

APPEAL REF: APP/B3438/W/24/3351035

Local Planning Authority Reference: SMD/2021/0610

Appeal by Bloor Homes NW Ltd

Land to the east of Froghall Road, Cheadle

**Statement of Common Ground between
Bloor Homes NW Ltd and Staffordshire Moorlands Council
in relation to Landscape and Visual Matters**

January 2025

CONTENTS

1.0 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE 1

2.0 PARTIES..... 1

3.0 PLANNING POLICY 2

4.0 MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES AGREE..... 2

5.0 MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES DO NOT AGREE..... 7

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Landscape Effects – Comparative Table

APPENDIX B: Visual Effects – Comparative Table

1.0 Background and Purpose

- 1.1 This Statement of Common Ground relates to an appeal by Bloor Homes NW Limited (herein after referred to as the "Appellant") into a planning application (Ref: SMD/2021/0610) within the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council area (the "Council").
- 1.2 This Landscape Statement of Common Ground (LSoCG) has been prepared jointly by the Appellant and the Council. It addresses and summarises the areas of common ground and differences between the Appellant and the Council in relation to landscape and visual matters.

2.0 PARTIES

The SoCG is jointly agreed by:



Signed:

Date: 06 01 25

Name: Tim Jackson

On behalf of FPCR Environment and Design /Bloor Homes NW Limited



Signed:

Date: 6/1/25

Name: Stuart Ryder, Director Ryder Landscape Consultants Ltd

Acting on behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

3.0 PLANNING POLICY

Development Plan

- 3.1 The parties agree that the following policies are of most relevance to landscape and visual matters and the appeal proposals:

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted September 2018)

- *Policy DC3 – Landscape and Settlement Setting;*
- *Policy C3 – Green Infrastructure;*
- *Policy NE2 – Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows; and*
- *Policy SS10 - Other Rural Areas Area Strategy*

- 3.2 The Council also consider the following two Local Plan policies to be of relevance to landscape and visual matters and the appeal proposals:

- *Policy SS11 - Churnet Valley Strategy*
- *Policy - DC4 - Local Green Spaces*

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024)

- 3.3 The parties agree the most relevant part of the NPPF is:

- Paragraph 187 b):
187. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.....

- 3.4 The Council also consider the following to be a most relevant part of the NPPF:

- Paragraph 135 c)
135 Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

4.0 MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES AGREE

Baseline Conditions

The Appeal Site and Context

- 4.1 The Site extends to approximately 8.7 hectares (ha) and comprises two fields on south/ south east-facing sloping ground on the northern edge of Cheadle, Staffordshire.
- 4.2 The Site lies partly adjoining the existing northern settlement edge, with existing residential development situated partly adjoining the western and southern sides of the Site. It also adjoins Froghall Road on its western boundary, with Hammersley Hayes Road/ a track (and Public Right of Way – Cheadle FP40) extending alongside but outside the south eastern Site boundary. Broad

Haye Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building) lies immediately to the east of the Site and existing farmland lies beyond to the north and north east.

- 4.3 The existing development to the south of the Site comprises existing houses on Hammersley Hayes Road; the Broad Hayes Park development and the Cheadle North Strategic Development Area (development under construction). An area of Public Open Space measuring 0.25Ha also lies bordering the Site, off Hammersley Hayes Road.
- 4.4 A hedgerow field boundary containing four mature trees extends through the Site from Froghall Road in the west to the north east corner of the Site. The Froghall Road boundary also comprises a hedgerow and two recognisable trees. A low voltage power line and timber posts also cross the south western part of the Site.

Topography

- 4.5 The topography of the Site's wider context is undulating and shaped by a series of valleys and ridges, including the Cecilly Brook, that lies to the east of the Site and falls from north to south. More pronounced and prominent ridgelines and higher ground exist within and surrounding the southern parts of Cheadle. These include the Hillside and Cheadle Park to the north west of the town centre and further wooded ridgelines to the south west and south east of the town. These all rise to in excess of 230 metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). Wooded higher ground and hills also lie more distantly to the east of the town, above the River Churnet Valley.
- 4.6 The Site lies on sloping ground that falls towards the south and south east, from around 190m AOD on its north western edge, alongside Froghall Road, to around 175m AOD on its south eastern side adjoining Hammersley Hayes Road/ track (and PROW). This is a general change in level of circa 15m across the Site.

