MWDA: Gillmoss Materials Recovery Facility

Townscape and Visual Assessment

09 December 2008

Produced for
Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority

Prepared by
Mouchel

St John's House
Queen Street
Manchester
M2 5JB
UK

T 0161 8324542
F 0161 8352038

Document Control Sheet

Project Title MWDA: Gillmoss Recycling Park

Report Title Townscape and Visual Assessment

Revision 4

Status Final

Control Date 09 December 2008

Record of Issue

Issue	Status	Author	Date	Check	Date	Authorised	Date
1	Draft	A Jones	1/9/08	A Williams	22/9/08		
2	Final Draft	A Jones	6/11/08	A Williams	6/11/08		
3	Final	A Jones	6/11/08	S Duff	2/12/08	P Coughtrey	3/12/08
4	Final	A Jones	6/11/08	S Duff	9/12/08	P Coughtrey	9/12/08

Distribution

Organisation	Contact	Copies
Mouchel	Sarah Duff	1 e
MWDA	Graeme Bell	1 e

This Report is presented to Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority (MWDA) in respect of the Gillmoss Materials Recovery Facility Townscape and Visual Assessment and may not be used or relied on by any other person or by the client in relation to any other matters not covered specifically by the scope of this Report.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the report, Mouchel Limited is obliged to exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence in the performance of the services required by MWDA and Mouchel Limited shall not be liable except to the extent that it has failed to exercise reasonable skill, care and diligence, and this report shall be read and construed accordingly.

This Report has been prepared by Mouchel Limited. No individual is personally liable in connection with the preparation of this Report. By receiving this Report and acting on it, the client or any other person accepts that no individual is personally liable whether in contract, tort, for breach of statutory duty or otherwise.

Contents

Tables

Abbreviations

DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
GLVIA	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
LDD	Local Development Document
LDF	Local Development Framework
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LTP	Local Transport Plan
MRF	Materials Recovery Facility
MWDA	Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority
OS	Ordnance Survey
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance Note
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
RPG	Regional Planning Guidance
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
UDP	Unitary Development Plan

1 Introduction

Mouchel has been commissioned by Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority (MWDA) to undertake a Townscape and Visual Appraisal of the proposed Gillmoss Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) in Liverpool. This report outlines the findings of the assessment of predicted effects on townscape character and sensitive visual receptors that the construction and operation of the proposed MRF may have.

Townscape effects are concerned with the impact that a proposed development may have on the quality of views and the sense of place that contribute to the physical enjoyment of a particular location or space.

Townscape is defined as the appearance of a town, city or urban scene. This differs from the wider landscape in that it is more concerned with the quality of a built space as opposed to something that is generally considered more natural, although few landscapes are not influenced strongly by humans. Instead townscape is broadly defined by its built form and the relationships with other adjacent built forms along with the spaces in between. It can be further influenced by the materials that are used, the sense of enclosure, the historical influences and the land use.

1.1 Statutory Planning Context

The following guidelines, legislation and planning policy documents provide the framework for the protection and conservation of townscape within the study area.

1.1.1 National Legislation

Statutes exist to ensure both direct and indirect protection of our most valued and important townscapes and the landscapes that they contribute to, their intrinsic visual qualities and the individual elements and components that constitute their appeal. Those with direct relevance to the assessment include the following:

- Countryside Act 1968;
- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981;
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
- Environment Act 1995; and
- Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

Statutes and national planning policy make no direct provision for the protection or conservation of specific views. They are, however, an implicit part of the values and qualities recognised in broader townscape designations that seek to protect areas of recognised character and quality.

1.1.2 National Planning Policy Guidance and Planning Policy Statements

Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) and their replacements Planning Policy Statements (PPS) are prepared by the government after public consultation to

explain statutory provisions and provide guidance to local authorities and others on planning policy and the operation of the planning system. They also explain the relationship between planning policies and other policies which have an important bearing on issues of development and land use. Local authorities must take their content into account in preparing development plans.

Relevant PPGs and PPSs to the assessment of townscape include the following:

- PPS 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development;
- PPS 12 – Local Spatial Planning; and
- PPG 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment.

1.1.3 Regional Policy Context

Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) and Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) exist as a planning guidance framework at regional level. The aim of such guidance is to promote sustainable patterns of spatial development and physical change. These frameworks inform the preparation of Local Development Documents (LDD), Local Transport Plans (LTP) and regional and sub-regional strategies and programmes that have a bearing on land use activities.

Following enactment of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, RPG became part of the statutory development plan and was renamed the RSS. Therefore, the existing RPG13 for the North West became the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (March 2003). Policies within the North West RSS relevant to this study are:

- Policy DP3 - New development must demonstrate good quality design and respect for its setting;
- Policy UR10 - Local authorities should identify areas in need of more greenery, urban greenspace and the public realm and develop appropriate strategies for their design and management; and
- Policy UR11 – Local authorities in partnership with other agencies should prepare joint strategies to identify the role, potential and management of urban fringe areas with the emphasis on improving their visual attractiveness as urban/ rural edge settings for the recreational and biodiversity value.

Of particular relevance to this study is policy UR-11, this policy emphasises the role of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to prepare local design strategies and principles for inclusion in LDD or as supplementary planning guidance. Of particular relevance, is the policy, which sets out “guidance to ensure the integration of new development with surrounding land use taking account of landscape character, setting, the quality, distinctiveness and heritage of the environment and use of sympathetic materials”.

1.1.4 Local Policy Context

The study area lies within Liverpool and the relevant LPA is Liverpool City Council (LCC). The relevant development plan is the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which is a 'saved plan' within the current Local Development Framework (LDF). Polices contained within the UDP, which are relevant to the townscape and visual assessment, are as follows:

- Policy GEN1 – aims to protect and enhance the built environment by encouraging a good standard of design and landscaping in developments;
- Policy HD18 – new developments to comply with the following criteria, where appropriate to ensure high quality of design, of particular relevance:
  - The scale, density and massing of the proposed development relate well to its locality.
  - Development pays special attention to views into and out of adjoining greenspace, in particular boundary treatments, which allow for open views into greenspace and avoid designs which provide a poor face for them.
  - There is no severe loss of visual amenity or privacy to adjacent residents.
- Policy H22 – aims to protect and integrate existing trees and landscape features within new development;
- Policy H23 – all new development proposals should make proper provision for planting and its subsequent successful growth through provision of adequate management and aftercare. The policy acknowledges that the setting of a building can help improve the character of an area to the benefit of users and local residents. Landscape design needs thorough consideration of the overall design of the development. Due care should also be given to preserve and protect existing trees during construction;
- Policy EP5 – planning permission will not be granted for waste related developments if the proposal is not well screened through the use of other development, landscaping or the confinement of the operation within covered buildings; and
- Policy OE9 - Any development proposal within or adjacent to the Fazakerley Ecology Park located along the southern boundary of the Fazakerley Waste Water Treatment Works should be compatible with, and contribute to, the overall aims and objectives of the Ecology Park

The proposed MRF is located on land designated as a site for industrial development (Policy E1).

