11.3 The existing boundary planting should be retained as far as possible, especially along the eastern, western and southern boundaries and interplanted where there are natural gaps in order to create dense vegetative barriers.

11.4 The southern boundary planting could be enhanced to create stronger visual barriers, with additional planting further to the south to foreshorten views from further down and across the valley.

11.5 Materials that form the external envelope and roof of the buildings to match the surrounding existing palette, for example, the brick and dark brown roof tiles. These colours will also have a more subtle impact on the landscape.

11.6 The housing along the northern boundary could face northwards to mirror the northern development overlooking the adjacent open space.

11.7 A route for the PRoW should be created to provide an open feel and easy to travel with variety and landscape opportunities with good natural surveillance from the proposed properties.

11.8 Opportunities should be provided within the site to allow for new tree planting to ultimately help form a canopy that can break up the roofscape of the urban fringe. This is to include both additional planting along the site boundaries, tree planting within public open spaces, street tree planting and within rear gardens.
12.0 Summary of Residual Impacts and Significance

Summary of Residual Landscape and Visual Effects

12.1 While the visual assessment has looked, where necessary, at both the construction stage and operational stage separately the residual impacts will only cover the operational stage since:

- The construction stage is temporary;
- Any planting mitigation will take some years to become effective.

12.2 The most successful mitigation will be the development of a substantial landscape framework to reinforce the existing retained hedges and trees. This additional visual barrier effect will reduce the visibility of the development. The reassessment of visual impacts has been taken after this 15 year period following the start of the operational stage. In this time span any tree planting will have grown to over 8m high and any hedge planting, for example, will have now become a dense managed hedgerow.

Landscape Character

12.3 With the introduction of new residential development into this part of Burton Latimer and at the same time, the introduction of landscape management objectives including the introduction of further indigenous hedgerow species, the overall magnitude of landscape character impact is assessed as still being medium, since in accordance with Table 5 the development would give rise to a loss or alteration to one or more key landscape elements but may not be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set against the attributes of this receiving landscape. Assessed against a landscape character that has been determined to have a medium sensitivity, and a magnitude of change assessed as small the Significance of Effect will remain as minor.
Visual Impact

12.4 Within a 15-year assessment period;

- New hedging and vegetation boundaries will be well established and will have been managed at heights that provide more effective visual barrier.
- Planting to reinforce the existing vegetation will provide denser effective winter visual barrier.
- The tree belts and occasional hedge trees will also now be 8+ metres high.
- Materials that form the external envelope and roof of the buildings will have ‘weathered’ and have more subdued tones.

12.5 These mitigation measures would help limit views of the development and therefore alter and reduce some of the magnitudes of visual change from the established viewpoints.
Table 13 Summary and comparison of Residual Visual Significance of Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Viewpoints</th>
<th>Receptor Type</th>
<th>Receptor Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Significance of Visual Effect</th>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Significance of Visual Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Stage</td>
<td>Residual Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New residential estate accessed from Kingfisher Way</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/Moderate</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRoW adjacent River Ise</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dearlove Road</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/Moderate</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PRoW within open space, north of site</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PRoW to the rear of Diana Way</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finedon Station Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRoW on bridge over railway</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Major/Moderate</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PRoW east of Isham</td>
<td>Users of PRoW</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Very small</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A509 Kettering Road</td>
<td>Road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Effects indicated in bold are considered Significant’ in Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended 2017)
13.0 Conclusion

Landscape Character

13.1 The site does not fall within any statutory designations, although land to the south of the site forms part of the Historically and Visually Important Open Space (HVI057), identified as part of the Development Plan. Whilst the site can be seen to sit within the countryside and within the setting of this HVI, there are many incongruous elements which impact on this setting, such as the residential dwellings along the western fringe of Burton Latimer and the transport corridors such as the railway and A509 and the associated signs, signals and lighting.

13.2 The site falls within the national character area 89 – Northamptonshire Vales and the 17D River Ise Floodplain local character area.

13.3 With regard to the dominance of the residential dwellings forming the western edge of Burton Latimer, clearly visible throughout the wider landscape, along with the transport corridors, such as the railway and A509, set amongst a floodplain landscape, the assessment of local character areas, on the whole are assessed as having medium sensitivity to this form of development.

Construction Stage

13.4 For the proposed site itself during the construction stage and with the retention of the main important landscape features such as the boundary hedgerow, it is assessed to be subject to a small magnitude of change, due to the minor loss of or alteration to one or more key elements or features, and the introduction of elements that may be prominent but may not be considered to be uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Consequently the significance of landscape effect for the construction of the proposal is assessed to be moderate. This assessment of landscape effect is not classified as 'significant'.
Operational Stage

13.5 It has been assessed that a minor loss of key landscape elements and the introduction of elements that may be prominent but not uncharacteristic will occur and the subsequent landscape effects are considered not significant in planning terms.