Published Landscape Character Assessments

National Context

- 4.7 The Site lies within **National Character Area (NCA) 64, 'Potteries and Churnet Valley'**, as defined by Natural England. This area covers an extensive landscape tract stretching around Stoke on Trent and Newcastle under Lyme and across the landscape to the north, east and south from Biddulph to the edge of Uttoxeter. Extracts form **CD 9.3**.

County/ District Context

- 4.8 The '**Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment of Staffordshire Moorlands' (2008)** study defines a series of landscape character areas. The Site and all of the landscape surrounding Cheadle lies within the '**Ancient Slopes and Valley Farmlands' (ASVF)** Landscape Character Type. Extracts form **CD 9.4**.

Other relevant Published Studies

- 4.9 Other published studies relevant to the consideration of landscape and visual matters comprise:
- *Planning for Landscape Change: Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Structure Plan, 1996 – 2011. Extracts are lodged as **CD 9.5**;*

- *Landscape, Local Green Space and Heritage Impact Study (August 2016);*
- *Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan Green Infrastructure Strategy (2018);*
- *Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide Adopted (2018).*

Landscape Designations

- 4.10 The Site and its immediate context is not situated within a landscape that is subject to any national, local or other statutory or non-statutory landscape designations.

Landscape and Visual Effects

Landscape and Visual Impact Methodology

- 4.11 The Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) submitted with the planning application was prepared based upon the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*, third edition (GLVIA3), published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, in 2013.
- 4.12 The Local Planning Authority agree that the methodology, scope and process used in the LVA is consistent with GLVIA3 and that the submitted LVA is appropriate and proportionate to the nature of the existing landscape and the proposed development.
- 4.13 It is agreed that the LVA drew upon the relevant published landscape character assessment studies in undertaking the landscape and visual assessment. It is also agreed that the submitted LVA provides an additional site specific assessment of the local landscape and that the published landscape character assessment studies does not.
- 4.14 It is agreed that the submitted LVA provides a proportionate and appropriate assessment of the likely landscape and visual effects that will arise from the proposed development, albeit that the overall conclusions reached by the Appellant and the Council may differ in some instances.

Landscape Value

- 4.15 The parties agree that the Landscape Value of the Site and its immediate context is most appropriately assessed following the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 02-21 '*Assessing landscape value outside national designations*'.
- 4.16 Based upon this TGN, it is agreed that the Landscape Value of the Site and its immediate context is assessed to be '*Medium*'.

'Valued Landscape'

- 4.17 The Site is not and does not form part of a '*Valued Landscape*' for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 187 a).

Trees and Hedgerows

- 4.18 No trees within the site are covered by a Tree Preservation Order.
- 4.19 It is agreed that the majority of existing trees and hedgerows in quantitative terms within and bounding the site potentially could be conserved as part of the Appeal Scheme, as detailed within

the Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment (pAIA – **CD 2.3**) submitted with the planning application. An estimated 170m of hedgerow to the Froghall Road site boundary is to be removed to facilitate the proposed access into the site.

- 4.20 It is agreed that the Appeal Scheme has the potential to enhance and extend the number and lengths of trees and hedgerows across the site, as indicated on the submitted Parameters Plan and Illustrative Masterplan albeit within a changed landscape context.

Landscape Effects

- 4.21 The accompanying Comparative Table of Landscape Effects (at Appendix A) sets out the parties relative positions in these terms.