2 Methodology

2.1 Study Area

The study area has been defined as the area through which existing townscape character may change or be influenced as a direct result of construction and operation of the proposed development. This has broadly been defined by the extent to which the proposed development would visually influence townscapes immediately adjacent to and surrounding the development.

2.2 Townscape Character

There is no nationally recognized townscape assessment methodology; instead the broad principles of the landscape character assessment process outlined in other methodologies such as GLVIA[1] and DMRB[2] have been applied to the subject of Townscape.

2.2.1 Stages in the Assessment Process

There are five key stages to the assessment process:

- Recording and analysis of the existing townscape context of the receiving environment;
- An appreciation of the nature, forms and features of the proposals;
- Identification of design and mitigation measures appropriate to the proposed development and surrounding townscape;
- An assessment of the magnitude of change likely to result from the development and the sensitivity of the existing townscape to change; and
- Evaluation of the significance of the changes identified based on the above assessment.

The assessment relied on a thorough understanding and observation of existing townscape character and the development proposals.

The assessment involved an iterative process in which the analysis and evaluation of potential impacts informed the progression of the scheme design and any mitigation measures. The process commenced with identification of townscape character and quality within the receiving environment and analysis of its value, leading to recognition of the sensitivity to any changes likely to result from progression of the proposals. This was achieved through a combination of desk based identification supported by a site visit to establish existing built form, structures and open spaces and a review of the potential impacts on such features within the study area, taking into account the design features and overall land-take requirements associated with the proposed development.

The nature and status of physical townscape characteristics were established through a review of existing data sources and consultation with statutory agencies and relevant local authority departments. Data gathered were checked and verified

through on site surveys, allowing distinctive local character zones to be defined and the social characteristics of townscapes (identified by relationships between built form and the way in which it is used and managed) to be recorded.

An assessment was then undertaken to identify the magnitude of change and to evaluate the potential significance of the effects likely to arise from construction and operation of the proposals. Appropriate mitigation measures were then identified and any residual effects were assessed to draw conclusions as to the likely overall effect of the proposed development on the receiving environment.

2.3 Assessment Criteria

The prime criteria used to evaluate the effect on townscape character are centred on the extent to which existing townscape elements, features and key characteristics would be lost or modified by the proposals. The criteria that were used to establish character, quality and value are set out in Appendix A.

Effects can be adverse where features or key physical characteristics such as established planting, historic buildings or structures have to be removed to permit construction. Conversely, effects can prove beneficial where existing derelict buildings or poorly maintained features are restored or replaced, or where there is reclamation of derelict land, constituting an improvement in the existing settlement and land use pattern.

The analysis of the significance of an effect derives from consideration of sensitivity to change and magnitude of change in relation to townscape character zones and their constituent components; account is then taken of the effect mitigation measures would have in addressing potentially significant effects.

2.4 Change Over Time

The effects of a development change over time as mitigation strategies, included as part of the development proposals, establish, and as the existing townscape surrounding the development evolves. The assessment acknowledges this change and reports on the potential effects during the construction phase, upon opening of the scheme and those 15 years following.

2.5 Assessment Ratings

The findings are represented using a descriptive, descending scale ranging from large - moderate - slight and adverse through neutral to an ascending scale of slight - moderate - large and beneficial. Explanation of the impact ratings is provided in Appendix B.

2.6 Impact Application and Evaluation

Each of the townscape character areas identified in Section 4 - Baseline Conditions have been evaluated against the key character impact criteria and allocated an impact rating accordingly.

The assessment and evaluation for each character zone concludes with a summary statement of the effect of the proposed development, taking into account proposed mitigation measures and reflecting the significance of change over time.

The following key tasks have been undertaken as part of the townscape assessment:

- Analysis of existing assessment data derived from previous environmental studies of the area;
- Desk based analysis of available mapping and aerial photography covering the study area to identify landform, vegetation and settlement patterns;
- Desk based review of any available background townscape studies and appraisals, including district area and local centre plans;
- A review of available planning policy documentation relevant to the scheme (from Liverpool City Council);
- Preliminary desk based plotting of potential townscape character zones;
- Site appraisal and appropriate modification of preliminary zones. Site recording involved annotation of 1:1,250 and 1:10,000 scale Ordnance Survey plans defining the zones and the key elements determining character;
- Site photography to illustrate character zones, notable views / viewpoints and key townscape elements;
- Drafting and description of character zones, analysis of their sensitivity to change and evaluation of change in character and potential resultant effect on existing quality;
- Development of landscape mitigation proposals;
- Consultation with the relevant planning authority; and
- Identification of potential residual effects.

2.7 Visual Effects

The assessment into visual effects has involved the three stages of assessment described below; the criteria are set out in Appendix C:

- Identification of principal visual receptors and an indication of their sensitivity to changes in their view related to the implementation of the proposed route options;
- Site survey to verify receptors and determine the potential magnitude of impact for the identified receptors arising from the proposed route options; and
- Identification of broad mitigation measures to potentially address significant impacts identified by the assessment.

2.8 Baseline Environment

Establishment of the existing visual context for the proposed MRF has involved consideration of the information relating to existing landscape character established during the landscape character baseline assessment, the definition of a zone of visual influence (the visual envelope) for the proposed MRF and the identification of key visual receptors within the visual envelope.

2.9 Visual Envelope

The visual envelope represents the extent of the area within which there would be potential for views of the proposed MRF. A preliminary plotting of the visual envelope was undertaken by reviewing current OS mapping for the area to establish where landform, large scale established planting and areas of built development would be likely to define the availability of views. The initial plotting was then checked on site and modified. A follow up site visit was made on the 3rd November 2008 to update the baseline environment resulting in significant changes to the visual envelope.

Inclusion of an area within the visual envelope does not itself determine that all potential receptors within the defined area would experience views of the proposed scheme, there being many localised features such as individual buildings, hedgerows, small copses or localised variations in landform which may obstruct views from a receptor shown as being in the envelope. The prime objective is to establish an area within which key receptors whose views may be influenced by the proposed MRF can be identified.

The assumptions adopted in drafting the envelope have been that the observer height is 1.5 metres and that the assumed height of vehicles using the proposed road would be 3.5 metres, the nominally acceptable height for an average commercial vehicle or Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV).

2.10 Key Receptors

The identification of key receptors involved a review and initial plotting of buildings, areas open to public use, rights of way, informal routes and local roads located within the visual envelope. Site surveys were then undertaken to establish the nature, location and actual availability of view. This enabled a schedule of key receptors to be identified for the purpose of assessing the order of impact they would be likely to experience.