Residual Significance of Landscape Effects

13.6 Following the implementation of the mitigation measures, vegetation growth and weathering of materials, the residual impact will become reduced and this is determined to have no significant residual effects.

Visual Effects

13.7 All viewpoints are from public accessible areas and have been specifically chosen to represent certain views or users of certain views. Viewpoints chosen include footpaths, settlements and roads that fall within the ZTV.

Construction Stage

13.8 The introduction of construction features and facilities, construction lighting, together with general construction activities for large scale projects will not be unfamiliar or uncommon features in the local landscape.

13.9 With the introduction of all these construction activities, given that the scheme would occur over a relatively short period, it would result in a medium magnitude of change.
13.10 The sensitivity of the large majority of visual receptors in closest proximity to the proposed construction activities can be classified as high (residents and users of PRoW). Consequently, with a high receptor sensitivity set against a medium magnitude of visual change, the temporary visual effect during the construction period would, as a worst case, result in a significance of effect that can be assessed as Major/Moderate (i.e. ‘Significant’).

*Operational Stage*

13.11 Due to the location of the site within the exposed nature of western fringe of Burton Latimer the site is potentially visible from a number of locations. The visual impact assessment has identified a number of significant visual effects when the proposal and ancillary works are considered as a stand-alone development. In particular viewpoints 1, 3, 4 and 7 where the receptor is in close proximity to the site and existing visual barriers created by topographical and vegetation features are minimal.

13.12 This is primarily due to the scale of the proposals being considered noticeable even though it would not affect the quality or character of the view. The visually exposed residential dwellings from the recently constructed suburban developments form a setting in which the new residential development will lie from most viewpoints. The floodplain landscape further south of Burton Latimer forms a linear open space, transected by a network of PRoW’s, but the setting of this is offset by the incongruous elements of the urban fringe and the transport corridors and wind turbines.

13.13 For the majority of the receptors and the wider landscape as a whole the assessment has found that while parts of the development may be visible such views are glimpsed and would not have significant visual effects in planning terms.
Residual Significance of Visual Effects

13.14 With heights of these structures being up to 9m, the mitigation planting will increase the visual barriers to the entire site. Only one viewpoint (VP4) is considered to have residual significant visual effects. This viewpoint is located directly on the site boundary from the PRoW which crosses through the site.

13.15 Set within the context of residential development, overall this site offers a natural infill for appropriate development. The residual significant viewpoint would be expected given the close proximity to the site and any change would be appreciated at that distance. This development is not considered inappropriate given the context of the surrounding built form.
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APPENDIX A - Glossary of terms

**Analysis (landscape)**
The process of breaking the landscape down into its component parts to understand how it is made up.

**Assessment (landscape)**
An umbrella term for description, classification and analysis of landscape.

**Biodiversity**
The concept of variety in all species of plants and animals through which nature finds its balance.

**Classification**
A process of sorting the landscape into different types using selected criteria, but without attaching relative values to the different kinds of landscape.

**Compensation**
The measures taken to offset or compensate for residual adverse effects that cannot be mitigated, or for which mitigation cannot entirely eliminate adverse effects.

**Constraints map**
Map showing the location of important resources and receptors that may form constraints to development.

**Countryside**
The rural environment and its associated communities (including the coast)

**Cumulative Effects**
The summation of effects that result from changes cause by a development in conjunctions with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions.

**Diversity**
Where a variety of qualities or characteristics occurs.

**“Do nothing situation”**
Continued change/evolution of landscape or of the environment in the absence of the proposed development.

**Element**
A component part of the landscape (for example, roads, hedges, woods)

**Enhancement**
Landscape improvement through restoration, reconstruction or creation.

**Environment**
Our physical surroundings including air, water and land.
Environmental appraisal  
A generic term for the evaluation of the environmental implications of proposals (used by the UK Government in respect of policies and plans).

Environmental fit  
The relationship of a development to identified environmental implications opportunities and constraints in setting.

Environmental Impact Assessment  
The evaluation of the effects on the environment of particular development proposals

Field pattern  
The pattern of hedges and walls that define fields in farmed landscapes.

Geographical Information System  
Computerised database of geographical information that can easily be updated and manipulated.

Heritage  
Historical or cultural associations.

Indirect impacts  
Impacts on the environment, which are not a direct result of the development but are often produced away from it or as a result of a complex pathway. Sometimes referred to as secondary impacts.