Visual Matters

Viewpoints

- 4.22 It is agreed that the Photo Viewpoints (1 – 12) (at Figures 7 -15 within the LVA) are suitably representative of the nature of views towards the Site from different receptors, directions and distances surrounding the Site. SMDC confirm that their Photo Viewpoints to be included within evidence will be from similar locations if not exactly the same spot as those presented in the Appellant's LVA.
- 4.23 It is agreed that where the Appeal Scheme will be visible it will typically be seen alongside and in the context of the existing settlement edge and other existing adjoining and nearby residential development.
- 4.24 It is agreed that the Appeal Scheme will not be visible from any of the identified visual receptor locations without views towards existing residential development on the northern edge of Cheadle.
- 4.25 It is agreed that VP12 can also be used to consider the visual effects on road users on Froghall Road and not just residential receptors on this stretch of the road. It is agreed that an additional viewpoint from the A552 Leek Road exists and photography has been shared between parties to allow this view to be assessed in the final Landscape Proofs. This additional viewpoint has been referenced VP13.

Photomontages

- 4.26 It is agreed that the Photomontages included within the LVA (at Figures 16 - 24) have been suitably prepared and provide a fair representation of the Appeal Scheme in these views subject to limitations over known materiality of the scheme at this Outline application stage.

Visual Effects

- 4.27 The accompanying Comparative Table of Visual Effects (at Appendix B) sets out the parties relative positions in these terms.
- 4.28 It is agreed that the visual effects of the Appeal Scheme will reduce over time with the maturing and management of the conserved and new trees, shrubs and hedgerow planting.

Residential Visual Amenity

- 4.29 It is agreed that there is nothing within the submitted planning application to indicate any unacceptable effects on Residential Visual Amenity will arise as a result of the Appeal Scheme proposals.
- 4.30 It is agreed that a detailed layout and scheme could be devised at the reserved matters stage that would suitably address and protect residential visual amenity; including with regard to the Council's space standards. This is also confirmed at paragraph 7.88 of the Committee Report.

5.0 MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES DO NOT AGREE

5.1 The parties disagree on the following matters;

- The level and significance of some of the landscape and visual effects arising from the proposed development.

5.2 The areas of differences are illustrated within the Landscape and Visual Effects comparison tables (Appendices A and B) and consist of landscape effects to the site and immediate context and visual effects for the following visual receptors at the Year 15 stage:

- Visual receptor group A - Residents off Hammersley Hayes and Froghall Road
- Visual receptor group C - Users of footpath Cheadle 40
- Visual receptor group G - Users of footpath Cheadle 38 and 39
- Visual receptor group H - Road users of Froghall Road
- Visual receptor group I – Road users on Froghall Road

LANDSCAPE SOCG, APPENDIX A: COMPARATIVE LANDSCAPE EFFECTS TABLE: SUMMARY

The Table below provides a comparison of the landscape effects assessed for the Appeal Scheme by the respective Landscape Consultants, namely; the Appellant (FPCR Environment and Design Ltd); the Council’s Landscape Advisers (Derbyshire Landscape and Placemaking); and the Council’s Landscape Witness for the Appeal (Ryder Landscape Consultants). Where N/S is included below this indicates that a judgement is not stated. The principal judgements for comparative purposes are the Overall Effects, as stated below.

	Assessor: APPELLANT or COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER or COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Judged Sensitivity of Landscape			Judged Magnitude of Landscape Effect	Overall Effect at Construction Phase	Overall Effect Upon Completion	Overall Effect at 15 Years Post Completion	Notes/ Differences
		Susceptibility to Change	Landscape Value	Overall Sensitivity	Scale or Size of the Degree of Change, including degree of contrast/ integration) at Stages of Project	Major Moderate Minor Negligible None	Major Moderate Minor Negligible None	Major Moderate Minor Negligible None	
		High Medium Low	High Medium Low	High Medium Low	High Medium Low Negligible/ None	Adverse or Beneficial	Adverse or Beneficial	Adverse or Beneficial	
National Landscape Character Area NCA 64 'Potteries and Churnet Valley'	APPELLANT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Negligible Completion: Negligible Year 15: Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	No differences between witnesses.
	COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	N/S	N/S	
	COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Negligible Completion: Negligible Year 15: Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	
County/ District (Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment of Staffordshire Moorlands (2008)) 'Ancient Slopes and Valley Farmlands' (ASVF) Landscape Character Type	APPELLANT	Medium/ High	Medium	Medium	Construction: Low Completion: Low Year 15: Low	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	No differences between witnesses.
	COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	N/S	N/S	
	COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Medium/ High	Medium	Medium	Construction: Low Completion: Low Year 15: Low	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	