2.11 Impact Assessment

The assessment of visual impacts involved a detailed site survey on 29th August 2008 with a follow up site visit on the 3rd November 2008. The weather on both days was relatively dull and overcast, visibility was, however, good. Individual records were made for each receptor. Where appropriate, receptors were grouped, with numbers of individual properties in the group or an estimate of number of users being noted.

Information recorded included:

- Receptor type and number (for example, office, footpath, open space);

- Form and quality of the existing view;
- Distance between receptor and the proposed MRF;
- Angle of view towards the proposed MRF;
- Elevation of receptor in relation to the proposed MRF (view up/view down/level view);
- Extent of the existing view predicted to be influenced by the proposed MRF; and
- Location of the proposed MRF in the view (foreground / mid ground / background).

2.12 Impact Application and Evaluation

Each of the receptors identified has been evaluated against the key visual impact criteria and has been allocated an impact rating. Identified receptors, potentially subject to the various grades of impact, are then identified. The assessment concludes with a brief discussion of the overall visual implications of the proposals and a summary rating for the visual impact.

3 Baseline Conditions

3.1 Introduction

The development site is located within the Merseyside conurbation. The area is characterised by urban sprawl that has developed as a result of the establishment of Liverpool as a major trading port.

3.2 History and Setting

The conurbation has expanded in successive waves since the establishment of Liverpool as a major trading port in the 15th century. The port expanded rapidly towards the end of the 17th century in response to increasing demands for Cheshire salt, Lancashire textiles, coal, pottery and metal goods. The sprawl emanated from the pre-Victorian core located at the water's edge. The ring road marks the general extent of Victorian Liverpool. Outside the ring road, the majority of development is post-war housing with some areas of farmland, golf courses and parkland associated with country houses. The conurbation contains several Victorian public parks, such as Stanley Park.

3.3 Character Areas

3.3.1 National Character Areas

The proposed MRF lies in Gillmoss approximately 1 km west of the M57 between junctions 5 and 6. As such, the site falls within the Landscape Character Area 58 – Merseyside Conurbation as defined by 'The Character of England Map' carried out by the then Countryside Commission and English Nature (now Natural England) in 1996.

The key characteristics of this wider landscape are:

- Area encompasses City of Liverpool and Birkenhead north-east of the mid-Wirral sandstone ridge;
- Urban growth and built-up landscape is the dominant feature;
- Phased urban sprawl due to establishment and expansion of Liverpool as a major trading port;
- The amount of green-space is limited. Much of what remains is either formal parkland or derelict land; and
- The Mersey Estuary provides a break between the dense urban conurbations of Liverpool and Birkenhead, which also has important nature conservation value.

3.3.2 Sub-Regional Character Areas

No landscape or townscape character assessment exists for the City of Liverpool.

3.3.3 Local Character Areas

At a local level the study area can be sub divided into a number of smaller local character areas that can be defined by their key features, sense of enclosure and

general appearance. These spaces generally retain some awareness and commonality of features with the immediately adjacent character areas, but retain sufficient differences to be considered as definable areas.

The study area has been split into six local character areas (Figure 1.1) defined and described below:

3.3.3.1 Effluent Treatment Works

The site is operated by United Utilities as an effluent treatment works and is located to the west of the proposed MRF. The site is flat, with earth bunds around its perimeter and one access point which is located opposite the development site entrance. The site boundary is defined by a metal palisade security fence and a dense semi-mature screen planting, approximately 8-10 m high. The perimeter screen planting consists of a mix of deciduous and evergreen species. In the UDP, this planting has been designated part of the enhancement and protection of green-space, new countryside area and site of nature conservation value. The area along the southern boundary has been designated as an ecology park and is currently under construction. The Ecology Park provides an amenity resource for local residents and employees, and will include facilities for cycling, walking, wildlife and nature conservation. The area occupied by the waste water treatment works is designated as industrial use. There are no direct views into the site from the surrounding highway network apart from glimpsed views from the newly developed Ecology Park. The effluent treatment works are enclosed with tree planting towards its perimeter, particularly to the east, earth bunds along its perimeter also reduce views through the site and add to its enclosure.

The character area is considered to be of **ordinary** quality with a **low** sensitivity to change.

3.3.3.2 Copplehouse Housing Estate

Along the northern boundary of the estate is a medium density two storey housing estate. The estate is a mixture of housing styles and age. The housing immediately adjacent to the site boundary consists of semi-detached contemporary brick buildings, which reflect little of the local distinctiveness. The estate is well maintained with properties having off road parking. There is no open space provision within the estate, such as play areas or playing fields. The houses lie in land designated in the UDP as land for new housing. Further to the north there is a separate housing area consisting of a mixture of 1950's council properties and 1930's bay window fronted semi-detached housing. The access roads into and out of both these areas are from the East Lancashire Road (A580) to the south and the Valley Road (A506) to the north, connected by Copplehouse Lane and Stonebridge Lane.. The newly constructed roundabout has diverted the bottom of Stonebridge Lane which will service the entrance to the proposed MRF.

The character area is considered to be of **ordinary** quality with a **medium** sensitivity to change.

3.3.3.3 Industrial Estate

To the east and south of the site, industrial land-use predominates. The existing mix of 1960's concrete units (for example Stage Coach) have been slowly demolished and replaced by new retail and industrial units, which are characterised by large flat roofed metal clad sheds (for example Carcraft). The industrial estate is visible from the A580 and the units are linked with a minor road network leading from the A580. The road width and scale has been designed to take articulated lorries. Land to the east, adjacent to the M57 is fallow grassland and is designated as land for industrial use in the UDP. To southeast of the area, a corridor of land adjacent to the A580 is currently been developed as a landscaped spine with office units, new roads and a roundabout, known as the Stonebridge Business Park. Linear waterways and avenue planting have been constructed recently along the southern perimeter with marginal planting and reed beds, creating an attractive amenity space. This green buffer between the road and the boundary edge will over time greatly enhance the area and create a strong linear avenue.

The character area is considered to be of **ordinary/good** quality with a **medium** sensitivity to change.

3.3.3.4 Croxteth Housing Estate

Towards the south of the development site, separated by the East Lancashire Road (A580) is a medium density two storey housing estate. The housing closest to the site boundary consists of a mixture of 1950's style semi-detached contemporary brick and rendered buildings. The estate properties are a mixture of off road parking and front gardens converted to hard standings for cars. There is open space provision within the estate, such as playing fields, open scrubland and small green spaces. The green spaces are primarily scrubland and open, rough grassed areas with occasional trees, with designated footpaths and desire lines. The houses are designated as primarily residential areas in the UDP with the remaining green spaces designated for enhancement and protection of green spaces. Croxteth community school lies to the west of the estate. The access road into the estate is from the north along the East Lancashire Road (A580).