Landcover  
Combinations of land use and vegetation that cover the land surface.

Landform  
Combinations of slope and elevation of the land conditioned by knowledge and identity with a place.

Landscape capacity  
The degree to which a particular landscape character type or area is able to accommodate change without unacceptable adverse effects on its character. Capacity is likely to vary according to the type and nature of change being proposed.

Landscape character  
The distinct and recognisable pattern of elements that occurs consistently in a particular type of landscape, and how this is perceived by people. It reflects particular combinations of geology, landform, soils, vegetation, land use and human settlement. It creates the particular sense of place of different areas of the landscape.
### Landscape character type
A landscape type will have broadly similar patterns of geology, landform, soils, vegetation, land use, settlement and field pattern discernible in maps and field survey records.

### Landscape effects
Change in the elements, characteristics, character and qualities of the landscape as a result of development. These effects can be positive or negative.

### Landscape evaluation
The process of attaching value (non-monetary) to a particular landscape, usually by the application of previously agreed criteria, including consultation and third party documents, for a particular purpose (for example, designation or in the context of the assessment)

### Landscape factor
A circumstance or influence contributing to the impression of a landscape (for example, scale, enclosure, elevation)

### Landscape feature
A prominent eye-catching element, for example, wooded hilltop or church spire.

### Landscape quality (or condition)
Is based on judgements about the physical state of the landscape, and about its intactness, from visual, functional, and ecological perspectives. It also reflects the state of repair of individual features and elements which makes up the character in any one place.

### Landscape resource
The combination of elements that contribute to landscape context, character and value.

### Landscape sensitivity
The extent to which a landscape can accept change of a particular type and scale without unacceptable adverse effects on its character.

### Land use
The primary use of the land, including both rural and urban activities.

### Landscape value
The relative value or importance attached to a landscape (often as a basis for designation or recognition), which expresses national or local consensus, because of its quality, special qualities including perceptual aspects such as scenic beauty, tranquillity or wildness, cultural associations or other conservation issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>A combination of the scale, extent and duration of an effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>The specific approach and techniques used for a given study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Measures, including any process, activity or design to avoid, reduce, remedy or compensate for adverse landscape and visual effects of a development project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception (of landscape)</td>
<td>The psychology of seeing and possibly attaching value and/or meaning to landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary principle</td>
<td>Principle applied to err on the side of caution where significant environmental damage may occur, but where knowledge on the matter is incomplete, or when the prediction of environmental effects is uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>The liking by people for one particular landscape element, characteristic or feature over another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>See Landscape quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptor</td>
<td>Physical landscape resource, special interest or viewer group that will experience an effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory authority</td>
<td>The planning or other authority responsible for planning consents or project authorisation (synonymous with determining authority).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>A picture of a possible future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>The process of identifying the likely significant effects of a development of the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of place (genius loci)</td>
<td>The essential character and spirit of an area; genius loci literally means 'spirit of the place'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive/sensitivity</td>
<td>See landscape sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieve mapping</td>
<td>Technique for mapping environmental constraints, working from a series of overlays, sieving out less important factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>The principle that the environment should be protected in such a condition and to such a degree that ensures new development meets the needs of the present without</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

**Technique**
Specific working process

**Threshold**
A specified level in grading effects, for example, of magnitude, sensitivity or significance.

**Visual amenity**
The value of a particular area or view in terms of what is seen.

**Visual effect**
Change in the appearance of the landscape as a result of development. This can be positive (ie beneficial or an improvement) or negative (ie adverse or a detraction)

**Visual envelope**
Extent of potential visibility to or from a specific area or feature.

**Visualisation**
Computer simulation, photomontage or other technique to illustrate the appearance of a development.

**Worst-case situation**
Principle applied where the environmental effects may vary, for example, seasonally to ensure the most severe potential effect is assessed.

**Zone of visual influence**
Area within which a proposed development may have an influence or effect on visual amenity.
APPENDIX B - Sources of Information

The following sources of information were obtained or consulted during the course of the assessment:

- Consultations with the client regarding the development proposals;
- Northamptonshire County Council and Kettering Borough Council published landscape character descriptions;
- Aerial photography;
- Ordnance Survey Mapping at 1:10,000, 1:25,000 and 1:50,000 scale;
- Site visits and fieldwork to confirm data derived from available mapping and to identify and assess potential impacts.
APPENDIX C – Policy

North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031

POLICY 3 – LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Development should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape setting, retaining and, where possible, enhancing the distinctive qualities of the landscape character area which it would affect.

Development should:

a) Conserve and, where possible, enhance the character and qualities of the local landscape through appropriate design and management;

b) Make provision for the retention and, where possible, enhancement of features of landscape importance;

c) Safeguard and, where possible, enhance important views and vistas including sky lines within the development layout;

d) Protect the landscape setting and contribute to maintaining the individual and distinct character, and separate identities of settlements by preventing coalescence;

e) Provide appropriate landscape mitigation and/or suitable off-site enhancements; and

f) Preserve tranquillity within the King’s Cliffe Hills and Valleys Landscape Character Area and other areas by minimising light and noise pollution and minimising the visual and traffic impacts of development.
POLICY 4 – BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY

A net gain in biodiversity will be sought and features of geological interest will be protected and enhanced through:

a) Protecting existing biodiversity and geodiversity assets by:

i. Refusing development proposals where significant harm to an asset cannot be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated. The weight accorded to an asset will reflect its status in the hierarchy of biodiversity and geodiversity designations;

ii. Protecting key assets for wildlife and geology, in particular the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site, from unacceptable levels of access and managing pressures for access to and disturbance of sensitive habitats;

iii. Protecting the natural environment from adverse effects from noise, air and light pollution;

iv. Where appropriate requiring developments to provide or contribute to alternative green infrastructure (Policy 19); and

v. Ensuring that habitats are managed in an ecologically appropriate manner.

b) Enhancing ecological networks by managing development and investment to:

i. Reverse the decline in biodiversity and restore the ecological network at a landscape scale in the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area (NIA);
ii. Reverse habitat fragmentation and increase connectivity of habitats where possible by structuring and locating biodiversity gain in such a way as to enlarge and/or connect to existing biodiversity assets such as wildlife corridors;

iii. Preserve, restore and create priority and other natural and semi-natural habitats within and adjacent to development schemes.

c) Supporting, through developer contributions or development design, the protection and recovery of priority habitats and species linked to national and local targets. Such measures could include the retention of, and provision of areas of open green space, and hard and soft landscaping to address habitat and visitor management.

d) Developments that are likely to have an adverse impact, either alone or in-combination, on the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area or other European Designated Sites must satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, determining site specific impacts and avoiding or mitigating against impacts where identified. Mitigation may involve providing or contributing towards a combination of the following measures:

i. Access and visitor management measures within the SPA;

ii. Improvement of existing greenspace and recreational routes;

iii. Provision of alternative natural greenspace and recreational routes;

iv. Monitoring of the impacts of new development on European designated sites to inform the necessary mitigation requirements and future refinement of any mitigation measures.
A Mitigation Strategy document concerning the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area will be produced, with a view to its subsequent adoption as an Addendum to the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Document by June 2016, to support the adopted Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031.

Development proposals will need to take account of the Northamptonshire Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document, the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Document and the JPU Mitigation Strategy for the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area. Where necessary, this will include new residential development contributing towards implementation of this Mitigation Strategy.
POLICY 8 – NORTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES

Development should:

a) Create connected places by ensuring that it:

i. Connects to the maximum number of local streets, avoiding dead ends, to allow it to integrate into the wider settlement and to connect to existing services and facilities;

ii. Integrates well with existing cycle, pedestrian, public transport and vehicular movement networks and links to these routes in the most direct and legible way possible, to achieve logical routes;

iii. Improves or creates open green spaces which tie into the wider network of public green spaces and routes to allow for movement across the settlement through its green infrastructure;

iv. Provides direct routes to local facilities within or outside the site to create more walkable neighbourhoods; and

b) Make safe and pleasant streets and spaces by:

i. Prioritising the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users and resisting developments that would prejudice highway safety;

ii. Ensuring a satisfactory means of access and provision for parking, servicing and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards;

iii. Ensuring that streets and spaces are continuously enclosed by buildings, or by strong landscaping with well-defined public and private space;

iv. Ensuring that streets and spaces, are overlooked, active, feel safe and promote inclusive access;
v. Creating legible places which make it easy for people to find their way around; and

vi. Contributing, towards enhancements to the existing public realm such as tree planting to add to the character and quality of the main streets and to encourage walking and cycling.

c) Ensure adaptable, diverse and flexible places by:

i. Creating varied and distinctive neighbourhoods which provide for local needs through a mix of uses, unit sizes and tenures; and

ii. Mixing land use and densities within settlements and ensuring that people can move easily between and through them by non-car modes;

d) Create a distinctive local character by:

i. Responding to the site’s immediate and wider context and local character to create new streets, spaces and buildings which draw on the best of that local character without stifling innovation;

ii. Responding to the local topography and the overall form, character and landscape setting of the settlement; and

iii. The creative use of the public realm through the use of measures such as incidental play spaces, bespoke street furniture and memorable features.

e) Ensure quality of life and safer and healthier communities by:

i. Protecting amenity by not resulting in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking;

ii. Preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, light, water or noise pollution or land instability;
iii. Incorporate ecologically sensitive design and features for biodiversity to deliver ‘Biodiversity by Design’;

iv. Seeking to design out antisocial behaviour and crime and reduce the fear of crime through the creation of safe environments that benefit from natural surveillance, defensible spaces and other security measures having regard to the principles of the ‘Secured by Design’;

v. Proportionate and appropriate community and fire safety measures; and

vi. Incorporating flexible and resilient designs for buildings and their settings, including access to amenity space.
POLICY 19 – THE DELIVERY OF GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

The special mixed urban and rural character of North Northamptonshire will be maintained and enhanced by:

a) Managing development and investment to secure a net gain in green infrastructure through:

i. Establishing multi-functional greenspaces within the GI network;

ii. Providing, where opportunities exist, new wildlife habitats, facilities and routes to enhance assets and the linkages between them;

iii. Supporting the strategic green infrastructure priorities of

1. The Nene and Ise Valleys (Policy 20)

2. The Rockingham Forest (Policy 21).

b) Safeguarding identified sub-regional green infrastructure corridors by:

i. Not permitting development that compromises their integrity and therefore that of the overall green infrastructure network;

ii. Using developer contributions to facilitate improvements to their quality and robustness;

iii. Investing in enhancement and restoration where opportunities exist.

c) Contributing towards the enhancement or ongoing management of local green infrastructure corridors by prioritising green infrastructure investment in areas where net gains can be made to the range of functions, particularly those that improve access between the towns and their surrounding countryside and remedy local deficiencies in open space provision and quality;

d) Requiring, where appropriate, project level Habitats Regulations Assessments, to ensure the protection of European designated sites
such as the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site.

POLICY 20 – THE NENE AND ISE VALLEYS

The Nene and Ise Valleys will be priorities for investment in green infrastructure to strengthen biodiversity and landscape character, support a prosperous local economy, provide leisure and recreational opportunities and support the revitalisation of towns and the protection and enhancement of their surrounding countryside. Proposals should ensure the integrity of European designated sites such as the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA are protected. This will be achieved by managing development and investment to:

a) Improve visual and physical linkages between the rivers and waterways and adjacent settlements by creating and maximising vistas to the valley/water and ensuring development, public realm and access are orientated to the valley/water;

b) Develop the tourism potential of Wellingborough, Thrapston and Oundle as gateways to the rivers and the wider valleys as focal points for the provision of waterside facilities;

c) Prioritise the protection and enhancement of existing visitor attractions and facilities with appropriate infrastructure to ensure that these remain the focal points for visitors, in order to take the pressure off more sensitive locations;

d) Support new green infrastructure and heritage based attractions of a type and scale that can be accommodated by existing or new infrastructure and which strike an appropriate balance between visitor numbers and biodiversity, landscape, local amenity and heritage interests;
e) Provide a focus for improved navigation and enhanced waterways along the River Nene;

f) Improve strategic recreation trails along the length of the Nene Valley and developing these in the Ise Valley;

g) Identify opportunities and proposals for floodplain and river re-naturalisation, de-culverting within urban areas and river habitat improvements.

Relevant saved policies from the Local Plan include:

7 – Protection of the Open Countryside

An important aspect of planning policy for the natural environment is the general protection from unjustified development accorded to the open countryside. This is affirmed in specific policies which are summarised in Figure 3.1. For the purposes of this and similar policies, the open countryside is defined as those parts of the Borough outside the town inset boundaries and the defined village limits as shown on the Proposals Map.
RA5 – Housing in Open Countryside

Planning permission will not normally be granted for residential development in the open countryside. Exceptions may include:

i development essential for the purposes of agriculture or forestry, which:

a. by the design, materials and siting, would be sympathetic to the character of the surrounding countryside; and

b. is not normally more than 180 square metres in total floor space except where there are particular personal, family or business reasons for justifying a larger floor area and provided that in all circumstances it is appropriate to the character of the surrounding countryside;

ii reuse/conversion, retention and/or reinstatement of a suitable rural building (see Policy RA14)

iii the provision of housing to meet local need in accordance with Policy RA7;

iv a proposal in accordance with Policy RA2 (new village);

v the replacement of an existing dwelling (see Policy 48); and

vi gypsy sites (see Policy 119).
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Appendix 2 : Correspondence with the Planning Officer following the determination of the Outline Application