Land to the east of Froghall Road - Landscape and Visual Appraisal: Comparative Landscape Effects Table

Site and Immediate Context: Landscape	APPELLANT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Medium Completion: Medium Year 15: Medium/ Low	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	The landscape sensitivity of the Site and its context to this type of development is agreed as Medium . This is reflective of point made at 4.17 of the LSoCG. Differences occur with the assessment of magnitude of effect on the landscape character for the Site and its immediate context. SMDC Witness considers there to be half an effect grade higher difference at each of the assessed stages. There is agreement that the type of effect would be Adverse .
	COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	N/S	N/S	
	COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Large Completion: Large Year 15: Medium / Large	Major/Moderate Adverse	Major/Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	

LANDSCAPE SOCG, APPENDIX B: COMPARATIVE VISUAL EFFECTS TABLE: SUMMARY

The Table below provides a comparison of the visual effects assessed for the Appeal Scheme by the respective Landscape Consultants, namely; the Appellant (FPCR Environment and Design Ltd); the Council's Landscape Advisers (Derbyshire Landscape and Placemaking); and the Council's Landscape Witness for the Appeal (Ryder Landscape Consultants). Where N/S is included below this indicates that a judgement is not stated. The principal judgements for comparative purposes are the Overall Effects, as stated below.

Ref	Receptor Type, Location and photographs <small>(including approx no. of dwellings where applicable)</small>	Assessor: APPELLANT or COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER or COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Judged Sensitivity of Visual Receptor			Judged Magnitude of Visual Effects	Overall Effect at Construction Phase	Overall Effect Upon Completion	Overall Effect at 15 Years Post Completion	Notes/ Differences
			Susceptibility to Change	Value	Overall Sensitivity	Size/Scale of Visual Effect (including degree of contrast/ integration) at Stages of Project	Major Moderate Minor Negligible None Adverse or Beneficial	Major Moderate Minor Negligible None Adverse or Beneficial	Major Moderate Minor Negligible None Adverse or Beneficial	
A	Residents off Hammersley Hayes and Froghall Road (VP1) (approximately 30 dwellings)	APPELLANT	High	Medium	High/ Medium	Construction: High/ Medium Completion: High/ Medium Year 15: Medium	Major/Moderate Adverse	Major/Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Between Appellant and Council's Landscape Advisers; a difference of half an effect level at Completion and one effect level 15 years post Completion The Council's landscape witness accords with the Council's landscape advisor. The residential receptors are afforded half a grade difference in their levels of sensitivity and magnitude resulting in a higher grade of overall effect by one assessment grade.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Major Adverse	Major Adverse	
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	High	High	Construction: High Completion: High Year 15: High / Medium	Major Adverse	Major Adverse	Major Adverse	
B	Residents off Froghall Road and road users (VP12) (approximately 22 dwellings)	APPELLANT	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Low Completion: Low Year 15: Low	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. Nor is there difference between the Appellant and the Council's Landscape Witness with regards to the end visual effect as Minor Adverse. There is an assessed increased level of effect during construction and on
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	

Land to the east of Froghall Road - Landscape and Visual Appraisal: Comparative Visual Effects Table

		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Medium/Low Completion: Low Year 15:Low	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	completion before reducing to a Minor, Adverse visual effect at Year 15. It is agreed that the judgements in the table are the maximum based upon whether the receptor is a resident or road user.
C	Users of footpath Cheadle 40 (VP2)	APPELLANT	High	Medium	High/ Medium	Construction: High/ Medium Completion: High/ Medium Year 15:Medium	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. No difference between witnesses on receptor sensitivity but there is on the magnitude of visual change experienced.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	Difference of one grading point during construction, half a grading point at year 1 before mitigation has established and half a grading point at Year 15 when the proposed tree planting has established.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	Medium	High/ Medium	Construction: High Completion: High/Medium Year 15: Medium	Major Adverse	Major / Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	
D	Users of footpath Cheadle 40 (VP3)	APPELLANT	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Medium/ Low Completion: Medium/ Low Year 15: Low	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. No difference between witnesses on receptor sensitivity but there is on the magnitude of visual change experienced.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Difference of one grading point during construction, half a grading point at year 1 before mitigation has established and half a grading point at Year 15 when the proposed tree planting has established.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Medium Completion: Medium / Low Year 15: Low	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	
E	Users of footpath Cheadle 31 (VP06 & 07)	APPELLANT	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Low Completion: Low Year 15: Low/ Negligible	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse/ Negligible	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. No difference between witnesses on receptor sensitivity but there is on the magnitude of visual change experienced.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse/ Negligible	Difference of one grading point during construction, half a grading point at year 1 before mitigation has established and a new tree line has developed to the west edge of the Site.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Medium / Low Completion: Low Year 15: Low / None	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse / No Effect	End visual effects are assessed at the same Minor, Adverse and Permanent effect by both witnesses.