The character area is considered to be of **poor** quality with a **medium/high** sensitivity to change.

3.3.3.5 Transport Corridors

Towards the east and south of the development site are the M57 and the East Lancashire Road (A580) corridors form the primary transport corridors. The M57 situated between junction 6 and 4 forms part of a busy 3 lane carriageway in both directions with outer hard shoulder. The stretch of motorway can be accessed from junction 6 Valley Road (A506) and junctions 5 and 4 of the East Lancashire Road (A580). The East Lancashire Road is a 3 lane carriageway in both directions with additional slip roads at junctions with traffic lights and central and outer grass reservations. The grass reservation lining the outside of the carriageway is planted with medium sized trees. The A580 forms an arterial route into the city and provides

access into the Gillmoss Industrial Estate, this links with the broader transport network including the M57.

The character area is considered to be of **ordinary/poor** quality with a **medium/low** sensitivity to change.

3.3.3.6 The Ecology Park

Forming a link and extending the planting associated with the effluent treatment works the ecology park has been created as a result of policy decisions as part of the UDP.

The area forms a narrow strip of land extending north of the existing A580 between Lower Lane to the west and Back Gillmoss Lane to the east. The area comprises newly created water bodies in association with areas of new planting, walkways and recreation spaces. As a result the recent development the area has little sense of maturity with adjoining land uses changing as a result of increasing levels of development.

The character area is considered to be of **ordinary/good** quality with a **low** sensitivity to change.

3.4 Visual Context

The visual context of the site is broadly contained by residential development to the north and the structure planting associated with the sewage farm to the west. Several residential properties have direct rear elevation views towards the development site becoming increasingly filtered by planting to the northern boundary towards the east.

To the east and south there is recent development in the form of several new and large warehouse style buildings, beyond are the rooflines of the residential properties that extend southwards.

The visual context is outlined in detail as part of the baseline description for the visual impact assessment in Appendix D.

4 Assessment of Effects without Mitigation

4.1 Introduction

The proposed development will be finished to a high standard of design, using quality materials and a co-ordinated design theme to the massing arrangement, colour coding and siting of the development within the wider context of the expanding business development to the south.

The current disused open space of poor landscape quality would be replaced with the development. There would be no loss of townscape or landscape components of good quality within any of the local character zones, with only minor loss of existing self sown semi mature trees and shrubs within the development site itself.

4.2 Landscape Character

The following provides a summary of the anticipated effects on the identified local character zones.

4.2.1 Effluent Treatment Works

The sensitivity of this character area to change is considered to be low in relation to the proposed development, whilst the magnitude of change is assessed as no change given that no development will occur within this character area. The visually discreet character area would not be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed development.

The effects of the proposed development on a character area that is considered to be of ordinary quality and low sensitivity to change would be **neutral**.

4.2.2 Copplehouse Estate

The sensitivity of this character area to change is medium to low in relation to the proposed development, whilst the magnitude of change is assessed as no change given that no development will occur within this character area.

The resultant effects of the proposed development on the Copplehouse Estate character area that is considered to be of ordinary quality with a medium sensitivity to change would be **neutral**.

4.2.3 Industrial Estate

The sensitivity of this area to change is in the order of low in relation to the proposed development site, whilst the magnitude of change is also in the order of low as the development would not create a discernable change to the fabric of the existing baseline conditions of this zone.

The resultant effects of the proposed development on character considered to be ordinary/good quality with a medium sensitivity to change would be **neutral**.

4.2.4 Croxteth Housing Estate

The sensitivity of this character area to change is in the order of low in relation to the proposed development site, whilst the magnitude of change is in the order of no change as no development will occur within this character area.

The resultant effects of the proposed development on the Croxteth housing estate character area considered to be ordinary/poor quality with a medium/high sensitivity to change would be **neutral**.

4.2.5 Transport Corridors

The sensitivity of this character area to change is in the order of low in relation to the proposed development site, whilst the magnitude of change is in the order of no change as no development will occur within this character area.

The resultant effects of the proposed development on the A580 and M57 corridors character area considered to be ordinary/poor quality with a medium/low sensitivity to change will be **neutral**.

4.2.6 The Ecology Park

The sensitivity of this character area to change is in the order of low in relation to the proposed development site, whilst the magnitude of change is in the order of no change as no development will occur within this character area.

The resultant effects of the proposed development on the Ecology Park character area considered to be good quality with low sensitivity to change will be **neutral**.

4.3 Visual Effects

A detailed visual impact assessment has been undertaken as part of this study (Appendix 4). A summary of the results is provided below.

The development will have its most significant impacts on those properties along Longsdown Road with rear elevations that have direct views of the development site, particularly those that do not benefit from existing boundary planting and earth bunding along the northern boundary of the development site.

Views from the effluent treatment works are greatly limited by the dense screen planting along the west boundary. Earth mounding around the perimeter of the treatment works and the north perimeter of the ecology park with existing tree planting restricts views further to limited or no views of the proposed development.

Views from the Gillmoss Industrial Estate will be limited to partial or no views by the existing the warehouse towards the west of Gillmoss Industrial Estate. Any potential views will be similar to current surrounding and will fit well with the surroundings.

The East Lancashire road will have limited to no views of the proposed development because of existing tree planting along its perimeter and further earth mounding and tree planting between the development site and the road boundary. Any potential

view will be transient and be in the order of low to none. Furthermore the newly developing Stonebridge Lane Business Park has further restricted direct views of the proposed development.

Motorway users between junctions 4 and 6 will have no distance views of the proposed development. The recent erection of large warehouse style buildings and earth bunding have obscured any potential views. The view across the open flat landscape from the edge of the motorway verge terminates at the edge of newly constructed Axis industrial park. The development site is therefore not visible from this location.

The views from the Croxteth Estate towards the south of the development site will be reduced to some elevated views from upper floors of the north facing properties and Croxteth School. Within these elevated views the development site will not be fully perceptible and any views will be in the order of low. The development will fit well into the context of newly constructed warehouses along the East Lancashire Road.

A further distant view from the upper stories of University Hospital, Aintree will offer expansive views of the urban landscape including extensive housing, roads and vacant land.

A summary of the effects indicates the most significant impacts would occur to residential properties with rear elevation views of the development site, although partially limited by the existing screen planting and earth mounding in and around the development site. The effect of the development on the surrounding townscape will be in the order of low. It is therefore considered that the proposed development will fit well into its surroundings and any remaining effects could be mitigated with further planting and earth modelling.

5 Mitigation Measures

The townscape and visual assessment has highlighted a small number of potentially significant effects. In order that these can be reduced to an acceptable level a number of mitigation measures have been identified, these have been outlined below:

- As part of the design process consideration of architectural design features to the main building will provide interest and contribute to the local townscape has been given and subsequently incorporated into the design;
- Use of native shrub and tree planting appropriate to the location will provide screening to visual receptors, in particular to those properties to the north of the site to bolster existing boundary planting;
- Development of a strong landscape design for the site, to provide a setting for the building and interrupt views of the main building; and
- The extension of earth screen mounding along the northern boundary and new mounding adjacent to Stonebridge Lane will, in combination with the proposed boundary planting serve to screen views from residential properties.

The incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures would in the medium to long term reduce the overall effect of the development on local townscape and sensitive visual receptors. Despite these mitigation measures some residual effects may remain and these are described in Section 6 – Residual Effects.

6 Residual Effects

Residual effects are those remaining following the implementation of design and mitigation measures such as orientation of a building and use of screen planting.

Potential mitigation measures such as those outlined in Section 5 would go some way to reduce the effects that the development would have on local townscape and those sensitive receptors identified as part of the assessment. Despite these measures the development site would remain a new component resulting in some residual effects, these are outlined below:

- Change to existing open ground as viewed from the rear of properties to the north and Stonebridge Lane;
- Permanent loss of medium distance views from the rear of several properties to the north; and
- Increased sense of urbanisation along Stonebridge Lane.

The residual effect of the development has been assessed and is considered to be in the order of slight adverse.

7 Appendix A - Townscape Character, Quality and Value

7.1 Character

Townscape character is a composite of physical, social and cultural elements. Landform, hydrology, vegetation, land use pattern, user movement and cultural and historic features / associations combine to create a common sense of place and identity which can be used to categorise areas into definable units (termed character zones). The level of detail and size of unit can be varied to reflect the scale of definition required. It can be applied at national, regional and local levels. Criteria applied to define character include scale, density and mix, appearance, layout, cultural associations, human interaction and land use, often informed by supplementary information from sources including Local Character Assessments, Listed Building descriptions, local planning policies and local authority townscape appraisals.

7.2 Quality

Quality relates to the intrinsic aesthetic appeal demonstrated by a character zone or feature / composition within the townscape. A five point scale has been adopted to describe quality.

- Highest Quality - Areas of internationally, nationally or regionally important townscape containing high quality, highly valued, rare or unusual features in robust form and health. Stimulating, diverse and thriving street level uses with a high level of human comfort, interactive pedestrian environment and strong hierarchy of public amenity and civic spaces with negligible pedestrian and vehicle conflict. Areas containing an assemblage of important listed historical and rich cultural features and associations or highly valued modern buildings displaying strong architectural styles. Areas exhibiting a well-maintained, balanced and unified townscape structure with strong sense of place, containing attractive visual components and free from visual detractors.
- Very Attractive - Areas exhibiting a strong pattern containing several noteworthy or valued townscape features and elements in an aesthetically pleasing composition, free from prominent visual detractors. Locally distinctive, well maintained development form, with rich cultural associations using good quality, locally characteristic materials. Harmonious relationship between buildings, structures and publicly accessible spaces. Townscape promotes social interaction with pedestrian movements dominating traffic circulation with minimal vehicular conflict. Presence of Listed Buildings or local area designations, including features of regional interest.
- Good - Areas containing valued townscape components, combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition with low levels of disruptive visual detractors. Townscape exhibits a recognisable vernacular or planned

layout and harmonious balance of built form and open space, with buildings holding a degree of historic or cultural value or symbolism. Areas are generally well maintained and exhibit architectural styles or building materials of local distinction and importance. Townscape supports social interaction with pedestrian and traffic movement co-existing with limited conflict.

- Ordinary - Areas comprising primarily functional development, incoherent development or built form used in a contemporary manner with little indication of design expression or local distinctiveness, lacking a coherent and aesthetically pleasing composition. Areas displaying an identifiable structure, often containing frequent visually detracting elements, partially degraded by unsympathetic development or concealed by mixed land uses. Infrequent opportunities for social interaction with traffic circulation generally controlling pedestrian movement. Areas would generally be undesignated and commonplace at the local level with scope for improvement.
- Poor - Areas exhibiting poorly designed, unsympathetic development form or mixed land uses lacking structure, variety, coherence or clear communication links. Townscape comprising degraded, disturbed or derelict features, frequently enclosed by poorly defined boundaries containing rarely used ‘un-owned’ and community open spaces. Areas in poor condition or decline which appear unwelcoming or threatening, lacking opportunity for social interaction with pedestrian movement inhibited or severely constrained by major transport barriers. Townscape displaying a dominance of visually detracting elements or use of inappropriate materials and materials with limited lifespan. Areas would generally be restricted to the local level and identified as requiring recovery or enhancement.

7.3 Value

Townscape value relates to areas of particular scenic quality, those displaying important historic and cultural associations and those displaying important social / community interactions. It can be addressed by reference to international, national, regional and local designations; however a lack of formal policy designation on a given townscape does not necessarily infer the townscape is of low quality or value. Undistinguished, undesignated buildings of modern construction, displaying little in the way of architectural or historic significance may, for example, still hold value in terms of their contribution to the very character and appearance of an urban townscape. Conversely, a limited area of publicly accessible open space within a dense urban townscape may not be deemed a contributing factor to the character of the locality, but may hold value to user groups in terms of the relief it provides from the daily stresses of urban living.

7.4 Sensitivity and Magnitude

Sensitivity to change considers the character, quality and value of the existing townscape and the extent to which it is considered as being capable of accepting the

type of development proposed. In this assessment, sensitivity to change is ranked as follows:

- High Sensitivity - A townscape displaying particularly distinctive character highly valued and considered susceptible to relatively small changes.
- Medium Sensitivity - A townscape of moderately valued characteristics considered reasonably tolerant of change.
- Low Sensitivity - A townscape of generally low valued characteristics considered tolerant of substantial levels of change.

Magnitude of change considers the extent to which the proposed development would emerge as a new component in the townscape and would change the balance between components that currently constitute baseline character.

Magnitude of change might be high where the scale of the development and its structures is in contrast to a fundamentally intimate urban land use or settlement pattern, or where the proposals would result in significant modification to the ambience of an area and the way people use and interact within the urban environment. Conversely, low magnitude might be represented by proposals that require minimal loss of important townscape features or where the overall landform, settlement pattern and current degree of human interaction are able to accommodate the proposed development with a good degree of integration. In this assessment magnitude is ranked as follows:

- High Magnitude - Where the development would appear as a significant new component in the townscape and result in a total loss of or major alteration to the existing balance of components in the baseline context.
- Medium Magnitude - Where the development would appear as a distinctly noticeable new component in the townscape and result in a partial loss of or alteration to the existing balance of components in the baseline context.
- Low Magnitude - Where the development would appear as a noticeable new component in the townscape and result in a minor loss of or alteration to the existing balance of components in the baseline context.
- No Change - Where the development would appear as a barely perceptible component in the townscape and result in very minor loss of or alteration to the existing balance of components in the baseline context.

8 Appendix B – Townscape Effect Ratings

8.1 Large Beneficial Effect

The proposals provide an opportunity to enhance the townscape because:

- They enhance the layout, mix, scale, appearance, human interaction and cultural aspects of the townscape.
- They enable the restoration of the characteristic features of the townscape, partially lost or diminished as the result of changes resulting from inappropriate development.
- They enable a sense of place and scale to be restored through well-designed mitigation measures, that is, characteristic features are enhanced through the use of local materials to fit the proposal into the townscape.
- They enhance the character of the townscape through beneficial and sensitive design in a townscape which is not of any formally recognised quality.
- They facilitate government objectives to regenerate degraded urban areas.

8.2 Moderate Beneficial Effect

The proposals provide an opportunity to enhance the townscape because:

- They fit very well with the layout, mix, scale, appearance, human interaction and cultural aspects of the townscape.
- There is potential, through mitigation, to enable the restoration of characteristic features, partially lost or diminished as the result of changes resulting from inappropriate development.
- They will enable a sense of place and scale to be restored through well-designed mitigation measures, that is, characteristic features are enhanced through the use of local materials to fit the proposal into the townscape.
- They enable some sense of quality to be restored or enhanced through beneficial and sensitive design in a townscape which is not of any formally recognised quality.
- They further government objectives to regenerate degraded urban areas.

8.3 Slight Beneficial Effect

The proposals:

- Fit well with the layout, mix, scale, appearance, human interaction and cultural aspects of the townscape.
- Incorporate measures for mitigation to ensure they will blend in well with surrounding townscape.

- Will enable some sense of place and scale to be restored through well-designed mitigation measures.
- Maintain or enhance existing townscape character in an area which is not designated for the quality of its townscape, nor vulnerable to change.
- Avoid conflict with government policy of enhancing urban environments.

8.4 Neutral Effect

The proposals are well designed to:

- Complement the layout, mix, scale, appearance, human interaction and cultural aspects of the townscape.
- Incorporate measures for mitigation to ensure that the scheme will blend in well with surrounding townscape features and elements.
- Avoid being visually intrusive and do not have an adverse effect on the current level of tranquillity (where these exist) of the townscape in which the development is sited.
- Maintain existing townscape character in an area which is not a designated townscape, that is, neither national or local high quality, nor is it vulnerable to change.
- Avoid conflict with government policy towards enhancing urban environments.

8.5 Slight Adverse Effect

The proposals:

- Do not quite fit the layout, mix, scale, appearance, human interaction and cultural aspects of the townscape.
- Although not very visually intrusive, will impact on certain views into and across the area.
- Cannot be completely mitigated for because of the nature of the proposed development itself or the character of the townscape in which it is located.
- Affect an area of recognised townscape quality.
- Conflict with local authority policies for enhancing urban environments.

8.6 Moderate Adverse Effect

The proposals are:

- Out of scale or at odds with the layout, mix, scale, appearance, human interaction and cultural aspects of the townscape.
- Are visually intrusive and will adversely impact on the townscape.
- Not possible to fully mitigate for, that is, mitigation will not prevent the scheme from scarring the townscape in the longer term, as some features of interest will be partly destroyed or their setting reduced or removed.

- Will have an adverse impact on a townscape of recognised quality or on vulnerable and important characteristic features or elements.
- In conflict with local and national policies to enhance the urban environment.

8.7 Large Adverse Effect

The proposals are very damaging to the townscape in that they:

- Are at considerable variance with the layout, mix, scale, appearance, human interaction and cultural aspects of the townscape.
- Are visually intrusive and would disrupt fine and valued views of the area.
- Are likely to degrade, diminish or even destroy the integrity of a range of characteristic features and elements and their setting.
- Will be substantially damaging to a high quality or highly vulnerable townscape, causing it to change and be considerably diminished in quality.
- Cannot be adequately mitigated for.
- Are in serious conflict with government policy for the enhancement of the urban environment.

9 Appendix C – Visual Effect Criteria

The prime criteria used to evaluate visual impact relate to the extent to which existing views for key receptors, (such as residents, users of public facilities and visitors to open space and public areas), would change, taking into account landscape proposals and mitigation measures.

Other criteria used to ascertain visual impact include the size, elevation and proportion of the scheme in respect of the receiving environment and the degree to which activity within the receiving environment would alter, both during and post construction, and be visible. Cumulative visual impacts on the baseline environment are also taken account of in respect of the proposals.

Impacts can be detrimental where features or key characteristics such as established planting, old buildings or structures have to be removed, directly affecting the view or outlook of a given receptor. Conversely, impacts can prove beneficial where derelict buildings or poorly maintained landscape features are restored, replaced or maintained, or where there is the introduction of new tree planting and a landscape structure where none currently exists, constituting an improvement in the current view.

9.1 Sensitivity to Change

Sensitivity to change considers the nature of the receptor. Least sensitive receptors are considered, for example, to be people engaged in work whose primary focus would not necessarily be on the surrounding landscape views. Conversely, more emphasis is placed upon receptors whose change in view or visual amenity is either the prime focus, greater in scale or potentially covers a wider area.

The degree and importance of the view gained by a receptor also contributes to an understanding of how sensitive a given receptor is towards change. Therefore, value of the view and scenic quality are also taken into account in the assessment. In this assessment, sensitivity to change is ranked as follows:

9.1.1 High Sensitivity

Individual dwellings or dwelling groupings with a view in which the new MRF would become an important focal element from either gardens or room windows, both upper and lower storey.

Roads, footpaths and bridleways, and public open spaces with a view in which the new MRF would be an important focal element in that view.

9.1.2 Medium Sensitivity

Individual dwellings or dwelling groupings with a view from either gardens or room windows, both upper and lower storey, in which the new MRF would not be a focal element but would be a notable element in the view.

Roads, footpaths and bridleways, and public open spaces with a view in which the new MRF would not be a focal element but would be a notable element in the view.

Industrial / commercial buildings with a view in which the new MRF would be a focal element in the view.

9.1.3 Low Sensitivity

Dwellings with a view from either gardens or room windows, both upper and lower storey, in which the new MRF would not be a notable element in the view but would be discernible.

Roads, footpaths and bridleways, and public open spaces with a view in which the new MRF would not be a notable element in the view but would be discernible.

Industrial / commercial buildings with a view in which the new MRF would not be a focal element but would be a notable element in the view.

9.2 Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of change considers the extent of development visible, the percentage of the existing view newly occupied by the proposals and the viewing distance from the receptor to the development. In this assessment magnitude is ranked as follows:

- High Magnitude - Where the development would cause a substantial change to the existing view.
- Medium Magnitude - Where the development would cause a very noticeable change to the existing view.
- Low Magnitude - Where the development would cause a noticeable change to the existing view.
- No Change - Where the development would cause no discernible change to the existing view.

9.3 Visual Effects Ratings

The findings are represented using a descriptive scale ranging from adverse large - moderate - slight through neutral to an ascending scale of beneficial slight - moderate - large. There is a further impact rating, very large adverse, which is used to indicate impact on a receptor of very high sensitivity, significantly affecting an existing view of very high value and quality. Such a rating would indicate that the impact is considered highly prejudicial in relation to the specific topic of visual impact.

The various levels of impact can be applied to individual properties, businesses, groups of housing, areas of open space and lengths of footpath. Explanation of the impact ratings is provided below:

9.3.1 Large Beneficial Effect

This would typically apply where a proposal leads to the removal of a significant eyesore such as a derelict site or buildings and incorporates landscape measures

which substantially remodel and enhance the outlook for a large number of people, or where the proposal would cause a significant improvement in the existing view.

9.3.2 Moderate Beneficial Effect

This would typically apply where visual intrusion associated with the existing view is noticeably relieved, or where the proposals would result in a noticeable improvement. It would also apply where the proposals include provision for landscape proposals which would largely reduce the visual intrusion of the existing outlook and enhance views for a considerable number of people.

9.3.3 Slight Beneficial Effect

This would typically occur where existing visual impact associated with the current outlook is slightly relieved, or where the proposals would cause a barely perceptible improvement in existing receptor view.

9.3.4 Neutral Effect

This would typically occur where implementation of the proposals would not result in a discernible improvement or deterioration in existing receptor view or outlook.

9.3.5 Slight Adverse Effect

This would typically occur where the receptor is at some distance from the proposals, or where the proposal would not constitute a new point of principal focus. It would also occur where the proposal is closely located to the viewpoint but is seen at an acute angle and at the extremity of the overall available view, or viewed from rarely occupied upper storey rooms or less sensitive receptor types.

9.3.6 Moderate Adverse Effect

This would typically apply where the proposals result in a noticeable deterioration to the current outlook, involving removal of existing, visually screening elements in the view, thereby exposing the scheme. It would also occur where large new structures are introduced as part of the proposals which may appear at distance but be positioned as a focal point the field of view, or where the proposal can only be partially mitigated.

9.3.7 Large Adverse Effect

This would typically apply where the proposal would cause a significant deterioration in the current receptor view or outlook, be positioned prominently within an existing view of local interest in a valued landscape, or where only selected elements of the proposal can be effectively mitigated.

9.3.8 Very Large Adverse Effect

This would typically apply where the proposal would cause a highly prejudicial deterioration in the current view, be positioned prominently within an existing view of regional or national importance in a valued landscape, or where the proposal cannot be effectively mitigated.

10 Appendix D – Visual Effects Table

Table 10.1 – Visual Effects

Receptor Details	Receptor Quantity	Sensitivity	Receptor Ref Code & Fig Number	Proximity to Proposals	Existing Visual Outlook	Views Relative to Development and Magnitude of Change	Visual Impact Rating			
							Construction Period	Winter Year of Opening	Winter 10 Years	Summer 10 Years
Late 1990's style semi-detached houses 1 Rame Close, 27 Wadebridge Road, 12 – 14 Travanson Close	4	Medium	R1 Figure 1..2	210 m	Majority of views comprise adjoining properties, adjacent gardens and local roads. Some upper floor views have enclosed views between adjacent houses towards the development site beyond.	Upper floor windows afford enclosed views between adjacent housing towards the development site. Some awareness of the open space beyond housing. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **low**.	**Slight Adverse** Some slight awareness over the roof tops and through the existing vegetation during the winter. The temporary addition of cranes on site will be visible on the skyline during the construction period.	**Neutral** The houses opposite and garden boundary hedges effectively screen most of the views of the site resulting in no perceptible changes.	**Neutral** Some slight changes visible due to a lack of foliage through the winter months. The intervening houses, conifer hedges and boundary vegetation screens the development.	**Neutral** Intervening houses and Summer foliage will combine with the existing vegetation to effectively screen the main development site.
Late 1990's style semi-detached houses Along the length of 1-11 Travanson Close, 88 – 92 Longdown Road	14	Medium	R2 Figure 1.2	170 m	The front of the properties overlook Travanson Close. The properties gardens back onto the boundary of the site. The views beyond are reduced through the existing hedges and screen planting at the end of the gardens.	The backs of the lower and upper windows are limited to views through the existing conifer hedges and existing boundary vegetation. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **low**.	**Slight Adverse** Some slight awareness through and over the existing boundary hedges during the winter. The temporary addition of cranes on site will be visible on the skyline throughout the construction period.	**Neutral** The garden boundary hedges and existing screen planting effectively screen most of the views of the site resulting in no perceptible changes.	**Neutral** Some slight changes visible due to a lack of foliage through the winter months. The intervening conifer hedges screen the development.	**Neutral** Intervening Summer foliage will combine with the existing vegetation to effectively screen the main development site.

Receptor Details	Receptor Quantity	Sensitivity	Receptor Ref Code & Fig Number	Proximity to Proposals	Existing Visual Outlook	Views Relative to Development and Magnitude of Change	Visual Impact Rating			
							Construction Period	Winter Year of Opening	Winter 10 Years	Summer 10 Years
Late 1990's style semi-detached houses 1 – 6 Carland Close, 96 – 106 Longdown Road	11	Medium	R3 Figure 1.2	Between 130 - 310 m	The front of the properties overlook Carland Close and Londown Road. The property's gardens back onto the boundary of the site. The views beyond are reduced through the existing hedges and screen planting at the end of the gardens.	The lower and upper windows are limited to acute views through the existing screen planting and existing conifer hedges at the boundary of the gardens as well as existing screen planting. No views of the development site currently exist. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **low**.	**Slight Adverse** Some slight awareness through and over the existing boundary hedges and screen planting during the winter. The temporary addition of cranes on site will be visible on the skyline during the construction period.	**Neutral** The garden boundary hedges and existing screen planting effectively screen most of the views of the site resulting in no perceptible changes.	**Neutral** Some slight changes visible due to lack of foliage through the winter months. The intervening houses and conifer hedges screen development.	**Neutral** Intervening Summer foliage will combine with the existing vegetation to effectively screen the main development site.
Late 1990's style semi-detached houses 20 – 48 Wadebridge Road	11	High	R4 Figure 1.2	120 m	The front of the properties overlook Wadebridge Road. The property's gardens back onto the boundary of the site. The views beyond are interrupted by the sporadic existing hedges and fences at the end of the gardens.	The upper rear elevation windows will have direct views of the development site including construction activities. Ground floor windows are likely to have intermittent views of construction activities and may have some awareness of the development's roofline. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **high**.	**Moderate/Large Adverse** Rear elevation windows will have direct uninterrupted views of construction activities some of which would occur immediately beyond the property boundaries.	**Moderate Adverse** Upper floor rear elevation windows will have direct views of the new development in the middle distance and forming a new skyline to views.	**Slight /Moderate Adverse** Establishing mitigation planting will partially filter the views of the development however the roofline is likely to remain perceptible to views from the upper floor.	**Slight Adverse** Establishing mitigation planting will filter the views of the development however the roofline is likely to remain perceptible to views from the upper floor above summer foliage.
Late 1990's style semi-detached houses 50 - 58 Wadebridge Road	5	High/medium	R5 Figure 1.2	120 m	The front of the properties overlook Wadebridge Road. The property's gardens back onto the boundary of the site. The views beyond are heavily filtered by the a combination of mounding and mature screen planting.	The upper rear elevation windows will have direct but filtered views of the development site including construction activities. Ground floor windows are likely to be screened by a combination of boundary planting, fencelines and screen planting beyond. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **medium**.	**Moderate Adverse** Rear elevation windows will have direct but filtered views of construction activities beyond the screen planting, particularly during winter months.	**Slight Adverse** Upper floor rear elevation windows will have direct but filtered views of the new development in the middle distance and forming a new skyline to views.	**Slight Adverse** Existing planting will filter the views of the development however the roofline is likely to remain perceptible to views from the upper floor.	**Slight Adverse** Existing planting will filter the views of the development however the roofline is likely to remain perceptible to views from the upper floor.

Receptor Details	Receptor Quantity	Sensitivity	Receptor Ref Code & Fig Number	Proximity to Proposals	Existing Visual Outlook	Views Relative to Development and Magnitude of Change	Visual Impact Rating			
							Construction Period	Winter Year of Opening	Winter 10 Years	Summer 10 Years
1950's style council houses No. 1-23 Back Gillmoss Lane	23	Low	R6 Figure 1.2	560 m	The front of the properties overlook onto front gardens and Back Gillmoss Lane. The views extend across open amenity grassland to the edge of the East Lancashire Road. The newly erected warehouses of Stonebridge business park prevents further views towards the site.	The upper windows will have limited and acute views above the roof tops of the warehouse and through the existing perimeter planting along East Lancashire Road. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **low**.	**Slight Adverse** Some slight awareness over the existing boundary planting and warehouses during the winter. The temporary addition of cranes on site will be visible on the skyline during the construction period.	**Neutral** The warehouse and East Lancashire Road boundary planting effectively screens most of the views of the site resulting in no perceptible changes.	**Neutral** Mixed evergreen and deciduous foliage will combine with the existing boundary structures to effectively screen the main development site.	**Neutral** Intervening Summer foliage will combine with the existing structures and planting to effectively screen the main development site.
1960's style semi-detached houses 14 – 28 Parkstile Lane	8	Low	R7 Figure 1.2	880 m	The front of the properties overlook onto front gardens and Parkstile Lane. The views extend across open scrub and amenity grassland to the edge of the East Lancashire Road and the edge of the development site..	The upper windows will have limited and acute views of the perimeter of the development site but will be reduced through existing tree and shrub planting in the foreground view. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **low.**	**Slight Adverse** Some slight awareness towards the existing development perimeter during the winter. The temporary addition of cranes on site will be visible on the skyline during the construction period.	**Neutral** The foreground tree and shrub planting and East Lancashire Road boundary planting effectively screens most of the views of the site resulting in no perceptible changes.	**Neutral** Post construction the new development site would not be readily discernible within the wider context.	**Neutral** Post construction the new development site would not be readily discernible within the wider context.
University Hospital, Aintree	1	Low	R8 Figure 1.2	1330 m	Upper stories have broad expansive views of the urban landscape including extensive housing, roads and vacant land.	Upper floors to the southern and eastern elevations would have distant views towards the site. Within these extensive views the development site would be perceptible however would be set within the context of newly constructed warehouse type buildings, as a result the site and proposed development would not be readily discernible.	**Neutral/Slight Adverse** Potential for slight awareness of the construction activities within the wider context. Temporary cranes would be likely to be perceptible but would not form significant new features.	**Neutral** Post construction the new development site would not be readily discernible within the wider context.	**Neutral** Post construction the new development site would not be readily discernible within the wider context.	**Neutral** Post construction the new development site would not be readily discernible within the wider context.

Receptor Details	Receptor Quantity	Sensitivity	Receptor Ref Code & Fig Number	Proximity to Proposals	Existing Visual Outlook	Views Relative to Development and Magnitude of Change	Visual Impact Rating			
							Construction Period	Winter Year of Opening	Winter 10 Years	Summer 10 Years
Croxteth Community School	1	Low	R9 Figure 1.2	600 m	The back of the school is a large 1960's modernist horizontal style building constructed from red brick and glass faces north onto a large open square of mown amenity grass. A rough grassland scrub separates the schools perimeter from the East Lancashire road. The open views extend towards the perimeter of screen planting along the southern boundary of the Gillmoss industrial estate.	Upper floors to the northern elevations would have distant views towards the site. Within these elevated views the development site would be perceptible, however would be set within the context of newly constructed warehouse type buildings and existing boundary planting. As a result the site and proposed development would not be readily discernible.	**Slight Adverse** Some slight awareness over the existing boundary planting and warehouses during the winter. The temporary addition of cranes on site will be visible on the skyline during the construction period.	**Neutral** The warehouse and East Lancashire Road boundary planting effectively screens the majority of the views of the site resulting in no perceptible changes.	**Neutral** Existing foliage will combine with the existing boundary structures to effectively screen the main development site.	**Neutral** Intervening Summer foliage will combine with the existing structures to effectively screen the main development site.
East Lancashire Road and junction of Stonebridge Lane.	Motorists and pedestrians	Low	R10 Figure 1.2	300 m	The A580 has extensive views which extend across the busy carriageway towards the perimeter of the Gillmoss industrial estate. The existing screen planting along the perimeter prevents further views across towards the site.	The pedestrian or motorist will have limited or no views above the existing perimeter planting along East Lancashire Road boundary. The magnitude of change will be in the order of **low to no change.**	**Slight Adverse** Some slight awareness over the existing boundary planting during the winter. The temporary addition of cranes on site will be visible on the skyline during the construction period.	**Neutral** The East Lancashire Road boundary planting effectively screens most of the views of the site resulting in no perceptible changes.	**Neutral** Existing foliage effectively screens the main development site.	**Neutral** Intervening Summer foliage will effectively screen the main development site.

11 Appendix E – Figures

12 References

[1] Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment - Landscape Institute & Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment - 2002

[2] Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – Highways Agency - 1992