Land to the east of Froghall Road - Landscape and Visual Appraisal: Comparative Visual Effects Table

F	Users of footpath Cheadle 39 (VP08)	APPELLANT	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Medium/Low Completion: Medium/Low Year 15: Low	Moderate/Minor Adverse	Moderate/Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. No difference between witnesses on receptor sensitivity but there is on the magnitude of visual change experienced during the construction phase. End visual effects are assessed at the same Minor, Adverse and Permanent effect by both witnesses at Year 15.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Moderate/Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: Medium Completion: Medium / Low Year 15:	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	
G	Users of footpath Cheadle 38 and 39 (VP09 &10)	APPELLANT	High	Medium	High/ Medium	Construction: High/Medium Completion: High/Medium Year 15: Medium	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate/ Minor Adverse	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser at Completion of proposed development. Difference of half an effect level 15 years post completion. Even though the assessment of receptor sensitivity is the same at High / Medium and the magnitudes of effects are the same across the three assessed stages the outcomes are half an assessment grade larger
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	Medium	High/Medium	Construction: High/Medium Completion: High/Medium Year 15: Medium	Major / Moderate Adverse	Major / Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	
H	Road users of Froghall Road (VP 04 &04A)	APPELLANT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: High/ Medium Completion: Medium Year 15: Medium/Low	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate/ Minor Adverse	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. Area of difference between witnesses with a greater degree of magnitude of effect identified by the Council's witness resulting in a higher degree of visual harm at each of the three assessed stages. The difference in the assessed visual change is half an assessment grade at each stage.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Moderate Adverse	Moderate/ Minor Adverse	
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: High Completion: High Year 15: High / Medium	Major / Moderate Adverse	Major / Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	
I	Road users of Froghall Road (VP 05)	APPELLANT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Low Completion: Low Year 15: Low	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. Greater grading of susceptibility to change by Council witness leading to an

Land to the east of Froghall Road - Landscape and Visual Appraisal: Comparative Visual Effects Table

		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	increased assessment of receptor sensitivity for road users at this point. Also an increased magnitude of effect rating for the construction and Year 1 phases of the project. The same Low magnitude of effect is given by both witnesses. The half grading point difference arises from the different visual sensitivity assigned to the receptor at this point.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	High	Medium	High / Medium	Construction: Medium Completion: Medium / Low Year 15:Low	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Moderate / Minor Adverse	
J	Road users of Bank Top Road (VP 11)	APPELLANT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Negligible Completion: Negligible Year 15: Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	No difference between Appellant and Council's Landscape Adviser. Witnesses agree level of visual sensitivity. Slight difference in terminology between witnesses with the Council Witness' methodology allowing a No Effect to be recorded instead of Negligible.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	Negligible	Negligible	
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Low / None Completion: None Year 15: None	Minor Adverse	No Effect	No Effect	
K	Road users on A552 Leek Road	APPELLANT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Low Completion: Low Year 15: Low/ Negligible	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse/ Negligible	Not assessed by Council's Landscape Adviser. Difference of half a point at construction and year 15.
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE ADVISER	N/S	N/S	N/S	Construction: Completion: Year 15:	N/S	N/S	N/S	
		COUNCIL'S LANDSCAPE WITNESS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Construction: Low / Medium Completion: Low Year 15: Low / None	Moderate / Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse	