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1 Executive Summary

The importance of Melton’s countryside and greenspace

1.1 As we seek to accommodate growth and regeneration and make our settlements more sustainable, our countryside, landscapes and green spaces are valued, now more than ever, for the environmental, social and economic benefits they can provide. Not only are landscape and green space, therefore, at the heart of the pillars of sustainable development enshrined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), they also form the setting for the lives of communities and the people who define them, as set out in the European Landscape Convention (ELC). Yet at the same time we must find the appropriate balance between conservation of landscapes and facilitation of growth – an ELC based approach where we seek to conserve the best whilst planning for and positively managing change in ways that respond to character and sense of place.

1.2 These issues are particularly relevant in a rural borough such as Melton, where the frequently small scale, intimate historic landscape character is often intrinsic to the settlements, their form and understanding of their setting. This character and amenity also extends to the principal market town of Melton Mowbray, whose evolution has been much influenced by the important work of the Melton Mowbray Town Estate in securing and managing the significant green lungs within the town since its foundation in 1549.

Purpose of the report

1.3 Influence Environmental Ltd, a landscape architecture and environmental planning consultancy, was commissioned by Melton Borough Council in March 2015 to develop this report which forms one of the central strands of the spatial planning evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. The report is intended to inform the direction of growth and landscape and open space protection within the borough, through four key outputs. These are:

- A review of the Areas of Separation proposed within the ADAS report\(^1\) and also put forward through the Issues and Options Consultation, in order to robustly evaluate those which may come forward in the borough’s spatial strategy for the new Local Plan period and to assist in maintaining character and avoidance of coalescence;

- An assessment of existing and proposed Protected Open Areas and candidate Local Green Spaces put forward in the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation, to determine, with appropriate evidence, which sites are or are not worthy of protection (on

\(^1\) ADAS, 2006, Identifying Areas of Separation Criteria and Evidence
grounds including character and quality, landscape experience, community value and connection, contribution to historic legacy or ecological networks);

- An appraisal of the sensitivity of the settlement fringe and landscape setting of principal settlements within the borough to development, to inform consideration and conservation of settlement settings and landscape interface, and to guide siting of appropriately located new development in landscape and visual terms;

- Development of options and recommendations for planning policy approaches for the above three spatial planning outputs, within the emerging Local Plan.

1.4 For ease and clarity of reference, these outputs are presented as part of a ‘spatial portrait’ for each relevant settlement area, so that common themes and links between the outputs can be readily understood.

**Aims and objectives**

1.5 In addition to the above, this study has the following aims:

- Provision of a high level spatial planning, siting and design guidance framework in relation to future development, to inform the emerging borough spatial strategy, as well as to aid future site briefs and development management in strategic terms;

- Development of strategic green infrastructure and green space planning, conservation and management principles for future growth.

**Intended audience and user groups**

1.6 This report has the following user groups:

- Planning Officers (Plan Making and Managing Development);
- Developers and their consultants;
- People involved in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.

1.7 Advice on the most effective ways for these groups to use this report, and the sections of most relevance to them, is set out in the diagram overleaf.
How to use this report if you are:

**Plan Making Planning Officer**
- Executive Summary
- Methodology
- Recommendations for Individual AOS (+Boundary Mapping) at Section 4 (Group 1 and 2 settlements)
- Summary spatial planning recommendations for the three spatial outputs at section 6
- Annexe 1 for LGS assessment

**Managing Development Planning Officer**
- Recommendations/design guidance for individual AOS at section 4 (Group 1 and 2 settlements, in alphabetical order)
- Landscape/design guidance in relation to settlement fringe sensitivity analysis at Section 4 (Group 1 and 2 settlements, in alphabetical order)
- Annexe 1 for LGS assessment to inform planning application / pre planning application consultation responses

**Developers and their Consultants**
- Recommendations/design guidance for individual AOS at section 4 (Group 1 and 2 settlements, in alphabetical order)
- Landscape/design guidance in relation to settlement fringe sensitivity analysis at Section 4 (Group 1 and 2 settlements, in alphabetical order)
- Annexe 1 for LGS assessment to inform planning application / pre planning application consultation responses

**People involved in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans**
- Executive Summary
- LGS assessment methodology at section 3
- Annexe 1 for LGS assessment
2 Introduction

Background and scope of commission

2.1 The draft Melton Core Strategy was withdrawn due to its failure to meet the tests of soundness for spatial planning, specifically that spatial planning policy and decisions should be:

- To have been positively prepared - based on a strategy which meets objectively assessed requirements (see assessment criteria and application at sections 3 and 4);
- To be justified and based on robust and credible evidence - evidence needs to be provided to justify the need for specific policies, e.g. that there is a particular issue or set of issues that need to be addressed through such an approach (see key issues, background to and purpose of this study at section 1. See also the evidence gathered under section 4);
- To be consistent with national policy - an approach based on consideration of landscape and green space is clearly advocated through the European Landscape Convention (ELC) and in the NPPF, as described in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7 of this report;
- To be the most appropriate strategy when considered against alternatives - this report provides information on appropriate options and strategies for consideration as part of the planning balance process;
- To be effective - where a policy proposes tackling an issue, there is a need to ensure that the mechanism for tackling the issue will be effective and that there is some basis for taking the course of action;
- To be deliverable, flexible and capable of being monitored - above all, policies must be realistic and achievable, capable of adaptation due to changing circumstances in the plan period, and ‘monitor-able’ – linked back to clear and transparent indicators and evidence (for the latter, see the assessment frameworks and criteria at section 3 of this report and summary findings at section 5 and the pro formas in the separate supporting annexe.

2.2 A need has been identified for a robust, transparent, justified and integrated evidence base in relation to consideration of landscape and settlement interface and sensitivity, settlement separation and protected open areas (existing and proposed). This will inform the articulation of the spatial direction in the new Local Plan. The above tests of soundness, and national planning policy, will form key hooks for the work, in terms of both method development and application. The work has also been informed by the findings of the recent Issues and Options consultation on the emerging Local Plan (2015).

Planning context

2.3 This section summarises the main policy messages which this report takes account of and which have informed the way the study has been undertaken/the emphases within the report.
National legislation and policy

2.4 The **European Landscape Convention** (ELC), which was signed by the UK in February 2006 and became binding in 2007, is the first international convention to focus specifically on landscape issues and aims to give consideration to landscape issues from the highest levels in all spatial planning and design exercises. Recognising that ‘all landscapes matter’ or are of value to somebody in some way and at some level, irrespective of designation, the ELC advocates a dynamic approach based on the following tenets:

- **Protect**: The best and finest or most significant landscapes;
- **Manage**: Landscape change in ways which are most responsive to character and sense of place;
- **Plan**: Creation of new landscapes and plan for change and adaptation within the landscape.

2.5 Furthermore, the ELC highlights the importance of developing landscape focussed/landscape informed policies which positively respond to these three objectives, and of establishing procedures for the general public and other stakeholders to participate in policy creation and implementation.

2.6 The ELC defines landscape as “an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”\(^3\). In this context, it is important to realise that the definition of landscape is all-encompassing and covers not only rural landscape but also peri urban areas, townscape and seascape.

2.7 The **National Planning Policy Framework**\(^4\) sets out the following over-arching policy strands of relevance to this study:

- **Section 8: Promoting Healthy Communities: Paragraphs 76 and 77**, which state that: ‘Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.

*The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:*

- where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and

---

\(^2\) Council of Europe, 2004  
\(^3\) Council of Europe, 2004  
\(^4\) Communities and Local Government, 2012
where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land’.

Section 11: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment: Paragraph 109, which states, inter alia, that ‘The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...’

Section 11: Paragraph 113: ‘Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks’.

Section 11: Paragraph 114, which states, inter alia, that: ‘Local planning authorities should: set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure’.

Under the section on proportionate evidence bases, at paragraph 170, the NPPF states: ‘Where appropriate, landscape character assessments should also be prepared, integrated with assessment of historic landscape character, and for areas where there are major expansion options assessments of landscape sensitivity’.

Relationship of this study to previous work

2.8 A number of related studies and pieces of work have previously been undertaken in relation to the Borough’s landscape, settlement setting and open space evidence base. These are:

- The Landscape Character Assessment of Melton Borough5;
- The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study6 in relation to renewables within the boroughs;
- The Areas of Separation report produced by ADAS7. This identified a series of initial Areas of Separation. These are updated and added to within this report, which reflects both changes in the landscape/spatial baseline and potential new Areas of Separation put forward in the emerging Local Plan Issues and Options consultation;
- Previously identified Protected Open Areas or POAs (Melton Borough Council) and additional information provided in relation to potential new POAs and candidate Local Green Spaces through the emerging Local Plan Issues and Options consultation. These areas form the basis for testing in this report. Protected Open Areas have formed a key part of the spatial planning policy direction in the previous and emerging Local Plans for the borough.

---

5 ADAS, 2006 Melton Borough Landscape & Historic Urban Character Assessment Report and ADAS, 2011 Melton Landscape Character Assessment Update 2011
6 LUC, 2014 Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study: Wind Energy Development
7 ADAS, 2006, Identifying Areas of Separation Criteria and Evidence
3 **Methodology summary and analysis framework**

3.1 This section sets out the methodology developed for the project, which is also summarised in the flow diagram overleaf. The methodology has been developed to meet the planning tests of soundness by creating a robust and transparent, well-justified evidence base for decision-making.

**Methodology stages**

3.2 The methodology stages are common to all three spatial outputs:

- Desk Study and data review;
- Criteria definition;
- Field Survey;
- Analysis.
Methodology Stages
(Common to all Outputs)

Desk Study/Scoping
- Policy/document/context review
- Identify issues/needs
- Gather evidence
- Build GIS Spatial database for characterisation/assessment framework

Define Assessment Framework
- Review baseline/policy context
- Benchmarking
- Characterise study area(s) and define integrated assessment criteria

Field Checking
- Test and refine criteria
- Gather information evidence for decisions

Reporting
- Capture Baseline (Describe)
- Analyse and make recommendations (Evaluate)
Desk study and data review:

Sources used

3.3 These are presented in Appendix D.

Study area

3.4 This is defined by the local authority boundary, as shown on figure 3.1 below (full reference at end of report).

![Figure 3.1 Study Area](image)

Criteria definition:

Developing a robust and transparent assessment framework for the project outputs

3.5 The approach to the assessment for each of the three spatial outputs of the project, and the assessment criteria derived (together with justification) is set out below.
 Areas of Separation

3.6 This output reviews the previous Assessment of the Areas of Separation within the Melton Borough⁸ and also considers the additional Areas of Separation proposed in the emerging Local Plan Issues and Options during 2014.

3.7 Areas of Separation are considered an important part of the spatial strategy for the borough, not least because of the borough’s settled and compact rural character considered in the context of the levels of growth anticipated during the plan period. It is, therefore, important to balance growth with this distinctive character, and to avoid the perception of coalescence, which could change settlement form and identity. Clearly, many of the issues associated with coalescence and separation also integrate with consideration of landscape and visual character, perception, openness and ‘naturalness’. An integrated approach is required, linking many of the attributes of the assessment criteria with those for the parallel settlement fringe landscape sensitivity analysis at section 4 (as well as giving consideration to changes in the landscape and spatial baseline since 2006). The assessment criteria for this analysis are presented below.

3.8 The following Areas of Separation are assessed in this report:
- Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars (Identified in 2006);
- Melton Mowbray and Thorpe Arnold (Identified in 2006);
- Melton Mowbray and Scalford (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Hill (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Melton Mowbray and Kirby Bellars (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Melton Mowbray and Great Dalby (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Melton Mowbray and Eye Kettleby (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Asfordby and Frisby on the Wreake (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Asfordby and Asfordby Valley (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Bottesford and Easthorpe (Identified in 2006);
- Bottesford and Normanton (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation);
- Long Clawson and Hose (Proposed through the Local Plan Consultation).

Assessment criteria and application

3.9 The following criteria have been defined for the assessment, to ensure a robust and transparent analysis, for integration with the landscape sensitivity study, and to take appropriate account of the previous (2006) study. Rather than defining a scale of ‘strength’ or ‘sensitivity’ for this element (as per the Landscape Sensitivity Study), a narrative approach has been taken for the Assessment of Areas of Separation. This is considered appropriate in

⁸ ADAS, 2006, Identifying Areas of Separation Criteria and Evidence
⁹ Asfordby Parish, 2015 Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan
this case as it avoids the danger of criteria ‘cancelling each other out’ when applied in a ranking, scale or matrix. For instance, in the matter of topography, a prominent ridge/scarp and an expansive open lowland/valley floor landscape can be equally important in defining physical and visual separation and therefore both are sensitive. The analysis draws out what is important in each case and defines parameters based on a combination of features which ‘break’ character or provide containment, or based on distance / perception.

Assessment criteria: Headings

- **Topography and skylines**: The degree to which topography contributes to perception of separation; whether prominent or distinctive landform features are present and the significance ascribed to these. It is also relevant to consider whether skylines are undeveloped or developed, as this will clearly influence the perceived sense of separation. Linked to landform and consideration of the nature and form of development, this may guide whether or not further development would impinge on the perception of separation, or whether development could be accommodated;

- **Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural / historic pattern**: The extent to which the landscape pattern and scale helps define a sense of separation. Presence of important or significant historic / landscape features which may or may not be designated and which settings / key planned or designed visual relationships / functional relationships may be important in contributing to separation;

- **Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience / recreational value and tranquillity**: Whether the area is comparatively free from intrusive modern developed influences, has a perceptible sense of remoteness / wildness / tranquillity, or is particularly valued for its recreational experience (whether formal or informal recreation – contact with nature etc.);

- **Views, visual character and intervisibility**: Visual character, extent of visibility and intervisibility with important features defining separation / intervisibility with historic sites, landmarks and settings. It is also highly relevant to consider the nature of views, the broad extent to which views may be experienced and enjoyed by receptors / users and the role of vegetation, topography and built form in defining visual character.

3.10 The criteria are similar to those presented in the 2006 study, with appropriate refinement and rationalisation to integrate with the other outputs of this new study. The criterion dealing with agricultural land classification as identified within the 2006 report has been omitted as it does not relate directly to consideration of landscape character and visual matters which define a sense of separation.

**Landscape sensitivity of the settlement fringes**

3.11 A key part of the consideration of locating potential new development is the potential for impact on settlement setting, local distinctiveness and landscape character. A number of settlements were identified by the Borough Council as locations where the emerging Local Plan may require allocations for development, as the focus for local landscape analysis. They were identified in order to assess the sensitivities of their local landscape to such change and to positively guide the form and location of any potential development. Should allocations be needed outside of the settlements assessed, further work may be necessary. The following
settlements were assessed for this part of the work\textsuperscript{10}. 

3.12 Main Town:
- Melton Mowbray

3.13 Primary Rural Service Centre Villages:
- Asfordby
- Bottesford
- Long Clawson
- Waltham on the Wolds

3.14 Secondary Rural Service Centre Villages:
- Asfordby Hill
- Croxton Kerrial
- Frisby on the Wreake
- Somerby
- Stathern
- Wymondham

**Landscape Classification**

3.15 The existing district landscape character areas from the Melton Borough Landscape Character Assessment (as amended)\textsuperscript{11} were used as a starting point for the assessment of the eleven settlement fringes, as shown in figure 3.2 below (full reference at end of report).

\textsuperscript{10} Identified through the emerging spatial strategy for the borough

\textsuperscript{11} ADAS, 2006 Melton Borough Landscape & Historic Urban Character Assessment Report and ADAS, 2011 Melton Landscape Character Assessment Update 2011
3.16 Account was also taken of the landscape character units derived for the Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study of 2014 (in relation to renewable energy development), as shown in figure 3.3 below (full reference at end of report). This is based on the 2006 landscape characterisation and provides further detail on landscape characteristics and sensitivities.
3.17 Due to its focus on the settlements and their fringes the 2006 study has been used as the primary basis for the local landscape classification for this study, supplemented by more detailed information gathered through field survey. Where appropriate, sub divisions were made in the field (described where relevant in individual area write ups at section 4), based on local variations in landscape character / differing sensitivities of the attributes to development of the type envisaged in the borough during the plan period.

3.18 The landscape around each of the settlements has been defined by Local Character Zones (LCZ) that relate to the settlement fringe (refer to individual figures in the related text for each settlement in section 4). Due to proximity between some settlements in the borough, some of these LCZs overlap and cover part of the same area as a LCZ identified for a nearby settlement, for example at Asfordby and Frisby on the Wreake.

3.19 It is important to note that the descriptions and assessment of sensitivity of the overlapping LCZ may differ, as they have been carried out in relation to the settlement fringe of the individual settlement not as part of a borough wide landscape character assessment.

3.20 The classification and assessment has been undertaken at a scale of 1:10,000 and is appropriate for decision making at that scale.
3.2.1 The district level LCA context in relation to the settlements for this landscape sensitivity study is set out in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Borough Landscape Character Areas (MBC LCA, 2006)</th>
<th>Landscape Character Units (Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frisby-on-the-</td>
<td>12. Wreake Valley</td>
<td>9. Wreake Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development scenario for the analysis

3.22 For the purposes of the analysis it has been assumed that the development scenario is medium to high density development of the type which comes forward in planning applications within the borough e.g. 30-40 dwellings per hectare (dph), 2-3 storey development, although the assessment is capable of being applied to lower densities and single storey development.

### Criteria Definition

3.23 A series of criteria have been defined to focus the analysis. The criteria have been informed by the information in the district landscape character assessment and knowledge gained of the area through fieldwork, and have been developed with reference to best practice guidance\(^\text{12}\). They have been applied to the landscape character zones identified for each settlement to determine the susceptibility to change and therefore the zones’ sensitivity to development.

3.24 The criteria are set out in Table 3.2 overleaf.

---


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Borough Landscape Character Areas (MBC LCA, 2006)</th>
<th>Landscape Character Units (Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ragdale to Saltby Wolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character,</td>
<td>Very well integrated and defined settlement edges with</td>
<td>Generally well integrated and defined settlement edges,</td>
<td>Poorly integrated/raw/exposed settlement edges, but which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation and enhancement potential (including landscape function in</td>
<td>natural, clear and defensible boundaries. Compact, clearly</td>
<td>mostly with clear/natural/defensible boundaries, albeit</td>
<td>may offer mitigation potential through new development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation to gateways, nodes, edge integration/relationship, landmarks</td>
<td>defined settlements, but outward looking in character,</td>
<td>potentially with some erosion where development may</td>
<td>edge landscape treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td>perhaps with loose linear/dispersed and porous form, where</td>
<td>already have breached such parameters.</td>
<td>Settlement may be inward looking and with little visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gaps are particularly important to settlement character. Intact</td>
<td>Mostly compact, clearly defined settlements, subject to the</td>
<td>relationship to the wider landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historic settlement and landscape character interface may</td>
<td>above note.</td>
<td>Much expanded, modern settlement edge, with little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>persist e.g. adjacent manor/parkland/ridge and furrow</td>
<td>Area mostly forms a positive approach or gateway to the</td>
<td>relationship to historic ‘urban structure’ such as gateways,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fieldscapes/‘closes’. The integrity of such features would</td>
<td>settlement and may include a key node/part of a key node</td>
<td>nodes and landmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be susceptible to change arising from residential development.</td>
<td>such as a village green. May have a degree of intervisibility</td>
<td>Settlement fringe/edge land uses/management are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area forms a key/positive approach or gateway to the</td>
<td>with settlement core and associated distinctive landmarks.</td>
<td>prevalent – again may offer mitigation/ enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>settlement/includes key node such as a village green. May have</td>
<td></td>
<td>potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong intervisibility with settlement core and associated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distinctive landmarks e.g. church tower/spire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>Contours are apparent as part of the settlement’s setting,</td>
<td>Few strong topographic features which define settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and such features may be distinctive and to a degree susceptible</td>
<td>parameters, little level of topographic variation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to change and sensitive to development footprints.</td>
<td>Developed/strongly settled skylines including modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open or ‘natural’ and undeveloped skylines which are</td>
<td>settlement and human influences or skylines which are neither</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>apparent in key views and/or would be susceptible to</td>
<td>visually distinctive nor prominent – a low level of susceptibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change arising from residential development.</td>
<td>to change and therefore low sensitivity to residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural</td>
<td>Small scale, intimate and intricate landscape patterns whose</td>
<td>Medium scale landscape patterns with some susceptibility to</td>
<td>Expansive, open landscapes with few features whose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pattern</td>
<td>legibility would potentially be susceptible to change arising</td>
<td>change arising from residential development.</td>
<td>legibility would be susceptible to change arising from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from residential development. Strong sense of intact cultural</td>
<td>Moderate [perhaps partially eroded] sense of cultural patterns,</td>
<td>residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pattern, historic functional relationships and evolution.</td>
<td>historic functional relationships and evolution.</td>
<td>Eroded, fragmented, weak sense of cultural pattern, historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and</td>
<td>Intricate, complex ‘mosaic’ landscapes whose integrity and</td>
<td>Landscape patterns which may display a degree of intactness</td>
<td>Simple or fragmented, eroded landscapes with low legibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tranquility</td>
<td>legibility would be affected by residential development and</td>
<td>and relative complexity in areas, with some potential for</td>
<td>such that new development may present an enhancement and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>therefore highly susceptible to change. Tranquil, peaceful, such</td>
<td>residential development to affect the integrity and legibility of</td>
<td>‘remediation’ opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that further residential development would represent a significant</td>
<td>these. A landscape with relatively few or fairly minor/moderate</td>
<td>Landscape of low tranquility, already characterised by high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intrusion.</td>
<td>levels of intrusion – some level of tranquility still persist.</td>
<td>levels of intrusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Expansive open and prominent views in and out, wide</td>
<td>Medium range views and medium level of (perhaps partially</td>
<td>Enclosed visual character with views kept short, little or no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intervisibility with adjacent landmarks, visually</td>
<td>filtered) intervisibility with adjacent landmarks, visually</td>
<td>intervisibility with adjacent landmarks, visually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important/prominent elements/adjacent character areas and</td>
<td>important/prominent elements/adjacent character areas and</td>
<td>important/prominent elements/adjacent character areas and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated features. Such views would have a high susceptibility</td>
<td>associated features.</td>
<td>associated features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landscape Sensitivity Scale and Definitions

3.25 The following five point sensitivity scale was developed and applied to the identified, local landscape character zones in relation to the assessment criteria – see Table 3.3.

Landscape value

3.26 It is also useful to consider landscape value as part of the overall discussion of landscape sensitivity. Value may be considered with reference to the following:

- The quality placed on the landscape, including the scenic quality;
- The presence of rare elements or features, or rare landscape character types;
- Whether the landscape contains a particular character and/or features or elements considered to be particularly important examples;
- The presence of nature, historical or cultural features of interest;
- Evidence that the landscape is important for recreational users;
- Perceptual aspects, such as tranquillity or wildness;
- Associations of the landscape with particular people in history (such as artists, designers or writers), or historical events, that contribute to the perception of natural beauty.

Landscape Sensitivity Scale and Definitions

3.27 The following five point sensitivity scale was developed and applied to the local landscape character zones (LCZs) in relation to the assessment criteria. It should be noted that intermediate sensitivity tiers have also been defined (e.g. moderate-high and moderate-low) to aid the analysis.

Table 3.3 Landscape sensitivity definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity Level</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High (Level 1)</strong></td>
<td>Key characteristics of the landscape are highly vulnerable to the type of change being assessed, with such change likely to result in a significant change in character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate to high (Level 1 to 2)</strong></td>
<td>Many of the key characteristics of the landscape may be vulnerable to the type of change being assessed, with such change likely to result in a potentially significant change in character. Considerable care will be needed in locating and designing change within the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate (Level 2)</strong></td>
<td>Some of the key characteristics of the landscape may be vulnerable to the type of change being assessed. Although the landscape may have some ability to absorb change, some alteration in character may result. Considerable care may be needed in locating and designing change within the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate to low (Level 2 to 3)</strong></td>
<td>The majority of the landscape characteristics are less likely to be adversely affected by change. Although change can potentially be more easily accommodated, care would still be needed in locating and designing change in the landscape. There is an opportunity to create and plan/design for new character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low (Level 3)</strong></td>
<td>Key characteristics of the landscape are less likely to be adversely affected by change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Development of landscape guidance

3.28 The application of the above criteria and sensitivity ratings were used to generate concise landscape guidance in relation to the LCZs, both in terms of high level landscape management and green infrastructure considerations and, where appropriate, in terms of broad brush development siting and design considerations to respond to identified landscape and visual issues.

### Protected Open Areas and Local Green Spaces Assessment

3.29 The Melton Local Plan 1999 designates a number of sites across the borough as Protected Open Areas (POA). These sites form the starting point for the assessment. Whilst MBC was working on the Local Development Framework for the borough, communities were engaged to review or recommend sites which they felt should be considered as new POAs. All of these sites are also assessed through this study. In addition to these sites, the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation provided the opportunity for the public to put forward sites for consideration as POA or Local Green Spaces (LGS). As part of the field survey, further candidate sites were also identified by the assessor and included in the assessment.

3.30 All of these sites have been fed into this assessment. The range of candidate sites is extensive and based mainly on sites put forward by local people. Inevitably more sites will be suggested in the future, and this report provides a framework for future assessment beyond this Local Plan period and for Neighbourhood Plans.

3.31 The requirements of this study are to consider the existing, proposed and candidate POA and their need for protection and their suitability for designation as a Local Green Space, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

3.32 The study evaluates each of the identified sites within the 59 settlements against the following assessment criteria (table 3.5 overleaf). The criteria are based on the requirements for Local Green Space designation set out within the NPPF.

3.33 The study aims to identify which of the existing, proposed or candidate sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces, and establish appropriate policy recommendations to safeguard important spaces within settlements, as summarised in figure 3.4 (full reference in Appendix B).
3.34 The principal output for this part of the assessment is to identify which of the considered sites meet the established criteria to be designated as a Local Green Space. Those sites assessed as meeting the criteria to be a Local Green Space, as set out in Table 3.5 are assigned a rating of ‘1’. Those sites which do not have the potential of meeting the criteria are assigned a rating of ‘3’. Sites given a rating of ‘2’ do not fully meet the established criteria. Some of these sites have the potential to become a Local Green Space in the future, beyond this Local Plan period. Other sites have value within their settlement but due to constraints primarily associated with their function, they would not be able to meet the Local Green Space criteria and could be safeguarded through other means where appropriate.

3.35 In addition to this the assessment provides a concise strategy for each of the considered sites, in order to inform future spatial planning policy and in response to individual sites’ functionality, quality, character, use and value (in reference to criteria set out in Table 3.5). The proposed strategies are defined in Table 3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conserve</td>
<td>Preserve important character and features, and protect them from loss or harm. Sites should be positively managed to maintain their condition, and preserved as they are – as recognised for their particular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In some instances it is appropriate to propose more than one strategy to a site. For example where the existing character and features are important and should be conserved but the overall site would benefit from improved quality to enhance the overall identity and functionality.
Table 3.5: Local Green Space Assessment: assessment criteria (where 1=strong and 3=weak)

Note: Different combinations of the below may be applicable, and professional judgement is applied in each case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to local community</td>
<td>Space is in immediate proximity to community/settlement and/or has direct physical access. Development may front or back on to the space to at least 2-3 of its sides. Space is likely to form an essential node or physical/visual focus for community. Community has direct physical and visual connection to space.</td>
<td>Space has a degree of proximity to community/development, with development either facing or backing onto the space to 1-2 sides. Space has some visual relationship to community and may form a secondary node/focus. Some, albeit less direct physical and visual connection between the community and the space.</td>
<td>Space is detached/removed from development and with very low/no intervisibility/visual or physical connection. Detached and with poor relationship between settlement/community and space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrably special to the local community</td>
<td>Space is 'multi-functional' - displays at least 3-5 social and quality of life functions of green infrastructure (such as landscape setting/historic legacy/ecosystem health/communal growing opportunity/spaces for nature and habitat/spaces for recreation whether formal or informal. Or: Space may be designated for heritage, biodiversity or landscape value and forms a core part of such designation. Or: Space has a tranquil character with notable absence of intrusions. Or: Space has extensive signs of positive use, activity and management/stewardship, maybe through a Friends Group.</td>
<td>Space displays up to 2-3 social and quality of life functions of green infrastructure. Or: Space may form a tangential part of a designation for heritage/biodiversity/landscape value, or have intervisibility with/form part of the setting of such sites. Or: Relatively tranquil character with few intrusions. Or: Fairly high degree of positive use and activity.</td>
<td>Space has weak functionality, displaying less than 2 functions of green infrastructure, which may be more 'incidental' or 'lower value' functions. Space is not designated or forming the setting of sites so designated. Eroded character with low tranquillity and wide evidence of intrusion. Low evidence of positive use and activity, neglected, space may be misused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The green area is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land</td>
<td>Intimate spatial scale, related more obviously to the community than the wider landscape (due to spatial configuration/layout/framing/natural surveillance etc).</td>
<td>Medium spatial scale, a degree of relationship to the community as well as the wider landscape.</td>
<td>Large/expansive spatial scale, relates much more to the wider landscape than the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of character, condition and quality</td>
<td>Clearly representative of key characteristics/features of significance identified in relation to the specific character area within the Landscape Character Assessment. Or: Strongly intact, robust and displays many of its ‘historic features’ of evolution and formation. Likely to be an integral part of the settlement’s evolution e.g. a traditional village green.</td>
<td>Some representation of key characteristics/features of significance identified in relation to the specific character area within the Landscape Character Assessment. Or: Relatively intact and robust, displaying some of its ‘historic features’ of evolution and formation, maybe with some erosion. May be an integral part of the settlement’s evolution.</td>
<td>Little representation of key characteristics/features of significance identified in relation to the specific character area within the Landscape Character Assessment. Or: Eroded, lack of robustness, little evidence of its ‘historic features’ of evolution and formation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field survey:

3.37 The assessment criteria for the three outputs were tested and confirmed at the relevant location and used to capture information for the report through field survey by qualified and experienced Landscape Architects including Chartered Members of the Landscape Institute (CMLI). Field visits were carried out throughout April and May 2015. On 12th May the surveyors were accompanied by members of the client group (officers from Melton Borough Council) who wanted to gain an understanding of the assessment process in order to inform their future application of the study. Example field survey pro formas are set out at Appendix A.

Analysis:

3.38 The findings of the analysis are presented in section 4.

Caveats associated with the use of the work

3.39 With the exception of the site specific work in relation to the Protected Open Areas, the other main outputs of this study have been undertaken at a scale of 1:10,000 and are, therefore, appropriate for decision making at that scale. With regard to the landscape sensitivity analysis, the boundaries drawn for the landscape character zones (LCZs) may in reality represent an area of transition on the ground rather than the line as drawn and account should always be taken of landscape context. Within the overall landscape sensitivity analysis, there may be variations in relation to individual landscape elements and their sensitivities in relation to residential development, and these are picked up in the reporting at section 4. The landscape sensitivity analysis has been undertaken in relation to residential development and it should be recognised that the attributes of the landscape may be sensitive in different ways to other development scenarios.
4 Assessment

4.1 This section presents the assessment of the identified settlements in relation to the three spatial outputs.

4.2 For clarity and ease of reference, and so that patterns can be discerned between the different outputs to inform future spatial planning, the assessment has been presented as a series of fully integrated spatial portraits or area profiles for the settlements, as follows:

- Group 1 Settlements: Those which are covered by all three spatial outputs e.g. Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis and Protected Open Areas;
- Group 2 Settlements: Those covered by two out of the three spatial outputs;
- Group 3 Settlements: Those represented by just one output (Protected Open Areas only).

4.3 Assessment findings are presented in relation to each of these three groups, in the remainder of this section.
**Group 1 Settlements:**

Settlements covered by all three spatial outputs i.e. Areas of Separation, Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis and Protected Open Areas

- Melton Mowbray
- Asfordby
- Asfordby Hill
- Bottesford
- Frisby on the Wreake
- Long Clawson
**Melton Mowbray**

**Assessment of Areas of Separation**

**Melton Mowbray – Burton Lazars**

4.4 This area was identified in the 2006 Areas of Separation report.

4.5 This area considers the small scale pastoral landscape and rising land between the southern edge of Melton and the ridgetop village of Burton Lazars to the south. The area includes the nationally important scheduled historic site of St Mary and St Lazarus Hospital, which was England’s largest medieval leper hospital.

[Map of Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars]

Looking south towards the northern edge of Burton Lazars, from Sawgate Road
## District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This AOS falls within two landscape character areas:  
  - Area 11: Pastoral Farmland  
  - Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe | This AOS falls within two LCUs:  
  - LCU 8: High Leicestershire Hills: Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland  
  - LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe |
| **Area 11: Pastoral Farmland**  
Described in the LCA as ‘A typical, pleasant, rural, gently rolling lowland pastoral farmland landscape, generally well-managed, with diverse field shapes and sizes, good hedges and scattered trees’.  
**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
  - Rolling topography  
  - Well managed pastoral landscape  
  - Scattered farmsteads  
  - Thick stock proof hedges  
  - Irregular shaped fields | LCU 8: High Leicestershire Hills: Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland  
**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
  - Gently rolling topography;  
  - Well managed pastoral landscape;  
  - Scattered farmsteads;  
  - Thick stock proof hedges;  
  - Broad scale;  
  - A pattern of medium scale regular and irregular shaped fields;  
  - Scattered hedgerow trees but limited woodland.  
In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:  
  - Areas of strongly rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake, Eye and Gaddesby valleys;  
  - The historic villages, their churches that form local landmarks, and their rural settings;  
  - Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
  - The deeply rural character of the landscape and sense of tranquillity;  
  - Its location within views from Burrough Hill viewpoint;  
  - The pleasing combination of fields, hedgerows, woodlands and villages which contribute to scenic quality.  
The medium scale fields with hedgerows across the rolling landform are particularly represented in this AOS, within the deeply rural landscape that has little influence from the suburban edge of Melton Mowbray. |
| **Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe**  
Described in the LCA as ‘A mixed urban fringe ridge and valley and valley floor landscape, mostly pastoral farmland, MOD and recreational |  
|  
|  
|
### 2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report):
**Character area context (principal character areas represented)**

| Land | Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mixed pasture and arable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Housing estates remain unscreened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the above aspects are represented in the AOS, such as the ridge and valley landforms, the clear distinction between settlement edge and landscape, the mixed agricultural land use and the rolling landscape of fields and hedges. This is a transitional landscape between the two character areas.

### 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCU 15: Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe</th>
<th>Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mixed pasture and arable land;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Housing estates remain unscreened;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Urban influence of Melton Mowbray.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:

- Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the south and Scalford Brook to the north;
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;
- Views from residential areas of Melton.

Rolling land, woodland blocks and views from residential areas are all applicable to the AOS. The tranquil, rural character of the wider LCU 8 extends into the AOS and is an important contributor to the sense of separation. There is a transitional in character, grading between the two LCU.

---

13 In all references to area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe, account has also been taken of the 2011 update to the Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment.
4.6 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating topography in the east associated with the north facing slopes of the Eye Valley, with a more pronounced ridge to the west on which Burton Lazars is sited, and which effectively contains perception of much of the southern edge of Melton Mowbray from the wider landscape. The eastern skyline is predominantly developed due to the presence of the ridgetop settlement of Burton Lazars. The sense of openness created by the land within the Area of Separation perceptibly contributes to the gap between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>This varies to some extent across the area, with texture and variation created by areas of ridge and furrow and scheduled earthworks (site of the medieval hospital of St Mary and St Lazarus) in the west/southwest and a simple rectilinear enclosure field pattern in the east. Overall, the relatively intact hedgerow structure and interlaced pattern of vegetation contributes to the perception of separation between the two settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>The historic landscape pattern and rural land uses (pastoral and arable agriculture) contribute to an essentially rural, tranquil landscape quality and landscape experience. This further assists in defining the sense of separation between the south of Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars. There is some evidence of recreational value due to the presence of the Jubilee Way long distance route which crosses the area – the landscape is likely to be valued for its own right by recreational users, indicating a functional value with regard to settlement setting and sense of separation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Views in and out from the wider landscape are often framed and filtered by undulating topography, the ridge on which Burton Lazars is sited and field boundary and intervening vegetation. There is little intervisability between Melton Mowbray and the wider landscape due to the presence of the rising land on which Burton Lazars is sited and this is instrumental in defining the perception of separation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations and justification:

The landscape to the west and northwest of Burton Lazars contains historic landscape features, which should be conserved. Topography limits the views of the existing built edge of Melton Mowbray experienced from Burton Lazars. Any development coming forward should have consideration of the important ridgeline to the south of Melton Mowbray that limits the visual connection of the two settlements. The physical and visual separation of the settlements should be retained, to conserve distinctive features.

Recommendation: Retain
4.7 The area identified within the ADAS (2006) report is considered to be sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements. The below figure (full reference Figure N0318 PL04-1) demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Melton Mowbray – Thorpe Arnold

4.8 This area was identified in the 2006 Areas of Separation report.

4.9 This area considers the small scale intricate landscape and sloping land between the northeast edge of Melton Mowbray and the ridgetop village of Thorpe Arnold to the east. The area includes earthworks on the southwest edge of the village and sports facilities to the east of Melton Mowbray.

Looking west towards the eastern edge of Melton Mowbray, from the Saxon earthworks
### District Landscape Character Context:

#### 2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report):
Character area context (principal character areas represented)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Described in the LCA as ‘A mixed urban fringe ridge and valley and valley floor landscape, mostly pastoral farmland, MOD and recreational land’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):  
- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges  
- Mixed pasture and arable land  
- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside  
- Housing estates remain unscreened  
- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD)  

Some of the above aspects are represented in the AOS, such as the ridge and valley landforms, the clear distinction between settlement edge and landscape, the mixed agricultural land use and the rolling landscape of fields and hedges.

#### 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCU 15 Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges  
- Mixed pasture and arable land  
- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside  
- Housing estates remain unscreened  
- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD)  
- Urban influence of Melton Mowbray  

In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:  
- Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the south and Scalford Brook to the north;  
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
- Views from residential areas of Melton.  

Rolling land, woodland blocks and views from residential areas are all applicable to the AOS.
4.10 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A distinctly undulating tributary valley topography, which is important in defining the visual and physical buffer between the exposed and prominent eastern edge of Melton Mowbray and the rural vernacular settlement of Thorpe Arnold which lies in close proximity to the east. The western skyline is developed in character whilst the eastern horizon on which Thorpe Arnold is sited is wooded in character, with the well wooded pastoral valley floor effectively defining the gap and opening up to an undeveloped horizon to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</strong></td>
<td>A small scale and relatively intricate landscape and cultural pattern persists across much of the Area of Separation. This includes lush pastoral and riparian landscape features and remnant co-axial field boundaries and hedgerows, plus remnant earthworks and areas of ridge and furrow. All of these features are instrumental in creating a perceived sense of separation – an interlaced effect of layers and structural landscape features which accentuate the gap between the two settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>A clearly rural character and landscape experience within the intimate and small scale riparian valley which separates Melton Mowbray and Thorpe Arnold. This quality and relative sense of tranquillity (albeit locally affected by settlement edges) further helps define the sense of separation and of leaving one settlement before entering another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views, visual character and intervisibility</strong></td>
<td>The Area of Separation has a relatively high degree of visual containment and filtration due to the small scale and relatively intact landscape pattern. This level of visual containment accentuates the visual sense of separation between the two settlements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations and justification:**

This is a space that is influenced by the valley topography and forms a natural separation between the edge of Melton Mowbray and Thorpe Arnold. The built form on the edge of Melton Mowbray along Melton Spinney Road, stands out as an extension of the town. Trees along the watercourse and sports pitch boundaries buffer views of the built form from Thorpe Arnold.

The built form of Thorpe Arnold is less conspicuous and development should not take place to the west of the existing settlement edge to assist in maintaining a sense of separation between Thorpe Arnold and Melton Mowbray.

**Recommendation: Extend**

4.11 The area identified within the ADAS (2006) report is considered to be sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements. In order to ensure that this buffered edge is retained the AOS should be extended west to Melton Spinney Road. The below figure (full reference at figure N0318 PL04-1) demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Melton Mowbray – Scalford

4.12 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

4.13 This area considers the medium scale agricultural and undulating valley landscape between the northern edge of Melton Mowbray and the secluded village of Scalford to the north.

Looking southwest across the undulating valley towards the northern edge of Melton Mowbray, from Thorpe Side
### District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This AOS falls within two landscape character areas:  
  - Area 6: Ridge and Valley  
  - Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe | This AOS falls within two LCUs:  
  - LCU 5: The Leicestershire Wolds: Ragdale to Saltby Wolds  
  - LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe |
| **Area 6: Ridge and Valley:**  
This area is described in the LCA as ‘A broadly homogenous gently rolling ridge & valley landscape with contrasting large scale arable fields along ridgelines and smaller scale pastures in the valleys, with managed hedges and scattered mostly ash trees’.  
**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
  - Rolling landscape  
  - Large scale open arable fields along ridgelines  
  - Small scale enclosed pastures on valley sides and floors  
  - Few buildings  
  
Aspects of the above particularly relevant to the AOS include the lightly settled character and the pattern of small scale enclosed pastures to valley sides and valley floors. | **LCU 5: The Leicestershire Wolds: Ragdale to Saltby Wolds:**  
**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
  - Rolling landscape drained by numerous stream valleys;  
  - Large scale open arable fields along ridgelines;  
  - Small scale enclosed pastures on valley sides and floors;  
  - Deeply rural with remote qualities;  
  - Urban influences include overhead lines and A606 and development at the fringes of Melton Mowbray, although these do not weaken the rural character;  
  - Small-nucleated villages located on the lower slopes of the valleys or at the valley heads;  
  - Low woodland cover and such woodlands as do occur are small in size;  
  - Broad grass verges to minor roads.  
  
In addition, the following landscape sensitivities are identified:  
  - Varied topography with areas of strongly rolling land and small scale, intimate valleys;  
  - Small villages (with a high concentration of conservation areas) with strong historical character and churches which form landmark features;  
  - Strong rural landscape with perceived qualities of tranquillity;  
  - Scenic qualities due to a combination of openness and enclosure, varied land cover and visual diversity;  
  - Long views from ridges across an attractive rolling and rural landscape.  
  
The small scale enclosed pastures to valley sides and floors and the strongly rural, tranquil character are particularly represented in this AOS. |
### 2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rolling landscape of fields and hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed pasture and arable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear distinction between urban edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing estates remain unscreened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the above aspects are represented in the AOS, such as the ridge and valley landforms, the clear distinction between settlement edge and landscape, the mixed agricultural land use and the rolling landscape of fields and hedges. Also the partly unscreened character of Melton’s northern settlement edge.

### 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)

**LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rolling landscape of fields and hedges;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed pasture and arable land;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing estates remain unscreened;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Urban influence of Melton Mowbray.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:

- Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the south and Scalford Brook to the north;
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;
- Views from residential areas of Melton.

Rolling lands associated with the Scalford Brook are particularly represented in the AOS.
4.14 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>An undulating topography associated with the valley sides of the Scalford Brook which runs east of the village of Scalford and ultimately runs south into Melton Country Park. Skylines are largely undeveloped and often defined by hedgerows and hedgerow trees. However, to the south Melton Mowbray has partly breached the valley contours in which it was historically contained and is clearly perceptible in this part of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A medium scale, predominantly rectilinear enclosure agricultural landscape pattern of mixed fields, bounded by a fairly intact hedgerow network. This grades into smaller scale agricultural landscape patterns around the historic village of Scalford. In this area such landscape patterns are often overlaid upon areas of medieval ridge and furrow field systems. A well vegetated disused railway cutting intersects the area south and southwest of Scalford. A combination of the landscape pattern/scale and the distance between the two settlements reinforces their already strong sense of detachment from one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>With the exception of the partly exposed northern settlement edge of Melton Mowbray to the south, the village of Scalford and a pylon line, the area has a strongly rural and tranquil character. This is due to the patchwork of mixed agricultural fields and the relative intactness of the landscape pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>The AOS has varied visual character and local visibility due to the interplay of landform and field boundary vegetation. These features effectively and in large part deny intervisibility between the two settlements (also due to distance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation and justification:**

This expansive area of intact rural landscape, with topography and landscape pattern further accentuating the already considerable sense of separation between Melton Mowbray and Scalford. The two settlements are some distance apart, within different landscape character areas that are clearly defined by landscape features. There are areas of prominent topography and areas of more intimate landscape associated with the undulating valley. There is limited intervisibility between the two settlements with much of Scalford contained to the intimate valley landscape. The existing edge of Melton Mowbray is located on prominent landform and is often conspicuous in the surrounding landscape.

The distinctive landform, varied visibility and intimate valley landscape pattern is sufficiently removed from the conspicuous edge of Melton Mowbray that it would be inappropriate for development that would lead to coalescence of the settlements. Development on the northern edge of Melton Mowbray could be controlled through character and design policies. The valley landscape, historic field pattern and associated features to the south of Scalford would control expansion of this settlement.

**Recommendation: Not required**

4.15 The area identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation is considered to be an
extensive tract of land that contains a variety of features that limit the physical and visual relationship of the two settlements. It is not necessary to designate this area.

**Melton Mowbray – Asfordby Hill**

4.16 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

4.17 This area considers the medium scale, predominantly pastoral and gently sloping, valley landscape between the western edge of Melton Mowbray and the hilltop village of Asfordby Hill to the west. The area includes the Ministry of Defence (MOD) Animal Centre and Remount Depot site.

Looking east towards the western edge of Melton Mowbray, from Welby Road
## District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This AOS falls within two landscape character areas:  
  - Area 19: Asfordby Quarry  
  - Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe | This AOS falls within two LCUs:  
  - LCU 14: The Leicestershire Wolds: Asfordby Quarry  
  - LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe |

### Area 19: Asfordby Quarry

Described in the LCA as ‘A disturbed, excavated, large scale, former colliery landscape now in industrial use’.

**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
- Industrial landscape – former colliery  
- Large scale  
- Disturbed  
- Continued industrial use

Aspects of the above particularly relevant to the AOS include the large scale landscape, which contributes to the openness of character in transition with the adjacent LCA.

### Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe

Described in the LCA as ‘A mixed urban fringe ridge and valley and valley floor landscape, mostly pastoral farmland, MOD and recreational land’.

**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges

In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:  
- Areas of more strongly rolling topography towards the centre and within the east of the area;  
- Areas of woodland where there is a greater sense of enclosure;  
- Landmark churches in adjacent areas.

The eastern rolling topography contributes to the character of the AOS, with some influence from the industrial workings.

### LCU 14: Leicestershire Wolds: Asfordby Quarry

**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
- Industrial landscape – former colliery;  
- Large scale;  
- Disturbed;  
- Continued industrial use.

### LCU 15: Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe

**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges;  
- Mixed pasture and arable land;  
- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside;  
- Housing estates remain unscreened;  
- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD);  
- Urban influence of Melton Mowbray.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Mixed pasture and arable land  
• Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside  
• Housing estates remain unscreened  
• Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD) | In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:  
• Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the south and Scalford Brook to the north;  
• Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
• Views from residential areas of Melton. |

Some of the above aspects are represented in the AOS, such as the ridge and valley landforms, the clear distinction between settlement edge and landscape, the mixed agricultural land use and the rolling landscape of fields and hedges.  
Rolling land, woodland blocks and views from residential areas are all applicable to the AOS.
4.18 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A distinctive valley topography with a wooded westerly skyline to the fringe of the quarries on Asfordby Hill and the easterly skyline of developed character, including mid-20th century and later residential as well as the MOD Animal Centre and Remount Depot site. The valley topography and the ridge lines which essentially mark the extent of development are important in demarcating the extent of the settlement, and in defining the sense of separation between the two areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A medium scale landscape of predominantly grazed fields and paddocks set within the partly eroded remnants of a co-axial field boundary network, with rectilinear parliamentary enclosures set within. The landscape has a relatively simple pattern and which has partly been eroded by MOD development that extends into the valley. The simplicity of pattern creates a sense of openness – the landscape is important in defining the gap between the two settlements, and development appears prominent within this open landscape where it has breached the ridgeline at Melton Mowbray to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>A partly fragmented, ‘edge’ influenced quality permeates much of this area due to land management and presence of MOD and other development. Such influences mean that the remaining sense of openness and separation is all the more important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Due to the area’s openness it has a relatively high degree of visibility and intervisibility – the area clearly contributes to the sense of separation between Asfordby Hill and Melton Mowbray in these terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations and justification:**

Melton Mowbray is effectively contained by the west-facing ridge overlooking the pastoral dry valley which forms the gap between Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Hill. Whilst the perception of Melton Mowbray’s edge is apparent and also in terms of land management and land use associated with Ministry of Defence (MOD) lands in this area, the valley nonetheless is clearly important in defining a sense of separation and setting between the two settlements. This is far more apparent to the northern side of Asfordby Road, as the land to the south is defined by a range of ‘edge’ uses and landscape management, such as the golf course. The eastern edge of Asfordby Hill and associated former quarries to the north are well integrated by broadleaf woodland and hedgerows, and this further assists in defining a sense of separation.

**Recommendation: Retain**

4.19 The area identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation did not have a defined location. It is considered that some of this area is sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements. The below figure (full reference at figure N0318 PL04-1) demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Melton Mowbray – Kirby Bellars

4.20 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

4.21 This area considers the medium to large scale pastoral landscape and gently undulating land between the southwest edge of Melton Mowbray and the village of Kirby Bellars to the west in the River Wreake floodplain. The area includes the scheduled historic site of Kirby Bellars Priory, which was founded as a chantry in 1316, also medieval and later earthworks associated with Kirby Park.

Looking northeast towards the western edge of Melton Mowbray, from the public footpath from the east of Kirby Bellars
### District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area 12: Wreake Valley:</strong></td>
<td><strong>LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and small-nucleated villages situated along the rising slopes of the valley edge’.</td>
<td><strong>Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):** | - Flat bottomed, east-west oriented river valley with gently sloping sides;  
- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray;  
- String of villages on edge of the valley;  
- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat;  
- Mixed arable and pasture;  
- Little woodland;  
- Localised areas with strong rural character;  
- Widespread features of historical and ecological (particularly wetland) interest. |
| - River Wreake  
- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray  
- String of villages on edge of the valley  
- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat | In addition, the following sensitive landscape features are identified:  
- The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake;  
- Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);  
- Historic buildings/structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;  
- Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;  
- River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSSIs);  
- Areas of ridge and furrow. |

The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS.

The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS, as is Kirby Park and associated valued historic features.
4.22 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A gently undulating to flat valley floor/floodplain topography associated with the broad valley of the River Wreake, with local variations associated with historic earthworks. Skylines are mostly open/undeveloped and defined in part by interlaced field boundary and hedgerow vegetation. The settlement edge of Asfordby Hill is clearly visible in views to the north; standing out as a poorly integrated, built edge, on the higher topography. There are glimpses of industrial units in views to the east but the edge of Melton Mowbray is largely contained by vegetated skylines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</strong></td>
<td>A medium to large scale and predominantly open pastoral landscape overlaid upon surviving medieval ridge and furrow field systems. The pattern is mostly intact (only localised interruptions are created by the railway line) and includes remains associated with a now shrunken settlement to the north and east (Priory, market cross), plus the site/earthenworks of Kirby Hall and its park and later manor house (also a distinctive relict stone wall boundary associated with the same). The scale, pattern and land use/land management within this area creates an open character, meaning the area is an important part of the setting of the village of Kirby Bellars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>A strongly rural and pastoral character is created which is accentuated by the lightly settled character (compact, loosely linear village of Kirby Bellars). A strong historic landscape dimension is apparent with the earthworks and remains of the Augustinian priory and Kirby Hall. All of these aspects are important in defining the area’s intact, lightly settled character, and therefore its value as settlement setting/in maintaining a sense of separation between Kirby Bellars and Melton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views, visual character and intervisibility</strong></td>
<td>An open visual character due to the simplicity of landscape pattern and predominantly pastoral grazing, with relatively strong levels of intervisibility. This further reinforces the area’s function as part of the setting to Kirby Bellars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations and justification:**

There is strong representation of the historic landscape character to the east of Kirby Bellars, with presence of historic features including ridge and furrow field pattern and earthworks that are sensitive and should be conserved. The landscape is relatively open and expansive, extending north towards Asfordby Hill. These open views are susceptible to changes to the predominantly undeveloped skylines. Historic features (including low stone wall) provide a natural division between the landscape patterns, relating to the settlement edges and would form a suitable edge for an Area of Separation (AOS) to the east of Kirby Bellars. To the east of the river the landscape pattern is more contained and is influenced by industrial and commercial land uses outside of Melton Mowbray.

Rather than the proposal for the AOS to be between Melton Mowbray and Kirby Bellars, it should extend to the north of Kirby Bellars to protect the historic landscape setting from expansion of Asfordby Hill and Asfordby Valley.

**Recommendation: Amend**
4.23 The area identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation did not have a defined location. It is considered that some of this area is sensitive to development. However, it is more important to maintain the separation between Kirby Bellars and Asfordby Hill and Valley. The figure below (full reference at figure N0318 PL04-1) demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Melton Mowbray – Great Dalby

4.24 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

4.25 This area considers the relatively intact small to medium scale enclosure landscape and plateau landform between the southern edge of Melton Mowbray and the secluded settlement of Great Dalby to the south. This area includes the disused Great Dalby Airfield.

Looking south towards the southwest edge of Melton Mowbray, from Dalby Road
District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This AOS is split between three landscape character areas:  
  - Area 7: Village Pastures  
  - Area 11: Pastoral Farmland  
  - Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe  | This AOS is split between two LCUs:  
  - LCU 8: High Leicestershire Hills: Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland  
  - LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe |
| **Area 7: Village Pastures:**  
This is described in the LCA as ‘A distinctive traditional pastoral landscape and attractive nucleated villages with a strong pattern of small fields often with historic features, enclosed by abundant hedgerow trees’.  
**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
  - Traditional stone built villages  
  - Small field with ridge and furrow  
  - Enclosed by ancient hedgerows with abundant hedgerow trees  
The above are all referenced within the AOS, in proximity to and defining the settlement edge of Great Dalby. | **LCU 8: High Leicestershire Hills: Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland:**  
**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
  - Gently rolling topography;  
  - Well managed pastoral landscape;  
  - Scattered farmsteads;  
  - Thick stock proof hedges;  
  - Broad scale;  
  - A pattern of medium scale regular and irregular shaped fields;  
  - Scattered hedgerow trees but limited woodland.  
In addition, the following landscape sensitivities are identified:  
  - Areas of strongly rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake, Eye and Gaddesby valleys;  
  - The historic villages, their churches that form local landmarks, and their rural settings;  
  - Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
  - The deeply rural character of the landscape and sense of tranquillity;  
  - Its location within views from Burrough Hill Viewpoint;  
  - The pleasing combination of fields, hedgerows, woodlands and villages which contribute to scenic quality. This combination characterises the view from Burrough Hill.  
Although Great Dalby airfield is an anomaly, a number of the elements identified above are represented in the AOS, such as the small scale irregular fields and areas of well managed pastoral farmland. |
| **Area 11: Pastoral Farmland:**  
This is described in the LCA as ‘A typical, pleasant, rural, gently rolling lowland pastoral farmland landscape, generally well-managed, with diverse field shapes and sizes, good hedges and scattered trees’.  | **LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe:**  
**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</strong></th>
<th><strong>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
- Rolling topography  
- Well managed pastoral landscape  
- Scattered farmsteads  
- Thick stock proof hedges  
- Irregular shaped fields  
The above characteristics are all referenced within the AOS, although a notable anomaly is the presence of Great Dalby Airfield.  
**Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe:**  
This area is described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A mixed urban fringe ridge and valley and valley floor landscape, mostly pastoral farmland, MOD and recreational land’.  
**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges  
- Mixed pasture and arable land  
- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside  
- Housing estates remain unscreened  
- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD)  
Some of the above aspects are represented in the AOS, such as the ridge and valley landforms, the clear distinction between settlement edge and landscape, the mixed agricultural land use and the rolling landscape of fields and hedges.  
- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges;  
- Mixed pasture and arable land;  
- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside;  
- Housing estates remain unscreened;  
- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD);  
- Urban influence of Melton Mowbray.  
In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:  
- Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the south and Scalford Brook to the north;  
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
- Views from residential areas of Melton.  
Rolling landscapes of fields and hedges are particularly applicable to the AOS. Again the Great Dalby airfield represents something of an anomaly. |
The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A relatively elevated plateau landform on which the disused Great Dalby Airfield (formerly RAF Melton Mowbray) is sited, fringed by an intricate and relatively small scale network of field boundary hedgerows and small woodlands forming the western edge to the settlement of Burton Lazars. Melton Mowbray lies in the Eye Valley to the north and is largely concealed from view on the most elevated points on the Great Dalby airfield. Great Dalby itself is contained within an intimate valley to the south of the airfield site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</strong></td>
<td>With the exception of the eroded landscape pattern created by the airfield, much of the rest of the area has a largely intact small to medium scale enclosure field pattern and associated landscape mosaic, overlaid upon extensive areas of medieval ridge and furrow field systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality is variable across the area, with the areas of intact small scale rural landscape mosaic contrasting sharply with the bleak, open plateau top expanse of Great Dalby airfield. However, due to the now essentially redundant nature of the airfield site, it is characterised by a stillness and tranquillity which reflects other parts of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views, visual character and intervisibility</strong></td>
<td>Landform character and landcover means that intervisibility between the two settlements is highly limited, with both Melton Mowbray and Great Dalby located in valleys and effectively concealed from each other by the ridge and plateau on which the airfield is sited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations and justification:**

This is an expansive, relatively open landscape with a medium field scale field pattern. There are areas of prominent topography and areas of more intimate landscape, associated with the rolling landform and vegetation across it. There is limited intervisibility between the two settlements with much of Great Dalby contained to the intimate valley landscape. The former airfield is located on the most prominent part of the landform between the two settlements and has an open character, due to previous removal of vegetation.

The prominent topography, level of visual prominence and medium to large scale landscape pattern is sufficiently removed from the more intimate settlement pattern that it would be inappropriate for development that would lead to coalescence of the settlements. Development of the northern edge of Great Dalby could be controlled through character and design policies. The ridgeline to the south of Melton Mowbray would control expansion of settlement in this area.

**Recommendation: Not required**

4.27 The area identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation is considered to be an extensive tract of land that contains a variety of features that limit the physical and visual relationship of the two settlements. It is not necessary to designate this area.
Melton Mowbray – Eye Kettleby

4.28 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

4.29 This area considers the small to medium scale agricultural and gently undulating landscape between the southern edge of Melton Mowbray and the small settlement of Eye Kettleby to the southwest.

Looking east towards the southern edge of Melton Mowbray, from Eye Kettleby Drive
## District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This AOS is split between three landscape character areas:</strong></td>
<td><strong>This AOS is split between two LCUs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | • Area 11: Pastoral Farmland  
|  | • Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe  
| **Area 11: Pastoral Farmland:**  | **LCU 8: High Leicestershire Hills: Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland:**  
| Described in the LCA as ‘A typical, pleasant, rural, gently rolling lowland pastoral farmland landscape, generally well-managed, with diverse field shapes and sizes, good hedges and scattered trees’.

**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  | **Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
|  | • Rolling topography  
|  | • Well managed pastoral landscape  
|  | • Scattered farmsteads  
|  | • Thick stock proof hedges  
|  | • Irregular shaped fields  
| The above characteristics are evident on the edge of the AOS with Eye Kettleby, with a small scale pastoral field network around the settlement, enclosed by mature hedges.  | • Gently rolling topography  
|  | • Well managed pastoral landscape  
|  | • Scattered farmsteads  
|  | • Thick stock proof hedges  
|  | • Broad scale  
|  | • A pattern of medium scale regular and irregular shaped fields  
| In addition, the following landscape sensitivities are identified:  | • Scattered hedgerow trees but limited woodland.  
|  | • Areas of strongly rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake, Eye and Gaddesby valleys;  
|  | • The historic villages, their churches that form local landmarks, and their rural settings;  
|  | • Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
|  | • The deeply rural character of the landscape and sense of tranquillity;  
|  | • Its location within views from Burrough Hill Viewpoint;  
|  | • The pleasing combination of fields, hedgerows, woodlands and villages which contribute to scenic quality. This combination characterises the view from Burrough Hill.  
| A number of these elements are represented towards the edge of the AOS with Eye Kettleby; particularly the pastoral landscape with thick hedges.  |  
| **Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe [LCA 21 Melton]:**  | **LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe:**  
| Described in the LCA as ‘A mixed urban fringe ridge and valley and valley floor landscape, mostly pastoral farmland, MOD and recreational  |  
|  |  
|  | **Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
|  | • Rolling landscape of fields and hedges;  
|  |  |
### Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):
- Rolling landscape of fields and hedges
- Mixed pasture and arable land
- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside
- Housing estates remain unscreened
- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD)

Aspects particularly represented in the AOS include the valley landform and rolling landscape of fields and hedges.

### 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)
- Mixed pasture and arable land;
- Clear distinction between urban edge and countryside;
- Housing estates remain unscreened;
- Some industrial and other land uses (e.g. MOD);
- Urban influence of Melton Mowbray.

In addition, the following key sensitive features are identified in this LCU:
- Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the south and Scalford Brook to the north;
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;
- Views from residential areas of Melton.

Rolling land and views from residential areas are applicable to the AOS.
4.30 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating valley topography influenced by the old railway cutting, with mostly undeveloped, tree lined skylines. As such a reasonable degree of containment is created, this assists with perception of separation between Eye Kettleby and Melton Mowbray.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A small to medium scale landscape pattern defined by enclosure field boundary hedgerows including relict co-axial field systems, plus blocks of farm woodland, wooded disused railway cutting and wood fringed lakes, the legacy of mineral extraction. These elements combine to create a sense of enclosure around the small settlement at Eye Kettleby and define the more open southern fringes of Melton Mowbray.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/ recreational value and tranquility</td>
<td>A rural character is created by the agricultural land use and interlaced field boundary hedgerows which greatly mask the perception of settlement. Eye Kettleby Lakes provide evidence of recreational value and interest in relation to this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Views from Eye Kettleby are essentially contained and kept relatively short due to the field boundary structure and presence of farm woodland blocks. Intervisibility between the settlements is filtered and limited for these reasons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations and justification:

The ridgeline from the southwest edge of Melton Mowbray to the east of Eye Kettleby lakes provides a natural division between the landscape patterns, relating to the settlement edges and restricts the intervisibility of the two settlements. There are sensitive landscape features and patterns within this landscape, which characterise the isolated settlement of Eye Kettleby. Any development coming forward in this landscape should seek to retain the isolated character of Eye Kettleby and protect the small scale landscape setting between Eye Kettleby and Kirby Lane from expansion of the industrial edge of Melton Mowbray.

Recommendation: Retain

4.31 The area identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation did not have a defined location. It is considered that some of this area is sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements. The figure below (full reference at N0318 PL04-1) demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis

Landscape classification for the settlement fringe

4.32 Based on GIS analysis and field survey, the following local landscape classification has been defined as a basis for the settlement fringe landscape sensitivity analysis for Melton Mowbray, having taken account of the work in 2006 and 2014 landscape studies.
## District Character Context

**2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context and summary descriptions from the LCA report**

**Area 6: Ridge and valley:**
'A broadly homogenous gently rolling ridge & valley landscape with contrasting large scale arable fields along ridgelines and smaller scale pastures in the valleys, with managed hedges and scattered mostly ash trees'.

**Area 11: Pastoral farmland:**
'A typical, pleasant, rural, gently rolling lowland pastoral farmland landscape, generally well-managed, with diverse field shapes and sizes, good hedges and scattered trees'.

**Area 12: Wreake Valley:**
'A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and small-nucleated villages situated along the rising slopes of the valley edge'.

**Area 13: Eye Valley:**
'A mixed rather discordant river valley landscape, with traditional small scale pastoral land to the north and contrasting large scale intensive open arable land to the south, which suppresses the natural river valley landscape'.

**2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context, plus key strategic landscape and visual sensitivities**

**LCU 5: The Leicestershire Wolds: Ragdale to Saltby Wolds:**
- Varied topography with areas of strongly rolling land and small scale, intimate valleys;
- Small villages (with a high concentration of conservation areas) with strong historical character and churches which form landmark features;
- Strong rural landscape with perceived qualities of tranquillity;
- Scenic qualities due to a combination of openness and enclosure, varied land cover and visual diversity;
- Long views from ridges across an attractive rolling and rural landscape.

**LCU 8: High Leicestershire Hills: Great Dalby and Gaddesby Pastoral Farmland:**
- Areas of strongly rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake, Eye and Gaddesby valleys;
- The historic villages, their churches that form local landmarks, and their rural settings;
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;
- The deeply rural character of the landscape and sense of tranquillity;
- Its location within views from Burrough Hill Viewpoint;
- The pleasing combination of fields, hedgerows, woodlands and villages which contribute to scenic quality. This combination characterises the view from Burrough Hill.

**LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:**
- The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake;
- Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);
- Historic buildings/ structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;
- Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;
- River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSSIs);
- Areas of ridge and furrow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context and summary descriptions from the LCA report</strong></th>
<th><strong>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context, plus key strategic landscape and visual sensitivities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Area 16: Farmland Patchwork:**  
‘A gently rolling lowland mixed farmland landscape with a distinct patchwork of small to medium scale regular shaped pastoral and arable fields with blocks of game cover and small woodlands’. | **LCU 10: The Leicestershire Wolds: Eye Valley:**  
- The historic villages and hamlets including Wymondham, Saxby, Garthorpe and Coston and their strongly rural setting and churches that form local landmarks;  
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
- The rural character of the landscape and sense of tranquillity, particularly in the east;  
- Views to the Leicestershire Wolds to the north and High Leicestershire hills to the south. |
| **Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe:**  
‘A mixed urban fringe ridge and valley and valley floor landscape, mostly pastoral farmland, MOD and recreational land’. | **LCU 14: The Leicestershire Wolds: Asfordby Quarry:**  
- Areas of more strongly rolling topography towards the centre and within the east of the area;  
- Areas of woodland where there is a greater sense of enclosure;  
- Landmark churches in adjacent areas. |
| **LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe:**  
- Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the north and Scalford Brook to the north;  
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;  
- Views from residential areas of Melton. |
### Landscape sensitivity analysis

4.33 The landscape sensitivity analysis for the LCZs within the settlement fringe is presented below.

#### LCZ 1 Melton Mowbray North

![Image](image_url)

Looking southwest across the undulating valley towards the north edge of Melton Mowbray, from Melton Spinney Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>Settlement edge conditions vary across this LCZ, with a generally good degree of landscape integration to the western extents and to the east, where late 20th century development ties in with the wooded Melton Country Park beyond. To the central part of the LCZ’s southern boundary, the perception of development is much more apparent where built form has increasingly ascended the valley slopes (modern urban extensions and the very prominent school development, plus two wind turbines near to the settlement edge). This impression is exacerbated in parts due to rather raw settlement edges in relation to some recent developments. Whilst such edges would afford a degree of mitigation potential, further development would potentially erode the historic valley settlement form of Melton. There are no notable gateways to Melton Mowbray and the approach to the settlement has been eroded through a poorly integrated edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A distinctly undulating topography formed from a series of relatively prominent north-south ridges associated with a network of tributaries of the Eye Valley. Such landform variation would be sensitive to residential development footprints. Skylines to the south are developed although the perception of Melton Mowbray is often subtle (with the exception of the areas described above) due to its predominant and historic location in the Eye Valley and the integration afforded by trees and hedgerows. Elsewhere horizons are largely undeveloped and would, therefore, be sensitive to large scale residential development footprints which would change this character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern varies across this LCZ, with land to the west of Scalford Road defined by a small scale rectilinear field pattern overlaid upon the undulating landforms. This is in contrast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LCZ 1: Melton Mowbray North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the more expansive, open character and simpler landscape pattern east of the road. However, this grades into a rather more intricate landscape mosaic further north, associated with the tributary watercourse and valley and the heavily wooded route of the disused railway line which runs north south through the valley and extends into the well-wooded Melton Country Park immediately south. The more intricate and small scale aspects of the landscape pattern / mosaic would be most susceptible / sensitive by virtue of their vulnerability to residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>A landscape of essentially rural quality and character, with the exception of where Melton Mowbray has breached its historic settlement parameters. There is otherwise relatively little sense of being on the edge of a large town from many parts of this LCZ. This sense of detachment would, therefore, be sensitive to further large scale residential development. Existing landscape patterns and features provide constraints to growth of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Relatively expansive views are available across large parts of the LCZ from the rural land network and in particular to the east of the Scaf ford Road, and from elevated landforms to the northernmost parts of the LCZ. Such visual character would be sensitive to large scale residential development due to the potential for change/impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this area to large scale residential development is medium to high, due to the varied topography which effectively forms the hinterland to the town, plus the tranquil rural character and the availability of expansive views from elevated points. There is variation within this overall sensitivity judgement, for example the more enclose landscape setting of the western part of the LCZ (between the A606 and Scaf ford Road). The rolling topography is instrumental in largely containing the perceived influence of Melton Mowbray from within the wider landscape. As such, breaks in this topographic line by recent development are very prominent, and further intrusion should be avoided. The undeveloped northerly skylines are sensitive to large scale residential development for these reasons. There is opportunity to create a better integrated settlement edge and positive approach to Melton Mowbray from the north, along the A606 and Melton Spinney Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.34 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- The settlement of Melton Mowbray is clearly perceived as a valley settlement from this LCZ. Development to the north of Melton Mowbray needs to be carefully considered so as not to erode the settlement’s relationship to the surrounding landscape;
- Development in this LCZ would be limited by landform and should be concentrated on the lower lying, less prominent topography so as to avoid being conspicuous in views along the valley to the north;
- Well-integrated residential development could be achieved in this area, without fundamentally altering the perception of Melton Mowbray as a valley town/changing its landscape relationship, through locating development on lower landform to the west and east of the LCZ, and avoiding the higher prominent landform directly north;
- Development to the east of the LCZ would allow for an improved gateway to the settlement and should encourage a well landscaped settlement edge that relates to the adjacent country park;
- New development to the east of Scalford Road has begun to break the skyline and should be better integrated through appropriate landscape proposals that physically and visually link to the country park to the east;
- Development in the west of the LCZ (between Nottingham Road and Scalford Road) should be contained by landform and not break the ridgeline along the western side of Scalford Road. Development in this location could be well integrated by landform with appropriate landscape proposals;
- Any development should take into account the prominent landform and its visibility in the wider LCZ, through consideration of heights and density of built form and appropriate landscape proposals that soften the built edge and integrate the settlement with wooded character of the valley;
- Seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision. This should also be tied in with reduced building storey height (maximum of two storeys to the edge) to reduce perception of built mass, and a simple, muted materials palette including timber, painted render and local brick. Green and brown/turf roofs may also be appropriate to the most prominent locations to help visually integrate townscape and landscape. Lit development edges should be avoided to assist with conservation of dark night skies/avoidance of sky glow and perception of further urbanising influences;
- Landscape proposals should contribute to a local green infrastructure network, which should also connect to the existing country park and links to the dismantled railway walking route.

**LCZ 2 Melton Mowbray Northeast**

Looking southwest towards the northeast edge of Melton Mowbray, from the A607 near to Twin Lakes Park
LCZ 2: Melton Mowbray Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>An exposed and rather abrupt settlement edge forms the LCZ’s western boundary, and is defined by neo-classical 1980s and 1990s cul-de-sac houses. This edge appears rather prominent in relation to the low valley which creates separation between Melton Mowbray and the village of Thorpe Arnold to the east. As such, whilst such an edge would ordinarily have mitigation potential, the gap between the two areas of settlement is sensitive and all the more valuable, given the above. The built form of the north of Melton Mowbray is prominent in this LCZ, with only glimpses of built form associated with the town centre and wider settlement visible amongst a well treed townscape in the valley. There is opportunity to better integrate this settlement edge through tree planting and landscape proposals as part of any development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A rolling valley topography defined by a small meandering tributary stream, creating an occasionally intricate landscape which opens up to the east and north along the A607. The Valley features would be sensitive to residential development footprints. The generally wooded and well integrated settled skyline at Thorpe Arnold to the east would be sensitive to residential development, as would the open riparian pastoral valley foreground which is equally important in describing a sense of separation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A relatively small scale and partially intricate landscape and cultural pattern that persists across much of the southern part of the LCZ. This includes lush pastoral and riparian landscape features and remnant co-axial field boundaries, plus remnant earthworks and areas of ridge and furrow around Thorpe Arnold. All of these combine to create a complex, textured landscape mosaic which would be susceptible to change and sensitive to residential development footprints. Farther north, the LCZ has a slightly more eroded character due to various localised land uses and land management activities, such as the Twin Lakes Park theme park and the Melton Mowbray Golf Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>A clearly rural character and landscape experience within the intimate and small scale riparian valley which separates Melton Mowbray and Thorpe Arnold. This quality and relative sense of tranquillity (albeit locally affected by settlement edges) would be sensitive to residential development. These perceptual qualities extend into the larger scale rural landscapes to the northern parts of the LCZ, albeit with localised intrusions created by features within Twin Lakes Park and by the mostly densely vegetated golf course (conifer lined boundaries).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>This varies widely across the LCZ, with greater levels of visual containment in the small scale, settlement influenced landscapes to the south (thereby reducing sensitivity in visual terms). The elevated and larger scale, more open landscape overlooking Twin Lakes Park from the A607 creates the potential for much more expansive views and intervisibility, and therefore greater visual sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LCZ 2: Melton Mowbray Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is judged to be <strong>medium to high</strong>. This is by virtue of the southern area’s function in providing separation between Melton Mowbray and Thorpe Arnold, its small scale and sense of intactness within the tributary valley which runs between the two areas of settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.35 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- Due to the function in providing separation (in line with the AOS assessment above) and the small scale, relatively complex landscape mosaic within the landscape closest to areas of settlement, there is little possibility for this LCZ to accommodate further residential development;
  - It is recommended instead that the LCZ is conserved as an integral part of a local green infrastructure network and to maintain separation between Melton Mowbray and Thorpe Arnold (refer to assessment of Area of Separation for the same, above);
  - Links between green spaces within Melton Mowbray and elements within the LCZ should be established as part of an overall green infrastructure strategy for Melton Mowbray. For example through the country park, cemetery and leisure facilities and up to the earthworks and footpath network around Thorpe Arnold.

## LCZ 3 Melton Mowbray East

Looking west along the Eye Valley towards the eastern edge of Melton Mowbray, from the B676 near Brentingby

### LCZ 3 – Melton Mowbray East/Eye Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and</td>
<td>This area is distinctly separate from the settlement edge by virtue of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LCZ 3 – Melton Mowbray East/Eye Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>its floodplain location and character, although the westernmost parts of the LCZ are bordered by prominent industrial estate development adjoining the valley. Residential built form is also prominent on the rising landform within LCZ4, adjacent to the industrial units. Whilst the harsh/abrupt industrial estate edges would afford mitigation potential, in reality there is limited scope for further development in this LCZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>Topography is that of a broad riverine valley through which the River Eye describes a meandering course, and with broad, gently undulating valley sides. Northern and southern skylines are largely undeveloped until one reaches the westernmost extents of the area (adjacent industrial estates) and are, therefore, susceptible/sensitive to development, as is the broad open valley floor landscape character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>An intimate and small scale character is created by a patchwork of pastoral grazing fields and occasional blocks of wet woodland, plus the historic and well-hedged rural lane network and locally prominent features such as the old Manor Farmhouse and former church of St Mary at Brentingby (both Grade II listed). In many parts of the valley floor an intact network of medieval ridge and furrow field earthworks persists. Although a degree of severance is created by the railway line, all of the above features would be susceptible to change, by virtue of the potential for residential development to adversely impact upon their legibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>A mostly tranquil character is created by the intimate pastoral landscape patchwork and by historic features such as the ironstone manor farm, associated outbuildings and the former church of St Mary. The perceptual quality imparted by such features would be susceptible to change, although it is noted that localised intrusions are created by the presence of the railway line and the industrialised western edge (including pylon lines).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Expansive westward views are available from the Saxby Road overlooking the valley. The open visual character of much of the valley and degree of intervisibility from elevated vantage points would be susceptible to change. The urbanised visual backdrop created by the pylons and the industrial estates would, however, locally reduce visual susceptibility and sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity to residential development is judged <strong>medium to high</strong> by virtue of the intactness of much of the valley landscape and the historic landscape character described above. Medieval field systems and the historic settlements including listed buildings through the valley would be particularly sensitive. It is recognised that within this overall sensitivity judgement, there would be elements where sensitivity would be reduced, due to intrusions such as the industrialised western edge and the railway line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.36 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- Due to the LCZ’s sensitivity, physical constraints and detachment from the main settlement edge, this LCZ has very little ability to accommodate development. Small scale development in proximity to the existing built edge may be possible with appropriate consideration of the landscape character and features through design and mitigation proposals;

- Efforts should instead be directed towards avoiding further landscape fragmentation and in conserving and securing valued elements of the valley and historic landscape character as integral parts of a local green infrastructure network;

- Any strategic green infrastructure proposals for Melton Mowbray should consider links from existing / new green spaces within the town to valuable surrounding landscapes, via an improved footpath network between features.

LCZ 4 Melton Mowbray Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>A densely developed 20th century settlement edge, well integrated by undulating topography with hedgerow and garden boundary vegetation. Development occupies the higher ground on the north facing slopes of the Eye Valley, meaning that the green foreground of the valley and ‘foothills’ is visually important and also in forming the physical and visual gap between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars. This and the defensible nature of the settlement edge mean that there is little mitigation potential – development would effectively, physically and visually, breach established settlement parameters in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating topography defined by the north facing upper valley side slopes of the Eye Valley. The skyline to the west is predominantly developed – the urban development within Melton Mowbray is visible on the crest of the hill, beyond the wooded settlement edge. Whilst this may reduce sensitivity in some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 4: Melton Mowbray Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>respects, it also means that further foreshortening of the horizon due to additional development could adversely affect character in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A simple rectilinear field pattern of medium scale defines much of this area – that of parliamentary enclosure, and mostly defined by areas of arable cultivation. To the settlement edges such as Burton Lazars, a smaller scale field network, including areas of ridge and furrow, persists. This greater intricacy of landscape pattern and presence of historic legacy features would be susceptible to change due to the potential impact of residential development upon their integrity. The simpler, larger scale arable field pattern which defines much of the area would be less susceptible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>A simple rural landscape of mostly repetitive pattern (with the exception of more ‘mosaic’ landscape character to some of the settlement edges such as Burton Lazars). The relatively light perception of development and settlement influence contributes to a tranquil landscape, which would be susceptible to change in these terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>A mostly open visual character by virtue of the gently rolling topography with low hedgerows, mainly arable landcover and medium scale, simple landscape pattern. This results in a relatively high degree of intervisibility, which would be susceptible to change or sensitive to residential development in visual terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>A medium to high overall landscape sensitivity, due primarily to the open visual character and the degree of intervisibility, the character of which would be vulnerable to change in light of residential development. The openness also contributes to the separation between Melton Mowbray and Burton Lazars, and is also sensitive for this reason. These characteristics should be conserved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.37 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- The existing settlement edge of Melton Mowbray is generally well integrated in long views that are available across the flat landform of this LCZ, due to the landform allied with the hedgerow field boundaries and vegetated settlement edge. With this in mind any development brought forward in this LCZ should have consideration of the existing edge character;
- Any development should be contained by existing landform and landscape features, and should not encroach on the character of the River Eye valley nor the character of Burton Lazars (in line with the AOS assessment above);
- The elevated landform of the settlement edge that slopes east towards the River Eye combines with the open visual character of the LCZ to limit the extents of development, due to potential prominence in views and impact on landscape character;
• Any development in this LCZ should be small scale and respond to and reflect existing settlement edge character;
• Any development should seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision. This should also be tied in with reduced building storey height (maximum of two storeys to the edge) to reduce perception of built mass, and a simple, muted materials palette including timber, pointed render and local brick. Green and brown/turf roofs may also be appropriate to the most prominent locations to help visually integrate townscape and landscape. Lit development edges should be avoided to assist with conservation of dark night skies/avoidance of sky glow and perception of further urbanising influences;
• There is potential to soften the existing development edge through appropriate development and landscape proposals, which should also contribute to a strategic green infrastructure network to incorporate the Jubilee Way.

**LCZ 5 Melton Mowbray South**

Looking north towards the southern edge of Melton Mowbray, from the Sandy Lane approach to the settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>The southern settlement edge of Melton is mostly integrated within the wider landscape by existing field boundaries/roadside hedgerows to the south and by the rolling landforms to the south which rise to the low plateau on which the disused airfield at Great Dalby is sited. As the landform dips down towards Melton Mowbray, the edge becomes more prominent and less well integrated with the small scale field network. In the context of the wider LCZ the southern edge has a logical and reasonably defensible settlement boundary created by the topographical variation, which would be sensitive to expansion in these terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>Topography is markedly undulating across this local character area, and the rolling landforms would be sensitive to residential development footprints by virtue of the potential for impact upon their legibility and integrity. The rolling topography is also linked with skyline character, helping mask the perception of Melton Mowbray from many vantages in the wider landscape, and this characteristic would, therefore, be susceptible to change arising from large scale residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and</td>
<td>This area contains extensive remnants of medieval ridge and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LCZ 5: Melton Mowbray South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>Furrow field systems which are readily apparent on the ground, particularly evident to the southwest edge. The historical/landscape integrity of this field network would be highly susceptible to change arising from residential development. Similarly sensitive would be the scheduled earthworks and archaeological features associated with the medieval leper hospital of St Mary and St Lazarus, the largest such site in England (plus associated moats and fish ponds) to the southeast of this LCZ at Burton Lazars. Similarly areas of intact, small scale early enclosure field systems and hedgerows and pastoral enclosures would be sensitive for the same reasons. The simpler and slightly larger scale field patterns to the east would be less sensitive due to lower potential for impact on their integrity/potential to absorb a degree of well-designed development within such structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquility</td>
<td>A strongly historic landscape aspect with small scale fieldscapes overlaid upon readily apparent areas of ridge and furrow. The landform effectively masks Melton Mowbray from view around Burton Lazars. Similarly the plateau top airfield at Great Dalby is all but concealed from view on the farmed slopes towards the southern edge of Melton Mowbray. The sense of tranquility and rurality on the edge of the settlement is, therefore, sensitive to residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Views out and intervisibility with the wider landscape are largely limited by folded/rolling landforms, which reduce sensitivity in visual terms at least, by virtue of the containment and screening afforded. The existing settlement edge has limited visibility in the wider landscape and becomes prominent in the locality of the Melton Mowbray, approaching along Sandy Lane and Dalby Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this area to residential development is <strong>medium to high</strong> by virtue of the mostly intricate, small scale landscape and cultural pattern. Some individual elements within the area would have a higher sensitivity, e.g. areas of ridge and furrow, plus scheduled archaeology/earthworks (which are prominent and clearly readable on the ground), due to their historic legacy value. It is recognised that the area has a lower sensitivity in visual terms due to the containment afforded by surrounding ridges (including the locally prominent one on which Burton Lazars is sited) and the folded valley landform which defines the southern hinterland of Melton Mowbray. The existing settlement is also prominent and not well integrated, as experienced in the local setting of the LCZ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:
The LCZ has a strongly rural, mostly intact character, and development up to the ridgeline (defined by vegetated field boundaries) between Sandy Lane and Melton Road should be avoided, both to maintain separation with Burton Lazars and to respect the sensitivity of historic landscape features/earthworks west of the village;

Due to the undulating topography there is variation in perception of the existing settlement edge and opportunity, therefore, to accommodate landscape sensitive development in this LCZ, which should work to improve the existing settlement edge and better integrate it with the landscape features;

The plateaued landform associated with the airfield is exposed and has little relationship to the lower lying existing settlement edge. Any development in this LCZ should be contained by the landform to the south and should not rise too far up the slopes in order to avoid perception of settlement from the plateau on which Great Dalby airfield is sited;

Any development should have consideration of existing landscape features that define the setting of the existing settlement and create an often contained landscape setting, including vegetation along roadsides, lanes, riparian corridors and associated with the leisure facilities at Eye Kettleby;

In landscape and settlement setting terms, a soft landscape edge should be created by any development – a porous edge with reduced density, ridge and furrow conserved as green infrastructure wherever possible, and sensitively sited and designed infrastructure;

Any development should seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision. This should also be tied in with reduced building storey height (maximum of two storeys to the edge) to reduce perception of built mass, and a simple, muted materials palette including timber, painted render and local brick. Green and brown/turf roofs may also be appropriate to the most prominent locations to help visually integrate townscape and landscape. Lit development edges should be avoided to assist with conservation of dark night skies/avoidance of sky glow and perception of further urbanising influences;

Links between existing green spaces in the south of Melton Mowbray and those that should form part of any development proposals are important and should also connect to the wider landscape including historical sites near Burton Lazars and noted recreational routes.

**LCZ 6 Melton Mowbray Southwest**

Looking east towards the western edge of Melton Mowbray, from the edge of the historic landscape at Kirby Bellars on the A607
## LCZ 6: Melton Mowbray Southwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>Much of this LCZ is defined by settlement edge influences and land uses / landscape management (such as the railway lines and disused railway line which intersect the area, the Asfordby Road Golf Course, Sysonby Grange Garden Centre and a wastewater/sewage treatment works). As such the boundary between settlement edge and the wider landscape is blurred, and this reduces the LCZ’s susceptibility to change and sensitivity to residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A gently undulating valley topography is largely masked by intervening woodland belts which subdivide the area and associated land uses. As such the prevailing perception is often of a well-wooded skyline, although with development influences often apparent, reducing susceptibility and sensitivity to development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>A landscape of much altered scale and cultural pattern, due to being overlaid with uses such as the golf course and sewage treatment works. The LCZ also includes the urban park at Egerton Park, alongside the Rivers Eye and Wreake which traverse a meandering course through the LCZ and provide instances of small scale riparian character. The dense wooded belts which have been planted to screen such elements, as well as the surviving network of hedgerows, effectively create a landscape of intimate scale and fairly complex pattern. These qualities would be susceptible to change and, therefore, sensitive to residential development footprints, in landscape terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>An eroded, interrupted quality is created by the land uses overlaid upon the landscape, as described above. The landscape is defined by a marked ‘edge’ influence due to the presence of such features and ‘manicured’ or ‘artificial’ landscape management associated with features such as the golf course. These reduce the perception of tranquillity and, therefore, the susceptibility of the landscape in perceptual and experiential terms. This area also includes locally valued urban amenities, such as Egerton Park, adjacent to Melton Mowbray’s western edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views, visual character and intervisibility</strong></td>
<td>A mostly contained and enclosed visual character is imparted by the density of vegetation and elements of landscape structure within this LCZ, such as hedgerows and woodland belts. Such elements reduce the susceptibility and sensitivity of the landscape in visual terms. Localised parts of the LCZ have a more open character, such as Egerton Park and the golf course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</strong></td>
<td>Overall sensitivity of this local character area to residential development is judged to be medium to low. This is by virtue of the eroded landscape pattern and the urban edge influences, as well as the mostly contained visual character. Within this overall judgement, specific aspects would be of greater sensitivity such as Egerton Park and the areas of small scale landscape associated with the Rivers Eye and Wreake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.39 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- Given the above constraints including existing land use and flood plain, it is likely that only a small scale quantum of development could be achieved in the LCZ;
- Any development would be best contained within the river bend and disused railway line which forms a vegetated arc west of the settlement edge, and visually and physically contains the existing settlement to the west of Melton Mowbray;
- Development in this location (with appropriate offsets and green infrastructure provision to the rivers and associated floodplains) could be effectively contained within the strong landscape structure in this area;
- As part of a local green infrastructure network links between Egerton Park, the golf course along the river and out to the historic landscape at Kirby Bellars should be encouraged.

LCZ 7 Melton Mowbray Northwest

Looking east across the valley towards the western edge of Melton Mowbray, from elevated topography along Welby Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>A mostly open, mid-20th century and later, part Ministry of Defence (MOD) and settled edge characterises much of the settlement interface of this LCZ. Development occupies a prominent ridgetop location overlooking the valley which defines much of the LCZ, and is at most partially integrated by garden boundary vegetation. Development has also partially spilled out on to the valley sides (the MOD Remount Depot site and houses to the south). Whilst the settlement edge displays a degree of enhancement and mitigation potential (which potentially reduces its sensitivity to development), the prominent valley top location in reality means that little development could be accommodated. The open foreground created by the valley is important in defining settlement separation and the gap between Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Hill to the west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LCZ 7: Melton Mowbray Northwest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A distinct valley topography with prominent developed skylines to the east. However, the role formed by the largely open lower valley slopes and valley floor are important in defining a setting to the settlement, and as such would be sensitive to further development breaching the ridgeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A medium scale landscape of predominantly grazed fields and paddocks set within the partly eroded remnants of a co-axial field boundary network, with rectilinear parliamentary enclosures set within. The landscape has a relatively simple pattern which has partly been eroded by MOD development which extends into the valley, also 'edge' influences such as telegraph poles and wires. The above characteristics reduce the susceptibility and sensitivity of the LCZ to change arising from potential residential development, although remnant co-axial landscape structure would be sensitive. The northernmost parts of the LCZ fall within the MOD Estate and include a well-managed and dense hedgerow network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>A partially fragmented quality results from the simplicity of the landscape structure, apparent field boundary loss and the presence of intrusions such as the MOD Depot. This sense of fragmentation is further exacerbated by the paddocks and associated field subdivisions (post and rail fencing) and telegraph poles/overhead wires. As such the landscape experience is interrupted, which reduces susceptibility and sensitivity to change arising from residential development in these terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Relatively expansive views are available across the broad valley from the ridgetops to either side. Such views would be susceptible and sensitive to change arising from residential development. However, wider intervisibility to the north and south is more limited (by vegetation within the MOD Estate to the north, at the head of the valley, and to the south within the adjacent LCZ 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>A medium overall landscape sensitivity to residential development. This is due to the medium landscape scale and variable landscape intactness and condition. Within this overall judgement, it is recognised that certain aspects would be far more sensitive and important. These include the role of the ridgetop to the west facing valley slopes in largely containing Melton, the visual sense of openness and the valley’s role in defining settlement setting and separation between Melton and Asfordby Hill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development**

4.40 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- The existing settlement edge is visible but predominantly well integrated, which should be a consideration of any development proposed within this LCZ;
Due to the sloping nature of the topography on the edge of Melton Mowbray, development that extends west beyond the ridgeline of the existing edge would become prominent, particularly in the northern part of the LCZ;

There is greater visibility of Melton Mowbray across the southern portion of the LCZ and some additional development could be accommodated in the views, although development beyond the prominent ridgeline would alter the perception of separation between Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Hill and should be avoided;

If development should come forward in this area it is important for a robust landscape and green infrastructure scheme to form part of the proposals – linking between spaces within Melton Mowbray, new spaces within the development and the surrounding landscape;

Any development should seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision and reduced building storey height (maximum of two storeys to the edge) to reduce perception of built mass. Green and brown/turf roofs may also be appropriate to the most prominent locations to help visually integrate townscape and landscape;

It is important to consider this LCZ in combination with the above Area of Separation assessment (paragraph 4.16) that identifies the importance of the separate identities of these settlements and the requirement for the AOS. Efforts should be directed at conservation and enhancement of intrinsic features of the valley landscape and associated structure, to help reinforce further the sense of separation between Melton and Asfordby Hill.

Local Green Space Assessment

4.41 A total of 37 existing and proposed Protected Open Areas (POA) have been considered within the settlement of Melton Mowbray (see Annexe 1 for full analysis and larger scale map).
with the NPPF, is determined through consideration of the spaces against the assessment criteria (see Table 3.5).

4.43 Nine of the 37 spaces in Melton Mowbray strongly meet the established criteria:

- Country Park (No.10)
- Cemetery (No.14)
- Wilton Park (No.21)
- New Park (No.22)
- Egerton Park (No.23)
- Memorial Gardens (No.25)
- Play Close (No.26)
- Churchyard (No.27)
- Country Park extension (No.35)

4.44 Most of these proposed LGS are in close proximity to the town centre and form a valuable part of the settlement character, in relation to the parks formed by the Town Estate. A couple of spaces are further out, namely the Country Park (Nos.10 and 35) and Cemetery (No.14), to the northeast of the settlement.

4.45 The parks within the town centre are predominantly formal in character, with a variety of open and more intimate spaces that cater for all requirements. They provide communal facilities and are multi-functional spaces; primarily providing for formal and informal recreation, as well as being a community, heritage and biodiversity asset in the town centre. The parks are generally well connected and create a robust park character adjacent to the central area. There are a large number of mature trees through the parkland, which denote the swathe of green space through the town centre. Each of the parks show signs of positive use and are clearly linked to the wider community. They should be conserved and reinforced where necessary.

4.46 The Country Park to the northeast of the town centre is more informal and contains some areas that are underused. It is a valuable, multi-functional open space set amongst the residential areas. It again provides a variety of spaces including formal play space, recreational fields, allotments and woodland. The parkland has a generally enclosed character, created through tree planting combined with the valley landform. The park provides an important green
wedge between the developments and provides a physical and visual relationship with the wider, rural landscape to the north. It is important to note that this parkland would benefit from some more appropriate management as there are signs of mis-use and under-use. The range of functions of the park could be enhanced.

4.47 The Cemetery (No.14) is an important, formal space that has over time become encompassed by built form. It has a weak connection to the adjacent country park, and would benefit from this being reinforced. This is a valuable community and heritage asset that should be conserved and reinforced.

4.48 The other 28 spaces show a combination of criteria 2 and 3. Some of these spaces are recreation and neighbourhood spaces that, whilst important community spaces, are not multi-functional and have weak character and integrity. Other spaces contribute to the setting of heritage features or are intrinsic to the adjacent development. There is opportunity to conserve / reinforce / enhance these through planning policy.
Asfordby

Assessment of Areas of Separation

Asfordby – Frisby on the Wreake

4.49 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

Looking northeast across the floodplain towards the southern edge of Asfordby, from a footpath north of Frisby on the Wreake
### District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area 12: Wreake Valley:</strong></td>
<td><strong>LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and small-nucleated villages situated along the rising slopes of the valley edge’.</td>
<td><strong>Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):</strong></td>
<td>- Flat bottomed, east-west oriented river valley with gently sloping sides;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- River Wreake</td>
<td>- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>- String of villages on edge of the valley;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- String of villages on edge of the valley</td>
<td>- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat</td>
<td>- Mixed arable and pasture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Little woodland;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Localised areas with strong rural character;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Widespread features of historical and ecological (particularly wetland) interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS.</td>
<td>In addition, the following sensitive landscape features are identified:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Historic buildings/ structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSSIs);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Areas of ridge and furrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS, as are historic landscape features such as ridge and furrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.51 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>An undulating valley side topography to the east of Frisby on the Wreake, which forms part of the north facing Wreake valley slopes. The landscape then flattens out across the valley floor to the south of Asfordby. An open and undeveloped skyline is formed by the valley crest to the south, overlaid by arable cultivation, hedgerows and occasional mature hedgerow trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A landscape of relatively small scale which includes many areas of intact ridge and furrow field systems, overlaid by a network of enclosure field boundary hedgerows, which effectively contain the eastern settlement edge of Frisby-on-the-Wreake. Lateral severance is created within the landscape due to the railway line and, further north, the meandering course of the River Wreake, associated floodplain and riparian vegetation. Wood-edged water bodies, the legacy of mineral extraction, flank parts of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>A strongly rural and riparian character is created by the interplay of valley landforms, well wooded riverine valley floor and the patchwork of hedgerows, fields and areas of ridge and furrow. Although some development influences are apparent, such as the railway line, the perception of settlement is to some degree foiled by landscape structure and field boundary hedgerows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Visibility varies throughout the AOS, with greater levels of intervisibility from more open and elevated aspects on the valley slopes to the south, and a much greater degree of visual containment in the rather more vegetated river valley floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations and justification:**

Frisby on the Wreake is a well contained settlement with well integrated built edge to the northeast. The railway line to the north provides a separating feature between identified landscape character areas; floodplain to the north and sloping co-axial fields to the east. The southern edge of Asfordby is contained by the River Wreake and development beyond this would be detached and inappropriate. The medium scale, visually contained, flat landscape of the valley is considered to be detached from the more intimate settlement pattern. Development could be controlled through existing landscape constraints and further through appropriate character and design policies. The character of the settlements is separated by the vegetated valley floor and both are contained to their settings.

**Recommendation:** Not required

4.52 The area was identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation. Although the area is sensitive in part to development, it is considered that the sense of separation would be maintained by existing landscape features and constraints. It is not necessary to designate this area.
Asfordby - Asfordby Valley

4.53 This area was identified in the 2006 Areas of Separation report.

4.54 This area considers the relatively small scale, partially eroded landscape and gently undulating land between the eastern edge of Asfordby and the small settlement of Asfordby Valley to the east.

Looking south across undulating fields towards the northeast edge of Asfordby, from Saxelbye Road
### District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</strong></th>
<th><strong>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This AOS is split between two landscape character areas:  
  - Area 7: Village Pastures  
  - Area 12: Wreake Valley | This AOS is split into two LCUs:  
  - LCU 5: The Leicestershire Wolds: Ragby to Saltby Wolds  
  - LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley |

**Area 7: Village Pastures:**  
Described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A distinctive traditional pastoral landscape and attractive nucleated villages with a strong pattern of small fields often with historic features, enclosed by abundant hedgerow trees’.

**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
- Traditional stone built villages  
- Small field with Ridge & Furrow  
- Enclosed by ancient hedgerows with abundant hedgerow trees

The AOS is not particularly representative of the above characteristics, although it is bordered by areas of ridge and furrow.

**Area 12: Wreake Valley**  
Described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and

**LCU 5: The Leicestershire Wolds: Ragby to Saltby Wolds:**

**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
- Rolling landscape drained by numerous stream valleys;  
- Large scale open arable fields along ridgelines;  
- Small scale enclosed pastures on valley sides and floors;  
- Deeply rural with remote qualities;  
- Urban influences include overhead lines and A606 and development at the fringes of Melton Mowbray, although these do not weaken the rural character;  
- Small-nucleated villages located on the lower slopes of the valleys or at the valley heads;  
- Low woodland cover and such woodlands as do occur are small in size;  
- Broad grass verges to minor roads.

In addition, the following landscape sensitivities are identified in relation to this LCU:  
- Varied topography with areas of strongly rolling land and small scale, intimate valleys;  
- Small villages (with a high concentration of conservation areas) with strong historical character and churches which form landmark features;  
- Strong rural landscape with perceived qualities of tranquillity;  
- Scenic qualities due to a combination of openness and enclosure, varied land cover and visual diversity;  
- Long views from ridges across an attractive rolling and rural landscape.

The urban influences described above are most apparent in this AOS.
### Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):
- River Wreake
- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray
- String of villages on edge of the valley
- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat

The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS.

### Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):
- Flat bottomed, east-west oriented river valley with gently sloping sides;
- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray;
- String of villages on edge of the valley;
- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat;
- Mixed arable and pasture;
- Little woodland;
- Localised areas with strong rural character;
- Widespread features of historical and ecological (particularly wetland) interest.

In addition, the following sensitive landscape features are identified:
- The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake;
- Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);
- Historic buildings/structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;
- Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;
- River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSSIs);
- Areas of ridge and furrow.

The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS.
4.55 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in **paragraph 3.9**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating valley topography which forms part of the south facing slopes of the broad River Wreake Valley. Skylines are often defined by the wooded route of the Asfordby bypass which bisects the area across its centre, and also in part by the settlement edges of Asfordby and Asfordby Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A partially eroded enclosure field pattern which is the legacy of agricultural intensification. This creates a landscape of medium scale, although there are variations where a smaller scale landscape pattern/fabric persists to the immediate settlement edges, along with areas of settlement edge woodland to Asfordby in particular. Immediately beyond the area to the north and south lie relatively extensive areas of medieval ridge and furrow field systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/ recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>A landscape which is partly defined by settlement edge influences such as the setting of Asfordby and Asfordby Valley and by the Asfordby bypass. Such influences are often contained within a relatively strong roadside and field boundary hedgerow network, which reinforces the perception of separation between Asfordby and Asfordby Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>A mostly contained visual character is created by the presence of hedgerows and areas of settlement edge woodland. Views into much of the area from the bypass are at most fleeting / glimpsed due to the relative density of the vegetation, allied to landform undulation. The vegetation also has the effect of largely containing the edges of the two settlements and the perception of these, and is important in defining the sense of separation. For the same reason, however, smaller scale field parcels to the settlement edges could potentially be released for development without perceptibly altering the area of separation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations and justification:**

It is appropriate for these to be two separate developments by virtue of their different identities and settlement character. The existing green edge of Asfordby is important for the setting of the village, as well as providing for informal recreation. The Bypass Road forms an appropriate dividing line between Asfordby and Asfordby Valley. The character of the existing edge of Asfordby Valley is eroded and could be suitable for development, without intruding on the character of Asfordby. Development should be constrained by the landscape features including topography and existing vegetation belts.

**Recommendation: Amend**
4.56 The area identified within the ADAS (2006) report is considered to be sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements. However, it is considered that parts of this area are less sensitive and could accommodate small scale development. The below figure (full reference at figure N0318 PLO4-1) demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis

Landscape classification for the settlement fringe

4.57 Based on GIS analysis and field survey, the following local landscape classification has been defined as a basis for the settlement fringe landscape sensitivity analysis for Asfordby, having taken account of the work in 2006 and 2014 landscape studies.
### District Character Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context and summary descriptions from the LCA report</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context, plus key strategic landscape and visual sensitivities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Area 6: Ridge and Valley:**  
'A broadly homogenous gently rolling ridge & valley landscape with contrasting large scale arable fields along ridgelines and smaller scale pastures in the valleys, with managed hedges and scattered mostly ash trees’. | **LCU 5: The Leicestershire Wolds: Ragdale to Saltby Wolds:**  
- Varied topography with areas of strongly rolling land and small scale, intimate valleys;  
- Small villages (with a high concentration of conservation areas) with strong historical character and churches which form landmark features;  
- Strong rural landscape with perceived qualities of tranquillity;  
- Scenic qualities due to a combination of openness and enclosure, varied land cover and visual diversity;  
- Long views from ridges across an attractive rolling and rural landscape. |
| **Area 7: Village Pastures:**  
'A distinctive traditional pastoral landscape and attractive nucleated villages with a strong pattern of small fields often with historic features, enclosed by abundant hedgerow trees’. | **LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:**  
- The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake  
- Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);  
- Historic buildings/ structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;  
- Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;  
- River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSSIs);  
- Areas of ridge and furrow. |
| **Area 12: Wreake Valley:**  
'A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and small-nucleated villages situated along the rising slopes of the valley edge’. | **LCU 14: The Leicestershire Wolds: Asfordby Quarry:**  
- Areas of more strongly rolling topography towards the centre and within the east of the area;  
- Areas of woodland where there is a greater sense of enclosure;  
- Landmark churches in adjacent areas. |
| **Area 19: Asfordby Quarry:**  
'A disturbed, excavated, large scale, former colliery landscape now in industrial use’. | |
## Landscape

4.58 The landscape sensitivity analysis for the LCZ within the settlement fringe is presented below.

### LCZ 1 Asfordby North

![Looking north along Bypass Road, from the eastern edge of Asfordby](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>The northern settlement edge backs on to the landscape of this LCZ but is separated from it by the A6006 bypass, one field depth to the north of the settlement edge. The bypass corridor is densely vegetated, effectively cutting it off from the wider landscape. The A6006 effectively rounds off the settlement / creates a clear settlement boundary, and there is physically little or no room for development in the short fields between the A6006 and the settlement edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A distinctly undulating topography is formed by a network of ridges and glacial dry valleys, part of the wider valley system of the Wreake Valley which lies directly to the south of the village. The open and undeveloped skylines to the north are susceptible / sensitive, as are the landform variations, which would be vulnerable to potential development footprints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>This LCZ is defined by a partially intact and historic small to medium scale rectilinear enclosure field boundary pattern, with areas of re-organised enclosure. There is some evidence of earlier ridge and furrow field systems (including small areas immediately south of the bypass, now partly overlaid and juxtaposed with paddocks). Such features would be susceptible to change by virtue of the potential for impact upon their legibility. It is recognised that the A6006 bypass creates a notable intrusion within this landscape pattern, as does the pylon line which crosses the western part of the character area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>A simple rural landscape of mostly repetitive pattern, although more altered to the east of Saxelbye Road. There is little settlement within this LCZ, although it is influenced by views across the roofline of Asfordby and settlements in the lower lying landscape to the south. The A6006 is a distinct dividing feature between the settled southern area and primarily unsettled landscape to the north. It is a relatively tranquil landscape, in contrast to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LCZ 1: Asfordby North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>A mostly open visual character by virtue of the sloping landform, low hedgerows and medium scale simple landscape pattern. This results in a relatively high degree of intervisibility, which would be susceptible to change / sensitive to residential development in visual terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is <strong>medium to high</strong> due to the rolling topography, open character of the slopes that encompasses the settlement and general lack of settlement influence in this area. There is some variation in sensitivity, whereby the smaller scale, more intricate field pattern to the west of Saxelbye Road is more susceptible to development impacts. Field hedgerows to the north are generally intact and have a strong visual influence, in combination with the topography in containing the settlement edge. The A6006 and strong vegetation buffer along it forms a robust edge to the settlement and contributes to the containment of built form. The rolling topography is instrumental in containing the perceived influence of Asfordby from within the wider landscape. The undeveloped northerly skylines are sensitive to large scale residential development for these reasons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.59 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- Due to the strong settlement boundary created by the bypass (A6006) along the northern edge and limited settlement in the landscape beyond this, there is limited potential to accommodate further residential development in this LCZ, without fundamentally altering the relationship of the northern settlement edge to the surrounding landscape;

- Any development beyond the bypass to the north would have no visual or physical relationship to the existing settlement edge due to the separation created by the road and its cutting;

- Any development in this LCZ would need to be well integrated with the existing edge and not extend beyond the defining feature of the bypass, and should relate to the existing settlement form on this edge.
### LCZ 2: Asfordby West

**Looking west towards the recreational facilities, from a footpath on the western edge of Asfordby.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>A partly exposed 1970s settlement edge, adjoined by various settlement edge land uses such as a cemetery and allotments. These and the pylon line ensure that the perception of settlement extends beyond the settlement boundary up to the road which intersects the LCZ in the east. The settlement edge and associated land uses, therefore, have mitigation and enhancement potential and a relatively low susceptibility/sensitivity to residential development in the easternmost part of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating valley side topography associated with the Wreake Valley to the south, albeit with landform variation being less pronounced than for LCZ 1. Land rises to the north, to an open and undeveloped skyline with the backdrop formed by a ribbon of woodland. Whilst landform variation within the LCZ is not of itself sensitive, the undeveloped horizon is judged to be sensitive to residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A simple landscape pattern is created by a medium to large scale network of parliamentary enclosure fields set within hedgerows, and predominantly under arable cultivation. Localised variation is introduced to the south, with fishing ponds partly encompassed by tree planting. These form part of the wider former gravel extraction area to the south in LCZ 3, which create a more complex mosaic landscape pattern, the integrity of which would be far more susceptible and sensitive to change arising from residential development than would the simple arable field pattern elsewhere in the LCZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>This is a simple rural landscape that is partly influenced by the edge of settlement features and land uses on its eastern edge. The western part of the LCZ is more rural and tranquil; contained by riparian vegetation belt. There are glimpses of settlement features such as church spires and pylons in wider views. This is a relatively simple landscape of relatively muted colour palette that has some susceptibility to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Views are often contained by mature hedgerows with hedgerow trees and planting associated with the fisheries. Views open up to the south of Hoby Road, across the floodplain. The low-lying landform allows views of the settlement edge from the western part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 2: Asfordby West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of this area. More open views of the rural landscape are susceptible to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</strong></td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity to residential development is medium to low, in light of the exposed settlement edge which affords a degree of enhancement potential, the eroded simple landscape pattern and the ‘edge’ influenced landscape character. Vegetated field boundaries have an influence on this LCZ, and provide separation between different landscape patterns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development**

4.60 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- This LCZ has potential to accommodate some sensitively designed development in relative proximity to the existing settlement edge and considering existing vegetation boundaries;
- Any development should achieve a gradation of density to the outer edges, linked with new greenspace provision to connect with existing recreational spaces and the floodplain landscape to the south, and should have a soft, defensible edge to the surrounding landscape;
- Existing landscape features provide a sense of containment to this settlement edge and reduce the perception of built form in the wider LCZ. These features should be retained as part of any development proposals and enhanced as part of an appropriate green infrastructure strategy to create a well-integrated edge that links with the existing green spaces and community facilities.

**LCZ 3 Asfordby South**

*Looking southeast across ridge and furrow fields to the southeast edge of Asfordby*
### LCZ 3: Asfordby South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>The settlement predominantly backs onto the LCZ, and is mainly integrated with the wider landscape by relatively dense wet woodland associated with the Wreake Valley immediately south, which carves a meandering course through the LCZ, flanked by areas of now wetted up mineral extraction. The existing settlement edge is well defined, offers low mitigation potential, and is susceptible to change resulting from potential residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>Topography is that of a broad, essentially flat river valley floor. Wooded skylines are created by the interlaced layers of riparian vegetation including wet woodland, tree belts and hedgerows, effectively masking the perception of development in many instances (residential development to the north and the sewage works to the south, which are surrounded by dense woodland). These characteristics would be susceptible to change resulting from residential development for this reason. A pylon line crosses the area to the west, locally reducing sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>A varied and richly textured landscape mosaic is created by pasture, flood meadows, wet woodlands, riparian vegetation associated with the meandering course of the River Wreake, the partly wooded lakes which are the legacy of former mineral workings, and areas of plantation woodland. In some areas aspects of the historic landscape pattern persist, such as small scale field patterns around Kirby Bellars north of the railway line and earthworks associated with the former Priory at Kirby Bellars. All of these features combine to create a relatively complex landscape pattern which would be susceptible to change by virtue of the potential for impact upon its legibility and integrity, although areas of simpler, open and larger scale pastoral land to the southwest, would be less sensitive for these reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>A relatively tranquil valley landscape which has some evidence of being enjoyed for recreation (footpath network and footbridges crossing the meanders and loops of the river). The areas of woodland and expanses of open water are instrumental in creating this sense of tranquillity, which would be susceptible to change. Areas where more of an ‘edge’ influence persists (pylon line, railway, sewage works) would be less susceptible for the same reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views, visual character and intervisibility</strong></td>
<td>A filtered visual character is created by the wet woodlands, plantations and mature tree belts. The often contained visual character reduces susceptibility and sensitivity in visual terms. However, areas of pastoral fields with a more open visual character and slightly greater degree of intervisibility with other parts of the LCZ would be more susceptible / sensitive in visual terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</strong></td>
<td>The landscape of this LCZ has an overall medium to high sensitivity to residential development due to the characteristics of the floodplain landscape and historic landscape patterns. There are less sensitive spaces within this LCZ, north of the river and in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LCZ 3: Asfordby South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proximity to the existing settlement edge. The reclaimed gravel pit lakes have well vegetated edges and combine with vegetation along the river to create intimate spaces on the flat valley floor. There has been erosion of historic field patterns and the settlement edge is exposed in part. It is a locally value recreational and ecological landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development**

4.61 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- There is opportunity to accommodate some sensitively designed development in proximity to the existing settlement edge on the southwest of Asfordby, and considering landscape boundaries such as the river and associated vegetation, which would contribute to the softening of the settlement edge;

- Any development should achieve a gradation of density to the outer edges, with links through to existing recreational spaces and the floodplain landscape to the south, and should have a soft, defensible edge to the surrounding landscape;

- The wetland landscape should be conserved and well linked to the settlement, due to its recreational value and opportunity to be part of a local green infrastructure network.

**Local Green Space Assessment**

4.62 A total of eight existing and proposed Protected Open Areas (POA) have been considered within the settlement of Asfordby (see Annexe 1 for full analysis).
4.63 The strength of appropriateness for the POA being protected as Local Green Spaces, in line with the NPPF, is determined through consideration of the spaces against the assessment criteria (refer to Table 3.5).

4.64 There are no spaces within Asfordby that are considered to meet the criteria for being protected as a Local Green Space.

4.65 There are clearly spaces of value within the settlement. However, they may require enhancement or improved management in order to be suitable for protection, or they would be retained through virtue of their function or under a general design or conservation policy.

4.66 For example, the churchyard is an important community space that contributes to the heritage setting of the church. However, it is not multi-functional, it requires improved management for ecological benefits and requires reinforcement of the existing access. The churchyard does not need to be designated as a Local Green Space in order to be protected, by virtue of its purpose and contribution to the heritage setting.

4.67 Other spaces within the settlement would likely be retained through design and character policy.
Asfordby Hill

Assessment of Areas of Separation

Asfordby Hill – Asfordby Valley

4.68 This area was identified in the 2006 Areas of Separation report.

4.69 This area considers the medium scale landscape and gently undulating land between the western edge of Asfordby Hill and the small settlement of Asfordby Valley to the west.

Looking west along Melton Road towards the eastern edge of Asfordby Valley, from the western edge of Asfordby Hill
District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This AOS is split between two landscape character areas:  
  - Area 12: Wreake Valley  
  - Area 19: Asfordby Quarry | This AOS is split between two LCUs:  
  - LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley  
  - LCU 14: The Leicestershire Wolds: Asfordby Quarry |

Area 12: Wreake Valley
Described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and small-nucleated villages situated along the rising slopes of the valley edge’.

**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**
- River Wreake
- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray
- String of villages on edge of the valley
- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat

The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS.

Area 19: Asfordby Quarry
Described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A disturbed, excavated, large scale, former colliery landscape

**LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:**

**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**
- Flat bottomed, east-west oriented river valley with gently sloping sides;
- Green wedge running into Melton Mowbray;
- String of villages on edge of the valley;
- Valley floor worked for sand and gravel and restored to wetland habitat;
- Mixed arable and pasture;
- Little woodland;
- Localised areas with strong rural character;
- Widespread features of historical and ecological (particularly wetland) interest.

In addition, the following sensitive landscape features are identified:
- The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake;
- Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);
- Historic buildings/structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;
- Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;
- River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSSIs);
- Areas of ridge and furrow.

The valley edge settlements and green wedge character are represented within this AOS.
### 2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)

**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**
- Industrial landscape – former colliery
- Large scale
- Disturbed
- Continued industrial use

The northern edge of the AOS is influenced by the remnant landscape.

### 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)

**LCU 14: The Leicestershire Wolds; Asfordby Quarry:**

**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**
- Industrial landscape – former colliery;
- Large scale;
- Disturbed;
- Continued industrial use.

In addition the following landscape sensitivities are identified:
- Areas of more strongly rolling topography towards the centre and within the east of the area;
- Areas of woodland where there is a greater sense of enclosure;
- Landmark churches in adjacent areas.

The disturbed and industrial landscape character is represented in this AOS.
The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in **paragraph 3.9**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating topography which forms part of the south facing slopes of the Wreake Valley. The Asfordby bypass follows the crest of the valley and the settlement edge of Asfordby Hill is prominent on the eastern skyline. The settlement of Asfordby Valley forms the western horizon, with more open views across the lower lying, predominantly arable valley slopes towards the meandering course of the river and riparian vegetation, to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A simple and predominantly arable landscape pattern of medium scale, set within a network of enclosure field boundary hedgerows, interspersed with occasional farm woodland blocks to the south and field ponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/</td>
<td>A partly eroded quality is created by expanded arable fields, exposed settlement edges and the busy Asfordby Road. As such, much of the area is already affected by settlement edge influences which affect to some degree its ability to form a perceptible gap between areas of settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>Partially open views are available across the area from the Asfordby bypass, although local landform undulation and field boundary hedgerows create a degree of visual filtering, as does (at greater distance and just beyond the area) the tree-lined course of the River Wreake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations and justification:**

These two settlements are characterised by their past, as villages for the miners of the extraction site to the north. They are relatively isolated pockets of terraced housing that have incrementally extended out along Melton Road. The character and landscape setting of the hamlets is eroded and there is little community focus within them. There is potential for these hamlets to have well-designed development with sensitive landscape edges to perceptibly enhance the sense of separation and setting. Development should not extend too far south into the more intact and historic landscape beyond.

**Recommendation: Not required**

The area identified within the ADAS (2006) report is considered to have limited sensitivity to development. The settlements have similar characteristics to each other and are perceptibly seen as one settlement. It is not necessary to designate this area.
Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis

Landscape classification for the settlement fringe

4.72 Based on GIS analysis and field survey, the following local landscape classification has been defined as a basis for the settlement fringe landscape sensitivity analysis for Asfordby Hill, having taken account of the work in 2006 and 2014 landscape studies.
## District Character Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context and summary descriptions from the LCA report</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context, plus key strategic landscape and visual sensitivities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Area 7: Village Pastures:** | **LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:**  
‘A distinctive traditional pastoral landscape and attractive nucleated villages with a strong pattern of small fields often with historic features, enclosed by abundant hedgerow trees’.

**Area 12: Wreake Valley:**  
‘A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and small-nucleated villages situated along the rising slopes of the valley edge’.

**Area 19: Asfordby Quarry:**  
‘A disturbed, excavated, large scale, former colliery landscape now in industrial use’.

**Area 20: Melton Farmland Fringe:**  
‘A mixed urban fringe ridge and valley and valley floor landscape, mostly pastoral farmland, MOD and recreational land’.

**LCU 10: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:**  
- The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake;
- Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);
- Historic buildings/structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;
- Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;
- River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSIs);
- Areas of ridge and furrow.

**LCU 14: The Leicestershire Wolds: Asfordby Quarry:**  
- Areas of more strongly rolling topography towards the centre and within the east of the area;
- Areas of woodland where there is a greater sense of enclosure;
- Landmark churches in adjacent areas.

**LCU 15: The Leicestershire Wolds: Melton Farmland Fringe:**  
- Areas of more rolling and sloping land towards the Wreake Valley in the north and Scalford Brook to the north;
- Areas of woodland, copses and spinneys which are features of the rural landscape;
- Views from residential areas of Melton.
Landscape sensitivity analysis

4.73 The landscape sensitivity analysis for the LCZs within the settlement fringe is presented below.

**LCZ 1 Asfordby Hill North**

Looking west across the industrial works to the north of Asfordby Hill, from Welby Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>The LCZ is formed by the redundant and active workings of Asfordby Quarry. As such, although it lies directly north of the northern settlement edge, it is rather detached and screened, from the existing settlement edge by both natural and man-made landform and scrub vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>Topography is varied across the LCZ, with local alterations from previous land workings. Welby Road forms the ridge along the eastern edge of the LCZ, extending north from the settlement. Contours are undulating, and slope down towards the northern edge of Asfordby Valley. The scrub woodland backdrop to the quarries creates an essentially wooded skyline which masks perception of development and have some susceptibility / sensitivity to development for this reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>Much of this LCZ has a disturbed pattern resulting from the quarrying, existing industrial use and partial restoration and natural regeneration. The LCZ includes wetland and pond areas associated with former extraction, plus partly disused mineral railway sidings linked to the mainline to the south and plantation woodland. A relatively intimate, contained landscape scale is created by the fringing woodland belts and the mosaic of scrub and grassland vegetation fringing the quarry workings. This contrasts with the restored landforms and restored farmlands to the west, which are of a far simpler, more open character, which would be less susceptible to development for these reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience</strong></td>
<td>An interrupted, fragmented quality is apparent due to partially active, partially derelict and partly restored quarry use. Signs of industrial activity are evident, creating a landscape defined by a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 1: Asfordby Hill North / Holwell Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and tranquillity</td>
<td>sense of intrusion, which reduces its susceptibility to change in experiential / perceptual terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>The lower lying parts of the LCZ have few opportunities for views, by virtue of the varied landform and the density of the vegetation. In more elevated and open restored areas, views are more extensive, albeit still of a framed character. The more enclosed lower lying lands have the lowest susceptibility / sensitivity in visual terms, for these reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this area to residential development is judged to be medium to low. The sense of detachment from the residential area increases landscape sensitivity, whilst the interrupted pattern and partly enclosed visual character reduces sensitivity. With this overall judgement it is recognised that aspects such as the mosaic landscape pattern and more exposed northern parts are comparatively important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.74 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- Any development should be situated within the lowest lying and most visually contained areas, and within the existing landscape framework, to visually mitigate and assimilate development, and reduce the perception of ‘settlement sprawl’;
- Development in this LCZ would be in part limited by landform, and should be established in proximity to the existing settlement edge, in order to link with the existing community;
- New development should contribute towards a local green infrastructure network by incorporating existing landscape features including the new woodland that is forming on the former industrial site;
- Enhance links to existing wetland areas and wet woodland/habitat mosaic as integral parts of a local green infrastructure network in relation to any potential development and new and existing green spaces.
## LCZ 2: Asfordby Hill South

![Looking south across the Wreake Valley from the western edge of Asfordby Hill, towards the historic edge of Kirby Bellars](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>The existing (significantly expanded and largely modern) settlement edge occupies a relatively prominent position on the crest of the Wreake River Valley. Although garden boundary vegetation buffers the built form, the edge is not well integrated and stands out from the gently sloping landform to the south. The existing settlement edge is exposed in part with little mitigation for the built edge. The landscape would be sensitive to the perception of additional development further down the valley side (other than potentially within indents of the settlement boundary) without appropriate landscape mitigation to better integrate the edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>The LCZ is defined by a gently undulating valley topography. The level of landform variation would be vulnerable and, therefore, sensitive to residential development footprints. Topographic variation also renders the ridgetop settlement edge prominent, meaning that the skyline would be sensitive to further development which could increase this perception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>A simple, planned enclosure field pattern defined by hedgerows bounding mixed arable and pasture fields. Landscape pattern becomes more intricate in proximity to the meandering, tree-lined course of the River Wreake and associated riparian vegetation to the south. Immediately west of the LCZ a far more intact small scale landscape pattern persists, often linked to the scheduled archaeology around the village of Kirby Bellars (Kirby Park). These features, their settings and the small scale riparian landscape associated with the course of the River Wreake would be the most susceptible elements to change. The railway line defines the southern boundary of the LCZ and the valley extents at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>A mostly rural riverine valley landscape. However, landscape experience is partly impaired by the simple and partly eroded arable landscape pattern and by the perception of settlement edge influences to the valley crests to the north. These reduce the susceptibility of the landscape to change in experiential terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LCZ 2: Asfordby Hill South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Relatively few parts of the LCZ are directly accessible other than by a fairly sparse network of PRoW. As such, main views across the largely open valley sides are likely to be from existing residential properties to the southern edge of the settlement. A more visually contained character persists to the more enclosed and small scale riparian landscape in the valley floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ in relation to the settlement edge, to residential development is judged to be medium. This is by virtue of the riverine landscape, which would be sensitive, offset by the simpler and more eroded valley side landscape pattern and the perception of settlement edge influences to the valley crests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.75 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- Due to the relative visual prominence and elevation of the settlement edge, development on the southern edge of the settlement should be of an appropriate scale and form, and sensitively designed in order to maintain the perception of openness of the valley landscape;
- There is opportunity to improve the existing settlement edge and better integrate it into the landscape, which should form part of any proposals;
- The indented form of the settlement edge and associated adjacent landscape structure, create the potential for discreet, pockets of two storey development, with reinforcement and enhancement of the existing settlement edge vegetation to secure greater connectivity between built areas and a stronger relationship with the encompassing landscape;
- The surrounding landscape is well-treed, with vegetated settlement edges. With this in mind, proposals as part of any development brought forward in this LCZ should incorporate a robust landscape strategy that improves the relationship of this settlement edge with the valley landscape.
## LCZ 3: Asfordby Hill Northeast

Looking west across the valley towards the western edge of Melton Mowbray, from Welby Road north of Asfordby Hill

### Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCZ 3: Asfordby Hill Northeast</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>A partly treed settlement edge with development backing on to the LCZ. The western residential edge of Melton Mowbray occupies a prominent ridgetop location to the east of this area (partly extending into the valley with MOD development at the Remount Depot site), overlooking the valley which defines much of the LCZ, and is at most partially integrated by garden boundary vegetation. The valley top location of the settlement of Asfordby Hill means that little development could be accommodated on this edge. The open foreground created by the valley topography is important in defining settlement separation and the gap between Melton Mowbray and Asfordby Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A distinct valley topography with prominent developed skylines to the east, although the western skyline at Asfordby Hill is formed by a combination of wooded settlement edge and scrub woodland to Asfordby Quarry to the more elevated slopes to the north. The largely open lower valley slopes and valley floor are important in defining a setting to the settlements, and as such would be sensitive to further development breaching the ridgeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>A medium scale landscape of predominantly grazed fields and paddocks set within the partly eroded remnants of a co-axial field boundary network, with rectilinear parliamentary enclosures set within, with a partly wooded ridge associated with Asfordby Quarry to the west. The landscape of the LCZ has a relatively simple pattern, which has partly been eroded by MOD development (Remount Depot site) which extends into the valley, also ‘edge’ influences such as telegraph poles and wires. The above characteristics reduce the susceptibility and sensitivity of the LCZ to change arising from potential residential development, although remnant co-axial landscape structure would be sensitive. The northernmost parts of the LCZ fall within the MOD Estate and include a well-managed and dense hedgerow network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including</strong></td>
<td>A partially fragmented quality results from the simplicity of the landscape structure, apparent field boundary loss and the presence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LCZ 3: Asfordby Hill Northeast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>landscape experience and tranquility</td>
<td>of intrusions such as the MOD Depot. This sense of fragmentation is further exacerbated by the paddocks and associated field subdivisions (post and rail fencing) and telegraph poles/overhead wires. As such the landscape experience is interrupted, which reduces susceptibility and sensitivity to change arising from residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Relatively expansive views are available across the broad dry valley from the ridgetops to either side. Such views would be susceptible and sensitive to change arising from residential development. However, wider intervisibility to the north and south is more limited (by vegetation within the MOD Estate to the north, at the head of the valley, and to the south by planting within the Asfordby Road Golf Course).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Medium overall landscape sensitivity to residential development. This is due to the medium landscape scale and variable landscape intactness and condition. Within this overall judgement, it is however recognised that certain aspects would be far more sensitive and important. These include the role of the ridgetops to the valley slopes in largely containing Asfordby Hill and Melton, the visual sense of openness and the valley’s role in defining settlement setting and separation between Asfordby Hill and Melton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development**

4.76 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- Due to the existing prominent edge of Asfordby Hill in relation to the landscape of this LCZ, there is limited opportunity for development without fundamentally changing the valley character that contributes to the individual characteristics of adjacent settlements;
- The existing eastern settlement edge is well defined and integrated into the landscape to the west of the ridgeline. The built form on this edge is partly visible but not prominent in the landscape of the LCZ;
- It is important to consider this LCZ in combination with the Area of Separation assessment (paragraph 4.16) that identifies the importance of the separate identities of these settlements and the requirement for the AOS;
- Development on this settlement fringe is constrained by the valley landscape and existing form of the settlement. Any development coming forward in this area would need to have careful consideration of existing landform, landscape features and prominence in views, and should not extend across the lower, more prominent valley slopes;
- Efforts should be directed at conservation and enhancement of intrinsic features of the valley landscape and associated structure, to help reinforce further the sense of separation between Asfordby Hill and Melton Mowbray.
Local Green Space Assessment

4.77 A total of six existing and proposed Protected Open Areas (POA) have been considered within the settlement of Asfordby Hill (see Annexe 1 for full analysis).

4.78 The strength of appropriateness for the POA being protected as Local Green Spaces, in line with the NPPF, is determined through consideration of the spaces against the assessment criteria (refer to Table 3.5).

4.79 There are no spaces within Asfordby Hill that are considered to meet the criteria for being protected as a Local Green Space. There are clearly spaces of value within the settlement. However, they may require enhancement or improved management in order to be suitable for protection, or they would be retained through virtue of their function or under a general design or conservation policy.

4.80 For example, the sports ground (No.1) to the north is an important community asset that contributes to the heritage of the settlement. However, it is not multi-functional, is showing signs of its age and would benefit from improved access and management.

4.81 The recreation space (No.5) and wooded areas (No.6) are notable spaces but require improved access, purpose and management in order to meet the criteria for Local Green
Space designation.

4.82 The communal courtyard (No.4) has weak functionality and eroded character. It is not suitable for designation as a Local Green Space but could be conserved by virtue of its setting to the Victorian terraces, through policy.
**Bottesford**

**Assessment of Areas of Separation**

**Bottesford – Easthorpe**

4.83 This area was identified in the 2006 Areas of Separation report.

4.84 This area considers the small scale pastoral landscape between the compact nucleated hamlet of Easthorpe and the south eastern arc of the large village of Bottesford. At the centre of the area is Manor Farm, the minor parkland and densely planted ornamental grounds of which are a prominent feature.

Looking northwest along the public footpath across fields to the south of Bottesford, towards the church and southern edge of the settlement.
### District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Area 2: Bottesford:**  
This area is described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A nucleated townscape, prominent within the Vale, and nearby village with surrounding pastures, streamsides and transport routes’.  
**Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):**  
- Town prominent in vale  
- Dominated by church at centre  
- Stream running through  
- Closely associated pasture  

The above characteristics are to a large extent represented in the AOS. Bottesford is surrounded by adjacent character area 1: Vale of Belvoir, with which the AOS has intervisibility to the south. | **LCU 1: Vale of Belvoir:**  
**Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
- Predominantly flat low lying landform with very gentle undulations, enclosed by rolling hills such as Belvoir Ridge in Leicestershire to the south;  
- River Smite flows through the area; it is set lower than the surrounding land, and is only identifiable by riparian vegetation on its steep banks;  
- The disused Grantham Canal is a local feature; an ongoing restoration project it is a popular recreational feature;  
- A remote rural character across the whole area, with occasional views to scattered villages and individual farms although mostly a remote, tranquil and undeveloped character;  
- The majority of land use is arable farmland although closer to the village fringes smaller pasture fields become more apparent, usually used as horse paddocks. A more continuous tract of permanent pasture is found between Colston Bassett, Kinoulton and Hickling;  
- Large scale regular patterned fields are common to the west of the area, although medium sized fields are present in the east. Pasture fields closer to the villages are smaller, although elsewhere integrate with the pattern and scale of arable fields. There are more trees around the pastoral fields which give a slightly stronger sense of enclosure to that of the arable fields. Closer to the Grantham Canal as the land gently slopes the field pattern becomes more irregular;  
- Field boundaries are predominantly maturing hawthorn hedgerows, up to 1.5m in height, especially around Colston Bassett. Field ditches are present at some boundaries usually along roads;  
- In the south there are very few hedgerow trees, these become more frequent towards the north of the area in the transition between the vales and the South Nottinghamshire Farmlands;  
- Woodland is dispersed and includes occasional blocks, clumps and linear belts. The main woodland component is formed by frequent clumps along field margins and around farms;  
- Locally prominent woodland is found in parkland around Colston Bassett Hall;  
- Clumps of woodland associated with water courses, along the Grantham Canal and maturing hedgerows are prominent linear wooded features. The medieval ploughing system of ridge and furrow |
### 2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)

- Small scattered villages throughout the area include the linear settlements of Kinoulton and Hickling and the smaller nucleated settlements of Colston Bassett and Owthorpe;
- Larger settlements of Langar and Cropwell Bishop are situated on the fringes of the DPZ;
- Distinctive vernacular settlements such as Hickling. Urban form is generally uniform and has mainly red brick properties with some larger individual rendered properties;
- Settlements are dispersed and tend to have rooflines visible within wooded edges. Villages often contain one main street or a couple with a small junction including a small grassed area and trees;
- A linear dispersion of farms and larger farm buildings mostly situated close to roads;
- Churches at Langar and Granby are prominent skyline features on high ground. Hickling church tower is prominent above a dispersed village edge;
- Extensive views beyond the vale towards the Belvoir Ridgeline in Leicestershire with Belvoir Castle prominent on the wooded ridgeline;
- Winding narrow lanes thread across the area linking the scattered villages. They have medium to wide grass verges with frequent ditches, some have very steep sides;
- Overhead lines are visible over the area due to the low-lying landform;
- Langar airfield, with its industrial buildings and runways has a localised urbanising effect on the rural mostly undeveloped appearance of the landscape.

### 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)

- is evident close to the village of Kinoulton and along the low escarpment at Hickling and is locally distinctive;
- The predominantly small, human scale of the features across the vale, in particular small historic villages with distinctive church spires, and hamlets with wooded edges;
- The tranquil and strongly rural nature of the area;
- Attractive views along the winding narrow lanes and towards the small villages and church spires set within fringes of trees and small pastoral fields;
- Pastoral areas which are strongly enclosed by trees, particularly areas associated with villages;
- Views towards Belvoir Castle and the Belvoir scarp where the Castle forms an important landmark feature (including the good views from Beacon Hill);

In addition the following landscape sensitivities are identified in relation to this LCU:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • The rural patchwork character of views from Belvoir Castle across the vale;  
• The character of Conservation Areas within the vale, including views identified in the Conservation Area appraisals as well as views identified as being important in this context (for example views from Standard Hill to the west of Hickling and the Church of St Luke). |  
Whilst many of the above characteristics and sensitivities are not applicable to the AOS, relating to the expansive wider landscape of the vale, a number are applicable. These are areas of ridge and furrow field systems, distinctive vernacular settlements (e.g. Botterford), church spires and views to Belvoir Castle and scarp.
The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A relatively flat floodplain topography associated with a broad tributary river valley. A wooded / treed skyline character persists to much of the defined settlement boundary, creating a logical and defensible settlement boundary. This has partly been breached to the southwest corner with in-progress construction of a residential development immediately south of the playing fields and bowling greens off Belvoir Road. To the south, skylines are much more open and expansive, with the prominent and undeveloped, largely open north facing ridge on which Belvoir Castle is located, forming the distant horizon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>The area is mostly defined by intact small scale fieldscapes (original settlement edge ‘closes’) and crossed by a network of PRoW. An area of well-defined ridge and furrow is also apparent within the pastures near to the south eastern boundary of Bottesford, as well as medieval village earthworks near Manor Farm. This appears to relate to the historic core of the settlement (which retains a good degree of its original form) at this point. The grade I listed 13th-15th century Church of St Mary and its prominent crocketed 19th century limestone spire form a key landmark and essential part of the cultural pattern here. The eastern part of the area is defined by Manor Farm (a red brick Georgian gentleman farmer’s house) and its grounds/minor parkland and by pastoral fields which form the setting to the compact historic hamlet of Easthorpe, defined mostly by small scale vernacular buildings in a leafy setting. To the south of the area, towards the A52, is a larger scale arable field pattern, which has a strong visual relationship with the land in the existing identified (in the ADAS report) AOS boundary. The A52 and associated vegetation effectively forms a dividing barrier feature at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/ recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>The area forms a perceptible gap between the settlements of Bottesford and Easthorpe and makes a significant contribution to the rural character and setting of both settlements. This is reinforced by the largely unaltered quality of Easthorpe and the fact that the south eastern quadrant of Bottesford has experienced a relatively low degree of recent expansion in comparison to other parts of the village. The small scale intact field pattern and the presence of areas of medieval ridge and furrow field systems further add to the sense of rurality and are sensitive to change. The area is crossed by a well-used network of PRoW, indicating its recreational value to the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Views are filtered in character in the northern and eastern parts of the area, due to the presence of mature trees and largely intact small scale historic rectilinear field patterns. To the south, a more open and expansive visual character persists, due to the larger scale of the landscape pattern. This creates intervisibility with the prominent north-facing ridge in the mid-distance, upon which Belvoir Castle is sited. The spire of St Mary’s Church forms a prominent landmark in almost all views back to Bottesford from within the Area of Separation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations and justification:

Retain, conserve and protect, due to its historic landscape character and historic landscape features, small scale and sense of intactness as well as the perceptible separation it creates between Bottesford and Easthorpe. It prevents Easthorpe being absorbed within Bottesford and as such is important in maintaining individuality of settlement character and setting. These settlements have very different characters of a historic hamlet (Easthorpe) and expanded settlement (Bottesford) with historic core.

The protected area should be extended to the south as far as the A52, since this visually reads as part of the same landscape. Expanding the area in this way would also limit further settlement expansion to the south eastern quadrant of Bottesford. It is noted in this connection that a site on the eastern side of Belvoir Road is currently being built out for housing. Any development which extended further into the area could have a negative impact on the sense of separation and the legibility of important, small scale historic landscape features within. It is important to conserve the strong visual relationship between this historic landscape and the church to the north and Belvoir Castle in the distance to the south. There are important historic features including fields, boundaries and built form that are highly sensitive to encroaching development footprints and these should be conserved through appropriate landscape proposals.

**Recommendation:** Extend

### 4.86

The area identified within the ADAS (2006) report is considered to be sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements. In order to ensure that this historic landscape setting is conserved the AOS should be extended south to the A52, to ensure that the individual characteristics of Bottesford and Easthorpe are retained. Figure N0318 PL04-2 demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Bottesford – Normanton

4.87 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

4.88 This area considers the medium scale arable landscape between the compact linear hamlet of Normanton and the north edge of the large village of Bottesford. The northern edge of Bottesford is clearly defined by the railway line and associated vegetation and landform.

Looking northwest along the public footpath across fields to the south of Bottesford, towards the church and southern edge of the settlement
District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1: Vale of Belvoir (AOS is also directly adjacent to area 2: Bottesford to the south): Described in the 2006 LCA as ‘An expansive gentle vale landscape with a strong pattern of medium scale rectangular shaped pastoral and arable fields with managed hedgerows and the Grantham canal, punctuated by nucleated villages with prominent church spires’.</td>
<td>LCU 1: Vale of Belvoir:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key characteristics (from the 2006 LCA):</td>
<td>Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expansive vale</td>
<td>- Predominantly flat low lying landform with very gentle undulations, enclosed by rolling hills such as Belvoir Ridge in Leicestershire to the south;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- String of nucleated villages</td>
<td>- River Smite flows through the area; it is set lower than the surrounding land, and is only identifiable by riparian vegetation on its steep banks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong rectangular field pattern of mixed farming bounded by hedges</td>
<td>- The disused Grantham Canal is a local feature; an ongoing restoration project it is a popular recreational feature;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local stone in houses and churches</td>
<td>- A remote rural character across the whole area, with occasional views to scattered villages and individual farms although mostly a remote, tranquil and undeveloped character;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above characteristics are represented in the AOS, although the rising land, foothills and scarp of Beacon Hill to the east of the AOS present an anomaly.</td>
<td>The majority of land use is arable farmland although closer to the village fringes smaller pasture fields become more apparent, usually used as horse paddocks. A more continuous tract of permanent pasture is found between Colston Bassett, Kinoulton and Hickling;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Large scale regular patterned fields are common to the west of the area, although medium sized fields are present in the east. Pasture fields closer to the villages are smaller, although elsewhere integrate with the pattern and scale of arable fields. There are more trees around the pastoral fields which give a slightly stronger sense of enclosure to that of the arable fields. Closer to the Grantham Canal as the land gently slopes the field pattern becomes more irregular;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Field boundaries are predominantly maturing hawthorn hedgerows, up to 1.5m in height, especially around Colston Bassett. Field ditches are present at some boundaries usually along roads;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the south there are very few hedgerow trees, these become more frequent towards the north of the area in the transition between the vales and the South Nottinghamshire Farmlands;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Woodland is dispersed and includes occasional blocks, clumps and linear belts. The main woodland component is formed by frequent clumps along field margins and around farms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Locally prominent woodland is found in parkland around Colston Bassett Hall;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clumps of woodland associated with water courses, along the Grantham Canal and maturing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)

- Hedgerows are prominent linear wooded features. The medieval ploughing system of ridge and furrow is evident close to the village of Kinoulton and along the low escarpment at Hickling and is locally distinctive;
- Small scattered villages throughout the area include the linear settlements of Kinoulton, and Hickling and the smaller nucleated settlements of Colston Bassett and Owthorpe;
- Larger settlements of Langar and Cropwell Bishop are situated on the fringes of the DPZ;
- Distinctive vernacular settlements such as Hickling. Urban form is generally uniform and has mainly red brick properties with some larger individual rendered properties;
- Settlements are dispersed and tend to have rooflines visible within wooded edges. Villages often contain one main street or a couple with a small junction including a small grassed area and trees;
- A linear dispersion of farms and larger farm buildings mostly situated close to roads;
- Churches at Langar and Granby are prominent skyline features on high ground. Hickling church tower is prominent above a dispersed village edge;
- Extensive views beyond the vale towards the Belvoir Ridgeline in Leicestershire with Belvoir Castle prominent on the wooded ridgeline;
- Winding narrow lanes thread across the area linking the scattered villages. They have medium to wide grass verges with frequent ditches, some have very steep sides;
- Overhead lines are visible over the area due to the low-lying landform;
- Langar airfield, with its industrial buildings and runways has a localised urbanising effect on the rural mostly undeveloped appearance of the landscape.

In addition the following landscape sensitivities are identified in relation to this LCU:

- The predominantly small, human scale of the features across the vale, in particular small historic villages with distinctive church spires, and hamlets with wooded edges;
- The tranquil and strongly rural nature of the area;
- Attractive views along the winding narrow lanes and towards the small villages and church spires set within fringes of trees and small pastoral fields;
- Pastoral areas which are strongly enclosed by trees, particularly areas associated with villages;
- Views towards Belvoir Castle and the Belvoir scarp where the Castle forms an important landmark.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feature (including the good views from Beacon Hill);</td>
<td>The rural patchwork character of views from Belvoir Castle across the vale;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rural patchwork character of views from Belvoir Castle across the vale;</td>
<td>The character of Conservation Areas within the vale, including views identified in the Conservation Area appraisals as well as views identified as being important in this context (for example views from Standard Hill to the west of Hickling and the Church of St Luke).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of the above characteristics and sensitivities are represented in the AOS, notably the tranquil rural character. Expansive views over the vale from Beacon Hill and foothills are also apparent.
4.89 The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>Topography to the north of Bottesford is that of a prominent ridge/scarp (Beacon Hill) and associated foothills grading into gently undulating land to the south and west of Normanton. Bottesford sits at the foot of the south facing slope of the scarp. Beacon Hill is an expansive area of grassland and hillside under mainly arable cultivation, presenting a prominent and undeveloped skyline which visually and physically separates the two settlements. On the lower lying land to the west of Beacon Hill skylines are defined by an interlaced network of field boundary hedgerows and the heavily vegetated corridor of the disused railway line to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A simple arable enclosure field pattern of rectilinear form and medium scale. Localised variations are introduced by the vegetated route of the disused railway line and the sinuous, tree lined course of a tributary stream to the west. As such the landscape is characterised by layers of vegetation in its lower lying areas, with a simpler pattern on the rising land of Beacon Hill scarp and foothills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>A tranquil rural character is imparted by the scarp (almost ‘downland’ quality, albeit overlaid with arable cultivation). The historic core of Bottesford and the prominent limestone church of St Mary and associated spire, nestled in the lower lying land and surrounded by farmland, are prominent features from the scarp top. The landscape is otherwise lightly settled and the patchwork of arable fields and boundary hedgerows further accentuates this quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Visual character and introversibility varies across the area. Expansive views and wide intervisibility are available from the scarp top at Beacon Hill, with views elsewhere more filtered by virtue of lower lying landform and field boundary vegetation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation and justification:

Beacon Hill itself and the associated escarpment is of such elevation and visual prominence, and is sufficiently removed from the settlement pattern, that it would not be recommended as a potential development location. There is, however, merit in designating the lower lying land around Normanton as an Area of Separation, in order to retain the compact settlement form and maintain the perception of a settlement gap between Normanton and Bottesford. It is not considered that the Area of Separation would need to extend as far south as the railway line, since this forms a natural and defensible check to development at Bottesford North in any case.

Recommendation: Amend
4.90 The area identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation did not have a defined location. It is considered that some of this area is sensitive to development and important for maintaining the individual character of the two settlements. The figure below (full reference at figure N0318 PL04-2) demonstrates the area to be considered in making planning decisions.
Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis

Landscape classification for the settlement fringe

4.91 Based on GIS analysis and field survey, the following local landscape classification has been defined as a basis for the settlement fringe landscape sensitivity analysis for Bottesford, having taken account of the work in 2006 and 2014 landscape studies.
## District Character Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</strong></th>
<th><strong>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Area 1: Vale of Belvoir:**  
‘An expansive gentle vale landscape with a strong pattern of medium scale rectangular shaped pastoral and arable fields with managed hedgerows and the Grantham canal, punctuated by nucleated villages with prominent church spires’.  
Area 2: Bottesford:  
‘A nucleated townscape, prominent within the Vale, and nearby village with surrounding pastures, streamsides and transport routes’. | **LCU 1: Vale of Belvoir:**  
- The predominantly small, human scale of the features across the vale, in particular small historic villages with distinctive church spires, and hamlets with wooded edges;  
- The tranquil and strongly rural nature of the area;  
- Attractive views along the winding narrow lanes and towards the small villages and church spires set within fringes of trees and small pastoral fields;  
- Pastoral areas which are strongly enclosed by trees, particularly areas associated with villages;  
- Views towards Belvoir Castle and the Belvoir scarp where the Castle forms an important landmark feature (including the good views from Beacon Hill);  
- The rural patchwork character of views from Belvoir Castle across the vale;  
- The character of Conservation Areas within the vale, including views identified in the Conservation Area appraisals as well as views identified as being important in this context (for example views from Standard Hill to the west of Hickling and the Church of St Luke). |
Landscape sensitivity analysis

4.92 The landscape sensitivity analysis for the LCZs within the settlement fringe is presented below.

**LCZ 1 Bottesford Central**

Looking east towards the western settlement edge, from the dismantled railway footpath

| **Criterion** | **Sensitivity to residential development:**  
**Commentary** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>The LCZ is in two parts – divided by the main settlement area of Bottesford. It is partly indented into the south-western settlement edge (late 20th century cul-de-sac development), with Belvoir High School, community centre and associated grounds/playing fields effectively integrating much of the LCZ with the wider landscape. Aspects of the settlement edge have an exposed character. The LCZ also considers a small parcel of land between the northern settlement edge and the railway line. This is defined by a well vegetated, integrated late 20th century settlement edge, with wider visual integration created by the wooded corridor of the railway line. A small industrial estate with an exposed edge lies in the north-eastern part of the LCZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A flat to gently undulating valley floor topography. Settled skylines lie to the north, with horizons more open and undeveloped to the south and west, interlaced with hedgerows/tree lined A52 and with the prominent north facing ridge forming the southerly horizon beyond. The flat to gently undulating character also applies to the land parcel directly north of the settlement, to the south of the railway line, albeit with localised artificial variation introduced by the railway embankment and disused railway curves and line to the west. This LCZ is mostly defined by strongly wooded skylines to all sides, which effectively foil perception of development, save for the industrial development to the northeast which forms the immediate horizon in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural</strong></td>
<td>A small scale rectilinear agricultural (mostly pastoral) field pattern, and with a rural lane character to the southern part of Belvoir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LCZ 1: Bottesford Central area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>pattern</strong></td>
<td>Road, which forms a positive southern gateway to Bottesford. The southern boundary of the LCZ is formed by a tree-lined tributary brook and the western boundary is defined by a heavily vegetated disused railway line cutting. Some of the fields adjacent to the settlement edge contain medieval ridge and furrow field systems, which would be sensitive to residential development due to impact on their legibility. The northern parcel consists of an expanded agricultural field to its western half, with distinctive and sensitive ridge and furrow to the eastern part. All parts are mostly fringed by wooded settlement edge / railway embankment and densely vegetated disused railway lines and curves. A small area of scrub vegetation lies directly north of the industrial estate, adjacent to the railway line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquility | A tranquil rural character is imparted by the brook and the rural lane at Belvoir Road and by the pastoral land use, together with surviving aspects of the pre-enclosure agricultural pattern. However, local erosions are created by the A52 to the south, the presence of the school to the west and aspects of the settlement edge where a partly exposed quality persists. This level of intrusion is also reflected in the north, due to the railway line. |

| Views, visual character and intervisibility | Contained by field boundary hedgerows (and vegetated railway embankments in the north), but with longer ranging views to the elevated scarp and Belvoir Castle to the south. |

| Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment | Overall landscape sensitivity of this area to residential development is judged to be medium to high, in view of the small scale character and presence of important and relatively intact historic landscape elements such as ridge and furrow field systems. Aspects which locally reduce sensitivity include the contained visual character, perceptual intrusions and ‘edge’ influences such as the school, railway and the A52. Within this judgement, the larger scale western half of the northern land parcel immediately south of the railway line is less sensitive (medium sensitivity) by virtue of its enclosed, settlement influenced character. |

**Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development**

4.93 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- Development could be well contained within the southern parcel, by existing landscape features and in relation to the existing settlement boundary. However, this parcel contains historic features (ridge and furrow) that are sensitive to development footprints and should be taken into consideration in any proposals. Historic features should be conserved, enhanced and better interpreted as valuable parts of a local green infrastructure network that links new and existing spaces;

- The land to the north (particularly the larger western fields) could accommodate a quantum of well-integrated and sensitively designed development of no more than two
storeys, provided it respected, conserved and enhanced existing landscape structure. The adjacent ridge and furrow to the east would be more appropriately conserved as part of a local green infrastructure network to integrate new and existing green spaces;

- A portion of well-integrated and landscape sensitive development could be accommodated within this LCZ, through incorporation of existing important landscape pattern and features in design proposals;
- Any development should maintain the existing, well-defined settlement edge character and should have a strong relationship to the existing settlement through integration of a strong green infrastructure strategy that links new and existing green spaces.

**LCZ 2 Bottesford Northeast**

![Looking south across local fields to the east of Bottesford, from Grantham Road](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>The LCZ abuts the existing settlement edge on the extended eastern edge of Bottesford – with a modern (late 20th century) and partly exposed settlement edge to the west, which has enhancement and mitigation potential. As such the LCZ forms the eastern gateway to Bottesford. There is no distinct gateway and the village approach is defined by ‘edge’ influences such as visible modern development and paddocks within the pasture fields south of the railway line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating valley landform, interrupted to the north by the vegetated railway embankment which in large part defines the skyline at this point. To the south, views are available to the distant north facing ridge on which the Belvoir Castle estate is sited, albeit filtered by interlaced field boundary vegetation which imparts a moderately leafy, enclosed character to the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A small scale field pattern is associated with the line of the River Devon running east-west, to the south of the Grantham Road. The watercourse and associated riparian vegetation impart a riparian character, as do the adjacent fields of pastoral grazing. This relative intricacy of landscape scale and pattern would be sensitive to residential development, in character terms, although the more eroded ‘edge’ influenced land between the Grantham Road and the railway line would be less sensitive for those reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual</td>
<td>This LCZ has two perceptual aspects – a tranquil, riparian...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 2: Bottesford Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>character associated with the watercourse in the south and a more urban influenced character due to the Grantham Road, settlement edge and railway in the north. The more tranquil southern part would be more sensitive, due to the vulnerability of the landscape experience to the effects of residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>A contained visual character is created by the vegetated railway embankment, field boundary vegetation and the vegetated watercourse corridor. These aspects all reduce sensitivity to residential development in visual terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall this area is considered to have a medium sensitivity to residential development, by virtue of the small scale intact landscape pattern to the south, offset by the settlement edge influences to the north, as well as the contained visual character. It is recognised that within this judgement, the small scale riparian influenced land to the south would have a far higher landscape sensitivity in this context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.94 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- Any development would be better concentrated in landscape and visual terms within the parcel of land between Grantham Road and the railway line, as this would avoid the most sensitive landscape features and offers enhancement potential due to the scope to create a better integrated landscape edge to the settlement than currently exists;
- Land to the south of Grantham Road associated with the riparian corridor is more sensitive and would be best conserved and enhanced as part of a local green infrastructure network for Bottesford, linking into the existing public spaces to the east of the village;
- Land to the south of Grantham Road is also important in maintaining separation between Easthorpe and Bottesford in order to conserve the separate settlement characters and historic landscape features;
- Development should seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges along Grantham Road and towards the watercourse, linked with new green space provision. Lit development edges should be avoided to assist with conservation of dark night skies/avoidance of sky glow and perception of further urbanising influences.
### LCZ 3 Bottesford Southeast

Looking northwest towards the southeast extent of Bottesford, from a public footpath across fields to the south of Bottesford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>This LCZ forms the southern gateway to the historic hamlet of Easthorpe. Easthorpe is characterised by many vernacular buildings with traditional local red brick and tile, painted brick and render and thatch all evident. Due to the intact and only lightly altered character of the hamlet this forms a very positive settlement gateway which would be highly sensitive to further residential development. The situation is very similar to the north of Easthorpe and the green setting here provided by pastoral fields is important in defining the perceptual separation between Easthorpe and Bottesford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>A gently undulating valley floor topography with skylines defined by interlaced mature field boundary vegetation and, at distance, the south facing escarpment of Beacon Hill and the north facing ridge on which Belvoir Castle and estate are sited. Whilst existing historic development within Easthorpe forms the horizon at points, this has a dispersed, loose and open character, which would be sensitive to further development. The historic church spire at Bottesford forms a prominent skyline element in some views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>A generally small scale and historic landscape pattern around the settlement edges is defined by intimate, early field enclosures/‘closes’ associated with the historic settlement. Remnants of the medieval field systems in the form of prominent ridge and furrow earthworks, also survive and are clearly legible to the west of the hamlet. Other aspects of the landscape pattern relate to the minor parkland landscape of the Georgian residence at Manor Farm, as well as the medieval village earthworks near Manor Farm. Some larger scale fields towards the south of the LCZ adjacent to the A52 and separate from the settlement edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</strong></td>
<td>A tranquil and rural character is created by the predominantly small scale traditional vernacular settlement of Easthorpe, set within a framework of mature trees and also by the small scale fields of cattle grazed pasture. There is no sense of being within close proximity to the town of Bottesford. This sense of tranquillity and detachment would be highly sensitive to further residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views, visual character</strong></td>
<td>Views are largely kept short by mature trees and by interlaced field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 3: Bottesford Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and intervisibility</td>
<td>boundary vegetation, as well as the vernacular cottages and domestic gardens within Easthorpe itself. Whilst the sense of containment would ordinarily reduce visual sensitivity, the green space foreground and setting created by the patchwork of small scale pastoral fields are in this case intrinsic to Easthorpe’s character and, therefore highly sensitive to residential development in visual terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment

This LCZ has high overall landscape sensitivity to residential development by virtue of its role in forming the intrinsic setting to the historic hamlet of Easthorpe and separation between settlements of differing characters. Aspects such as the intimate/small scale and largely intact landscape pattern, and medieval ridge and furrow field systems would also be highly sensitive due to the historic legacy and their vulnerability to residential development, as well as their functional relationship to the settlement’s evolution.

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.95 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- Due to the intactness of features and the historic character of this LCZ, the landscape of this area is sensitive to development footprints. Any development that comes forward in this landscape should, therefore, have careful consideration of the landscape features and historic landscape legacy elements. These should be conserved, enhanced and where appropriate interpreted as part of a local green infrastructure network in line with the parallel Areas of Separation assessment for Bottesford and Easthorpe above (paragraph 4.83);

- It is noted that a new development is in progress on the southern extents of Bottesford, in the west of this LCZ. Development should be well integrated with the landscape pattern and a defensible edge created by appropriate treatment to tie in with adjacent landscape features. Prominent development edges should be avoided in order to retain the rural and tranquil character of this LCZ, which is an important local resource;

- Some development could be accommodated adjacent to the southern edge of the existing settlement and should have regard for the small scale landscape pattern and features of this space. As part of any development in this area, strong green links between the landscape to the south and central green spaces (churchyard, playing field etc.) should be encouraged in order to contribute to a robust green infrastructure network;

- Any development should conserve and enhance views/visual corridors to the church of St Mary and to Beacon Hill wherever possible, seeking opportunities to create new views to these features within any development;

- It is important that the small scale field network associated with the recreation and cricket ground, setting of historic buildings including Manor Farm and The Elms and providing
separation between the edge of Bottesford and Easthorpe, are retained as part of the strategic green infrastructure network;

- Seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision. Lit development edges should be avoided to assist with conservation of dark night skies/avoidance of sky glow and perception of further urbanising influences.

**LCZ 4 Bottesford West**

Looking south along the western settlement edge of Bottesford, from Orston Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCZ 4: Bottesford West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 4: Bottesford West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the vegetated cutting of the disused railway and the railway curves. Overall, there are few features which would be sensitive to residential development with respect to landscape pattern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mostly rural character, albeit with prominent intrusions due to the sheds of the industrial estate and the visible modern settlement edge, plus the pylon line, all of which reduce the sensitivity of the landscape to residential development in aesthetic and perceptual terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By virtue of the low hedgerows, generally sparse tree cover and the expanded field pattern, this LCZ is characterised by relatively expansive and open views, which would, therefore, be sensitive to residential development. There is intervisibility with the prominent church spire of St Mary’s to the north east and Beacon Hill beyond, both of which form important elements of such views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity to residential development is judged medium to low. This is due to the existing exposed settlement edge which affords a degree of enhancement potential, the eroded, simple landscape pattern and the partly eroded/‘edge’ influenced perceptual landscape character. It is recognised, however, that due to its open visual character and degree of intervisibility, the visual sensitivity of the LCZ is higher than its landscape character sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- The LCZ has the potential to accommodate a degree of sensitively designed residential development in proximity to the existing settlement edge and within an enhanced and restored existing field boundary network. This would assist in improving the existing settlement edge, its landscape and visual connectivity, and in creating a more attractive green gateway to the settlement than currently exists in this location;

- Any development should seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision, to create a porous, gently foiled (rather than blanket screened) landscape edge. This should also be tied in with reduced building storey height/long gables/low rooflines (maximum of two storeys to the edge) to reduce perception of built mass, and a simple, muted materials palette including timber, painted render and local brick. Green and brown/turf roofs may also be appropriate to the most prominent locations to help visually integrate townscape and landscape. Lit development edges should be avoided to assist with conservation of dark night skies/avoidance of sky glow and perception of further urbanising influences;

- Conserve and enhance views/visual corridors to the church of St Mary and to Beacon Hill wherever possible, seeking opportunities to create new views to these features within any development;
• Development proposals should contribute to a local green infrastructure network, which should connect to the existing spaces identified within the settlement.

**Protected Open Areas Assessment**

**4.97** A total of 28 existing and proposed Protected Open Areas (POA) has been considered within the settlement of Bottesford (see [Annexe 1](#) for full analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POA Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Garden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory Garden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck ponds</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyard and periphery</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket pitch and bowls club</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.98** The strength of appropriateness for the POA being protected as Local Green Spaces, in line with the NPPF, is determined through consideration of the spaces against the assessment criteria (refer to **Table 3.5**).

**4.99** Five of the 28 spaces in Bottesford strongly meet the established criteria:

- Jubilee Garden (No.1)
- Sensory Garden (No.2)
- Duck ponds (No.6)
- Churchyard and periphery (No.9)
- Cricket pitch and bowls club (No.16)
4.100 These spaces are in close proximity to the local community and form an essential part of the village, providing strong physical and visual connections through the settlement. The spaces provide a variety of functions including informal recreation, setting of built form, spaces for nature and heritage setting. They are predominantly intimate spaces providing different experiences for the community, from functional recreational space to reflective space. Each of the spaces has signs of positive use and they are clearly linked to the community.

4.101 The churchyard and periphery (No.9) provide the strongest representation of key characteristics defined at the local level, containing the dominant church and having strong intervisibility with the River Devon around the perimeter. The river enters the village from the southeast but becomes most evident as it flows round past the duck ponds and churchyard. The banks of the river could be better managed in order to make the river more apparent through spaces No.6 and No.7, as well as to enhance landscape and biodiversity connectivity.

4.102 The other 23 spaces show a combination of criteria 2 and 3. Some of these spaces are private gardens and are not accessible to the community. Other spaces have fewer social and quality of life functions, show signs of neglect or are a large tract of land that does not relate to the local community.

4.103 Overall it is important for spaces to link (visually and / or physically) as part of a green infrastructure network; for example those spaces in the north of the settlement that link through from the railway station to the church and potentially to the recreation ground.
Frisby on the Wreake

Assessment of Areas of Separation

Asfordby – Frisby on the Wreake

4.104 This Area of Separation is identified and considered in paragraphs 4.49 to 4.52 above.

4.105 The recommendation for this AOS is Not required.

4.106 The area was identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation. Although the area is sensitive in parts to development, it is considered that the sense of separation would be maintained by existing landscape features and constraints. It is not necessary to designate this area.

Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis

Landscape classification for the settlement fringe

4.107 Based on GIS analysis and field survey, the following local landscape classification has been defined as a basis for the settlement fringe landscape sensitivity analysis for Frisby on the Wreake, having taken account of the work in 2006 and 2014 landscape studies.
### District Landscape Character Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Area 12: Wreake Valley:**

'A gentle lowland river valley landscape with contrasting sinuous river course and regular pattern of small to medium scale pastoral fields with distinct wetland and water areas from former gravel pits, and small-nucleated villages situated along the rising slopes of the valley edge'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCU 9: The Leicestershire Wolds: Wreake Valley:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The steeper sided valley landforms to the south between Rotherby and Frisby on the Wreake;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landmark features such as church spires (e.g. Hoby and Frisby on the Wreake) and distinctive buildings (e.g. Kirby Park);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historic buildings/structures e.g. Kirby Park and remnants of mills and locks;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scenic and special qualities including attractive compositions of river and vegetation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• River habitats, pools and other wetland habitats (some recognised as SSSIs);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Areas of ridge and furrow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landscape sensitivity analysis

4.108 The landscape sensitivity analysis for the LCZs within the settlement fringe is presented below.

LCZ 1 Frisby on the Wreake North

Looking west along the River Wreake across the northern edge of Frisby on the Wreake, from the public footpath off Mill Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>The railway line effectively defines the northern settlement parameters, and creates a defensible settlement edge, integrating it with the wider landscape to the north. This LCZ would, therefore, be sensitive to further development which would potentially change the settlement form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>Topography is that of a broad, essentially flat valley floor associated with the meandering course of the River Wreake. An extensive series of woodlands and tree fringed lakes (the legacy of mineral extraction) lie beyond, defining the greater part of the area. Skylines are, therefore, mostly undeveloped and sensitive to further development, although the southern skyline is of a settled character (edge of Frisby and the railway), but well integrated by tree planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>Where the ‘original’ landscape pattern remains (not altered by mineral extraction), this is of a small scale, intact and predominantly pastoral character. The pattern in such areas is in part overlaid upon areas of ridge and furrow field systems (thin swathe north of the railway line). Such patterns would be vulnerable to development footprints by virtue of the potential for impact on their integrity/legibility. Whilst many other aspects of the landscape’s pattern and scale have been altered for mineral extraction, the legacy of this use has often created richness and texture in the landscape – a mosaic of wetland habitats. The relative complexity of such environments would be vulnerable to development footprints for similar reasons to the historic, small scale landscape pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience</td>
<td>A tranquil lowland wetland landscape of woodland fringed lakes and ponds, meadows and pasture fields, with only localised intrusions in the form of settlement and the railway line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 1: Frisby on the Wreake North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and tranquillity</td>
<td>general relative tranquillity of the landscape experience would be vulnerable to residential development footprints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>A filtered visual character is created by the wet woodlands, plantations and mature tree belts. The often contained visual character reduces susceptibility and sensitivity in visual terms. However, areas of pastoral fields with a more open visual character and slightly greater degree of intervisibility with other parts of the LCZ would be more susceptible / sensitive in visual terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment

The overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is high, by virtue of the existing well-integrated settlement edge, defined by the railway and river, medium scale landscape pattern with complex vegetation patterns and tranquil setting of the riparian landscape. There is a strong sense of detachment of this LCZ from the existing settlement edge. The visual character is generally contained, with glimpses of the edge of Asfordby and church spire to the northeast. There is a generally intimate and tranquil character and development would be best avoided in this area.

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.109 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- Due to the sense of separation established by the railway and associated vegetation, combined with the sensitivity of this landscape and the complexity and intricacy of the landscape pattern described above, development would be best avoided in this LCZ;
- Seek instead to conserve valued historic and riparian features and habitats as integral parts of a local green infrastructure network that links into the village.

LCZ2 Frisby on the Wreake West

Looking northeast across the lower lying river valley landscape towards the southwest edge of Frisby on the Wreake, from Rotherby Lane
### LCZ 2: Frisby on the Wreake West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>The settlement edge at this point is generally well integrated and set within a dense network of well-treed hedgerows and a series of small scale fields overlaid on extensive areas of ridge and furrow. It is well defined by the small scale fields with hedgerow boundaries. A small scale and sensitive settlement edge which would be vulnerable to expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>Topography is that of a broad and essentially flat valley floor associated with the meandering course of the River Wreake which partly extends into the LCZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A small scale pastoral landscape with an intimate network of largely intact hedgerows overlaid upon a clearly defined series of ancient ridge and furrow field systems. Further intricacy is created by the meandering course of the River Wreake to the north and associated riparian vegetation, and by occasional small scale woodland blocks. All of these features would be susceptible to change arising from residential development due to the potential to impact development could have upon their legibility. The railway to the north creates localised severance within the landscape pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>An essentially rural, small scale, lush pastoral and floodplain landscape. These landscape qualities would be susceptible to change arising from residential development, due to its potential impact on the integrity of the landscape experience. The Leicestershire Round long distance route passes through this LCZ and is an important recreational resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Due to the intactness of the landscape pattern, a generally intimate and enclosed visual character with little opportunity for intervisability. Shorter, contained views that are less susceptible to development impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is medium to high, in view of the small scale character and presence of important and relatively intact historic landscape elements such as ridge and furrow field systems. There is a generally enclosed visual character, with a well-integrated settlement edge and a combination of walled and vegetated boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.110 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- The existing settlement edge is generally well integrated in views across the low-lying landform of the northern edge of this LCZ, due to the landform allied with the relatively intact field boundaries. With this in mind any development brought forward in this LCZ should have consideration of the existing edge character;
Any development should be of an appropriate scale, contained by existing landform and landscape features, and should not encroach on the character of the River Wreake valley nor the rising landform to the south of the LCZ;

Any development brought forward should have regard for identified sensitive features and landscape patterns, and should be well integrated with the existing settlement edge;

Efforts should be concentrated upon securing, conserving and enhancing aspects of the historic and riparian landscape pattern as essential parts of a local green infrastructure network to link spaces through the village and wider riparian landscape.

**LCZ 3 Frisby on the Wreake South**

---

**LCZ 3: Frisby on the Wreake South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>The settlement edge which forms the northern interface with this LCZ is mostly integrated by virtue of garden boundary vegetation, hedgerows and trees, and the rising landform of the valley side to the south. As such the existing settlement boundary is logical, defensible and contained by existing constraints. The eastern settlement edge is partly exposed, but bounded by extensive areas of ridge and furrow which form a notable constraint to development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>An undulating valley side topography (the LCZ forms part of the north-facing slopes of the Wreake Valley). Skylines are essentially open and undeveloped – the ridge beyond to the south forms the visual backdrop to Frisby on the Wreake. Topography and skyline character both have a degree of susceptibility and sensitivity to residential development due to the potential for adverse change to their character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A medium scale agricultural landscape of relatively simple pattern – a mostly intact network of rectilinear field boundary hedgerows define pastoral and arable fields. Medieval ridge and furrow field systems are clearly apparent to parts of this LCZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience</td>
<td>A rolling agricultural landscape of essentially intact rural character. Such an experiential dimension would be vulnerable to change arising from residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 3: Frisby on the Wreake South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and tranquillity</td>
<td>Views from the rural road network which crosses the LCZ are often channelled and framed due to the density of hedgerows. Elsewhere (arable fields), a more open visual character persists within the LCZ, and this would be more sensitive to change. The field boundary hedgerow network across the area, however, filters the level of intervisibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>The overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is medium, due to the medium scale landscape that is contained by rising topography to the south, up to Leicester Road. The settlement edge is relatively well integrated by vegetation across the slopes. The landscape pattern shows some signs of erosion, with some hedgerows removed creating larger scale fields. There is evidence of historic landscape elements such as intact hedgerows and ridge and furrow field systems, which would be best avoided in relation to development. It is recognised that these features, and the more intact and small scale landscape in the eastern part of the LCZ, would have a greater sensitivity to residential development, within the medium overall landscape sensitivity judgement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.111 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- The historic landscape pattern of this LCZ is particularly sensitive to development footprints and would influence the type and size of development that could be accommodated in this area;
- Any development that comes forward should be set within existing landscape patterns, not extend across tracts of land outside of the existing settlement line and look to conserve identified important features;
- Development should seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision and the historic landscape. This should also be tied in with reduced building storey height (maximum of two storeys to the edge) to reduce perception of built mass on the sloping landform, and a simple, muted materials palette including timber, painted render and local brick.
- Features such as ridge and furrow field systems would be best conserved, enhanced and interpreted as part of a green infrastructure network.
Local Green Space Assessment

4.112 A total of 13 existing and proposed Protected Open Areas (POA) has been considered within the settlement of Frisby on the Wreake (see Annexe 1 for full analysis).

4.113 The strength of appropriateness for the POA being protected as Local Green Spaces, in line with the NPPF, is determined through consideration of the spaces against the assessment criteria (refer to Table 3.5).

4.114 One of the spaces within Frisby on the Wreake meets the established criteria:

- Churchyard (No.11)

4.115 The churchyard (No.11) is relatively central and easily accessible, via a footpath that passes through in an east-west direction. It is a large open space that is important in providing the setting to the grade I listed Church of St Thomas of Canterbury. The churchyard is a valuable community and heritage asset that contributes to a green walking route through the village to the wider landscape. It would benefit from further management to improve the biodiversity value.

4.116 Other spaces in the settlement range from intrinsic spaces such as road verges and green
wedges to enclosed, private gardens. Few of these have potential to meet the criteria for designation as a Local Green Space due to having fewer social and quality of life functions and being inaccessible to the community.

4.117 The allotments (No.2), green space (No.8) and graveyard (No.12) have some potential to improve the functionality and accessibility to the community and should be appropriately reinforced / enhanced.

4.118 Other spaces may be important contributors to the village character, but not suitable for designation as Local Green Spaces and would be safeguarded through policy where appropriate.
**Long Clawson**

**Assessment of Areas of Separation**

**Long Clawson – Hose**

4.119 This AOS was put forward through Issues and Options consultation and the area shown on the map is an interpretation of comments received through this process.

4.120 This area considers the medium scale rectilinear landscape and gently undulating land between the northeast edge of Long Clawson and the village of Hose in the vale to the northeast.

Looking southwest along Hose Lane towards the eastern edge of Long Clawson
### District Landscape Character Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Area 7: Village Pastures:** This area is described in the 2006 LCA as ‘A distinctive traditional pastoral landscape and attractive nucleated villages with a strong pattern of small fields often with historic features, enclosed by abundant hedgerow trees’. | **LCU 1: Vale of Belvoir:** **Key characteristics (from the 2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study):**  
- Predominantly flat low lying landform with very gentle undulations, enclosed by rolling hills such as Belvoir Ridge in Leicestershire to the south;  
- River Smite flows through the area; it is set lower than the surrounding land, and is only identifiable by riparian vegetation on its steep banks;  
- The disused Grantham Canal is a local feature; an ongoing restoration project it is a popular recreational feature;  
- A remote rural character across the whole area, with occasional views to scattered villages and individual farms although mostly a remote, tranquil and undeveloped character;  
- The majority of land use is arable farmland although closer to the village fringes smaller pasture fields become more apparent, usually used as horse paddocks. A more continuous tract of permanent pasture is found between Colston Bassett, Kinoulton and Hickling;  
- Large scale regular patterned fields are common to the west of the area, although medium sized fields are present in the east. Pasture fields closer to the villages are smaller, although elsewhere integrate with the pattern and scale of arable fields. There are more trees around the pastoral fields which give a slightly stronger sense of enclosure to that of the arable fields. Closer to the Grantham Canal as the land gently slopes the field pattern becomes more irregular;  
- Field boundaries are predominantly maturing hawthorn hedgerows, up to 1.5m in height, especially around Colston Bassett. Field ditches are present at some boundaries usually along roads;  
- In the south there are very few hedgerow trees, these become more frequent towards the north of the area in the transition between the vales and the South Nottinghamshire Farmlands;  
- Woodland is dispersed and includes occasional blocks, clumps and linear belts. The main woodland component is formed by frequent clumps along field margins and around farms;  
- Locally prominent woodland is found in parkland around Colston Bassett Hall;  
- Clumps of woodland associated with water courses, along the Grantham Canal and maturing |  
- Traditional stone built villages  
- Small field with Ridge & Furrow  
- Enclosed by ancient hedgerows with abundant hedgerow trees  
  
All of these characteristics are represented in the AOS, with ridge and furrow particularly apparent in proximity to settlement edges. The AOS is bounded by character area 1: Vale of Belvoir, with area 3: Wolds Scarp directly south of Long Clawson. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hedgerows are prominent linear wooded features. The medieval ploughing system of ridge and furrow is evident close to the village of Kinoulton and along the low escarpment at Hickling and is locally distinctive;</td>
<td>• Small scattered villages throughout the area include the linear settlements of Kinoulton, and Hickling and the smaller nucleated settlements of Colston Bassett and Owthorpe;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Larger settlements of Langar and Cropwell Bishop are situated on the fringes of the DPZ;</td>
<td>• Distinctive vernacular settlements such as Hickling. Urban form is generally uniform and has mainly red brick properties with some larger individual rendered properties;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distinctive vernacular settlements such as Hickling. Urban form is generally uniform and has mainly red brick properties with some larger individual rendered properties;</td>
<td>• Settlements are dispersed and tend to have rooftops visible within wooded edges. Villages often contain one main street or a couple with a small junction including a small grassed area and trees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small scattered villages throughout the area include the linear settlements of Kinoulton, and Hickling and the smaller nucleated settlements of Colston Bassett and Owthorpe;</td>
<td>• A linear dispersion of farms and larger farm buildings mostly situated close to roads;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distinctive vernacular settlements such as Hickling. Urban form is generally uniform and has mainly red brick properties with some larger individual rendered properties;</td>
<td>• Churches at Langar and Granby are prominent skyline features on high ground. Hickling church tower is prominent above a dispersed village edge;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Settlements are dispersed and tend to have rooftops visible within wooded edges. Villages often contain one main street or a couple with a small junction including a small grassed area and trees;</td>
<td>• Extensive views beyond the vale towards the Belvoir Ridgeline in Leicestershire with Belvoir Castle prominent on the wooded ridgeline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A linear dispersion of farms and larger farm buildings mostly situated close to roads;</td>
<td>• Winding narrow lanes thread across the area linking the scattered villages. They have medium to wide grass verges with frequent ditches, some have very steep sides;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Churches at Langar and Granby are prominent skyline features on high ground. Hickling church tower is prominent above a dispersed village edge;</td>
<td>• Overhead lines are visible over the area due to the low-lying landform;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extensive views beyond the vale towards the Belvoir Ridgeline in Leicestershire with Belvoir Castle prominent on the wooded ridgeline;</td>
<td>• Langar airfield, with its industrial buildings and runways has a localised urbanising effect on the rural mostly undeveloped appearance of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition the following landscape sensitivities are identified in relation to this LCU:
- The predominantly small, human scale of the features across the vale, in particular small historic villages with distinctive church spires, and hamlets with wooded edges;
- The tranquil and strongly rural nature of the area;
- Attractive views along the winding narrow lanes and towards the small villages and church spires set within fringes of trees and small pastoral fields;
- Pastoral areas which are strongly enclosed by trees, particularly areas associated with villages;
- Views towards Belvoir Castle and the Belvoir scarp where the Castle forms an important landmark;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</strong></th>
<th><strong>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | feature (including the good views from Beacon Hill);  
• The rural patchwork character of views from Belvoir Castle across the vale;  
• The character of Conservation Areas within the vale, including views identified in the Conservation Area appraisals as well as views identified as being important in this context (for example views from Standard Hill to the west of Hickling and the Church of St Luke). A number of the above characteristics and sensitivities are represented in the AOS, notably the tranquil rural character and small scale landscape pattern, plus the presence of ridge and furrow field systems.  
LCU 2: The Leicestershire Wolds: Belvoir Scarp lies directly south of Long Clawson. |
The following table provides the assessment of the landscape character and features of the AOS against the criteria established in paragraph 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary and judgements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>Topography is predominantly flat with some undulations around the edge of Long Clawson. The landform is overlaid with a network of enclosure field boundary hedgerows, creating an interlaced and largely undeveloped skyline. The linear settlement of Long Clawson lies to the south set against a distinctive and part wooded scarp slope backdrop (at distance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern, including cultural/historic pattern</td>
<td>A small to medium scale rectilinear enclosure field pattern overlaid in part upon areas of ridge and furrow field systems. This creates a relatively intricate patchwork landscape, particularly in proximity to the two settlement edges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience/recreational value and tranquillity</td>
<td>A strongly rural, predominantly pastoral and lightly settled landscape, crossed by a network of PRoW linking the two settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>The local landform undulations and the density of hedgerows in the area mean that visual character is filtered and intervisibility between the two settlements is often restricted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations and justification:

This is an expansive, primarily flat piece of land with a small to medium scale patchwork field pattern to the west of Hose Lane. There is limited intervisibility between the two settlements, with some glimpses of farmsteads on the nearside settlement edges. The south and northeast settlement edges of Hose and Long Clawson respectively, are well integrated due to topography combined with vegetation in proximity to the settlement edge and across the wider, flat landscape. The expansive, flat topography contributes to the existing degree of separation between the two settlements. The undeveloped, expansive landscape is sufficiently removed from the settlement patterns, and is unlikely to come forward as a potential development location. Development on the edges of the settlement could be controlled through character and design policies.

Recommendation: Not required

The area identified through the Issues and Options (2015) consultation is considered to be an extensive tract of land. The predominantly flat topography combined with vegetation limits the physical and visual relationship of the two settlements. It is not necessary to designate this area.
Settlement Fringe Landscape Sensitivity Analysis

Landscape classification for the settlement fringe

4.123 Based on GIS analysis and field survey, the following local landscape classification has been defined as a basis for the settlement fringe landscape sensitivity analysis for Long Clawson, having taken account of the work in 2006 and 2014 landscape studies.
## District Character Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 LCA (Landscape and Historic Urban Character Assessment Report): Character area context (principal character areas represented)</th>
<th>2014 Landscape Sensitivity Study: LCU context (principal LCUs represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area 1: Vale of Belvoir:</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘An expansive gentle vale landscape with a strong pattern of medium scale rectangular shaped pastoral and arable fields with managed hedgerows and the Grantham canal, punctuated by nucleated villages with prominent church spires’.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Area 3: Wolds Scarp:</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘A pronounced locally dramatic northwest facing escarpment landscape, with a distinct pattern of traditional small scale regular &amp; irregular shaped pastures, woodland and historic features’.</td>
<td><strong>LCU 1: Vale of Belvoir:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• The predominantly small, human scale of the features across the vale, in particular small historic villages with distinctive church spires, and hamlets with wooded edges;&lt;br&gt;• The tranquil and strongly rural nature of the area;&lt;br&gt;• Attractive views along the winding narrow lanes and towards the small villages and church spires set within fringes of trees and small pastoral fields;&lt;br&gt;• Pastoral areas which are strongly enclosed by trees, particularly areas associated with villages;&lt;br&gt;• Views towards Belvoir Castle and the Belvoir scarp where the Castle forms an important landmark feature (including the good views from Beacon Hill);&lt;br&gt;• The rural patchwork character of views from Belvoir Castle across the vale;&lt;br&gt;• The character of Conservation Areas within the vale, including views identified in the Conservation Area appraisals as well as views identified as being important in this context (for example views from Standard Hill to the west of Hickling and the Church of St Luke).&lt;br&gt;<strong>LCU 2: The Leicestershire Wolds, Belvoir Scarp:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• The distinctive profile of the escarpment;&lt;br&gt;• The panoramic views from the upper slopes;&lt;br&gt;• The deciduous woodland including ancient woodland around Old Dalby;&lt;br&gt;• Historic field pattern and remaining areas of ridge and furrow;&lt;br&gt;• Rural character of vernacular settlements/ dispersed houses and minor roads;&lt;br&gt;• Areas of historic parkland;&lt;br&gt;• The largely undeveloped skyline which is characterised by small scale features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area 7: Village Pastures:</strong>&lt;br&gt;‘A distinctive traditional pastoral landscape and attractive nucleated villages with a strong pattern of small fields often with historic features, enclosed by abundant hedgerow trees’.</td>
<td><strong>LCU 1: Vale of Belvoir:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• The predominantly small, human scale of the features across the vale, in particular small historic villages with distinctive church spires, and hamlets with wooded edges;&lt;br&gt;• The tranquil and strongly rural nature of the area;&lt;br&gt;• Attractive views along the winding narrow lanes and towards the small villages and church spires set within fringes of trees and small pastoral fields;&lt;br&gt;• Pastoral areas which are strongly enclosed by trees, particularly areas associated with villages;&lt;br&gt;• Views towards Belvoir Castle and the Belvoir scarp where the Castle forms an important landmark feature (including the good views from Beacon Hill);&lt;br&gt;• The rural patchwork character of views from Belvoir Castle across the vale;&lt;br&gt;• The character of Conservation Areas within the vale, including views identified in the Conservation Area appraisals as well as views identified as being important in this context (for example views from Standard Hill to the west of Hickling and the Church of St Luke).&lt;br&gt;<strong>LCU 2: The Leicestershire Wolds, Belvoir Scarp:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• The distinctive profile of the escarpment;&lt;br&gt;• The panoramic views from the upper slopes;&lt;br&gt;• The deciduous woodland including ancient woodland around Old Dalby;&lt;br&gt;• Historic field pattern and remaining areas of ridge and furrow;&lt;br&gt;• Rural character of vernacular settlements/ dispersed houses and minor roads;&lt;br&gt;• Areas of historic parkland;&lt;br&gt;• The largely undeveloped skyline which is characterised by small scale features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landscape sensitivity analysis

4.124 The landscape sensitivity analysis for LCZs within the settlement fringe is presented below.

LCZ 1 Long Clawson Northeast

Looking north across patchwork fields towards the river floodplain, from footpaths on the northeast edge of Long Clawson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>An occasionally exposed settlement edge, with visible modern built form interspersed between older farmhouses and associated agricultural units. There has been some expansion north of the essentially linear vernacular village. Settlement backs onto the landscape to the north. The exposed edge offers mitigation and enhancement potential, although there are also aspects where a better integrated settlement edge persists due to structural vegetation associated with field boundaries and a watercourse. These would be more sensitive by virtue of their existing integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A relatively flat, low-lying topography, with open and undeveloped skylines – across the expansive Vale of Belvoir to the north and to the wooded Wolds scarp, which forms the backdrop to Long Clawson, to the south. Whilst the low level of landform variation would not be unduly sensitive, the undeveloped skyline character would be vulnerable to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A small scale rectilinear field pattern defined by mostly intact field boundary hedgerows, framing a network of predominantly pastoral fields with some arable. Smallest scale field patterns generally lie in closest proximity to the settlement edge. Tributary water courses such as Dam Dyke and associated riparian vegetation are apparent, adding interest, texture and variety to the landscape pattern. In a number of instances intact historic ridge and furrow field systems are clearly present beneath pasture fields. These and the small scale enclosures would be susceptible to change arising from residential development, by virtue of the potential for impact upon their integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual</td>
<td>An essentially rural, tranquil landscape experience is imparted by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 1: Long Clawson Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>the interplay of land cover, land management and land uses described above. This sense of tranquility would be susceptible to change arising from residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Due to the flatness of landform there are often long views out from the northern village edge across the floodplain. Field boundary vegetation occasionally obscures and contains the views, but there is a strong visual relationship to the wider landscape of this village edge. Such views are important in contributing to settlement character and identity, and would, therefore, be sensitive to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment

Overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is medium, due to the contained nature of the field pattern and predominantly well integrated settlement edge. The field pattern in proximity to the settlement edge is generally small scale with intact hedgerow boundaries and vegetated riparian corridors and field ponds. The primarily flat topography affords some long views towards the distant ridgeline, and mostly undeveloped skyline. It is recognised that there are areas of higher sensitivity due to more intact small scale field patterns, where development could impact on the integrity of such features.

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.125 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this area:

- The LCZ has a strongly rural, mostly intact character, that any development coming forward should have regard for in its design and layout;
- Any development should have consideration of existing landscape features that define the setting of the existing settlement and create an often contained landscape setting, including hedgerows and riparian vegetation, and should maintain an integrated settlement edge;
- Development should seek to achieve a gradation of development density to the outer edges, linked with new green space provision. This should also be tied in with reduced building storey height (maximum of two storeys to the edge) to reduce perception of built mass sprawling across the flat landscape, and should use a simple, muted materials palette including timber, painted render and local brick;
- Lit development edges should be avoided to assist with conservation of dark night skies/avoidance of sky glow and perception of further urbanising influences;
- Sensitive features such as small scale field boundaries, ridge and furrow and the tributaries should be carefully integrated as part of any proposals, and provide screening features that should provide containment for any development brought forward in this LCZ;
- The linear nature of the village is a key characteristic of the village that is clearly evident from this LCZ, and should be carefully considered in any development proposals in this area.

### LCZ 2 Long Clawson South

Looking south from the southern settlement edge of Long Clawson, towards the rising topography up to the ridgeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</strong></td>
<td>An increasingly loose and dispersed southern settlement edge due to extensions and infill, albeit well integrated due to garden boundary and hedgerow vegetation and small scale fieldscape across an undulating landform. This relatively defensible and well-defined settlement edge would be susceptible to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography and skylines</strong></td>
<td>This LCZ forms part of the foothills and upper slopes of the Wolds scarp and as such topographic variation is pronounced and relatively complex. This landform variation would be highly susceptible to change arising from residential development, although the flatter lands closest to the settlement edge would be less so. The northern skyline has a settled character, due to the elongated village of Long Clawson. However, the southern skyline, defined by a prominent and part wooded scarp slope, is entirely undeveloped and, therefore, sensitive to residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</strong></td>
<td>A mostly small to medium scale pastoral landscape with some larger arable fields set within. The landscape closest to the settlement edge is of the smallest scale – a patchwork of intimate, enclosed pastoral fields often overlaid upon well-defined ridge and furrow field systems. Small scale fields and ridge and furrow are also associated with the upper parts of the scarp slope and adjacent hanger woodlands and mixed woodlands. Intimate areas of riparian landscape are created by a tributary and spring line which flows north from the scarp hills. The areas of small scale landscape and intact cultural pattern would have the highest susceptibility and sensitivity by virtue of the potential for development to negatively impact upon their legibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including</strong></td>
<td>A relatively diverse landscape patchwork is created by the interplay of scarp and foothills landform, ridge and furrow,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ2: Long Clawson South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>landscape experience and tranquility</td>
<td>pasture, dense and laid hedgerows, plus areas of woodland to the scarp tops. This and the well-integrated settlement edge at Long Clawson create a strongly rural and largely intact landscape experience with a clear sense of tranquility. Such qualities would be susceptible to change arising from development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Visual character varies throughout this LCZ, with more expansive (and, therefore, visually sensitive) views to the southeast and more intricate pattern and small scale landscape with enclosed views to the south and southwest, which reduces sensitivity in visual terms. Occasional views are available to Long Clawson from the road which crosses the scarp, although these are often filtered to some degree by local landform variation and intervening vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment</td>
<td>Overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is medium to high, by virtue of the complex landscape pattern and intimate scale of the vegetated and undulating landscape with intact field boundaries and riparian corridors. There is variation in this judgement, between the large field pattern and more exposed landscape with expansive views to the southeast and more intricate pattern and small scale landscape with enclosed views to the south and southwest. The contours of the landscape to the south form the setting of the settlement and the skyline is undeveloped. The presence of historic landscape elements and the relative intricacy of landscape scale and pattern would be sensitive to extensive development. The existing edge of the settlement is generally not prominent, with the exception of properties along Coronation Avenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.126 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- There is opportunity to accommodate some sensitively designed development in proximity to the existing settlement edge, which takes into consideration the existing, generally well integrated edge character of the historic settlement form;
- Development that encroaches up the slopes of the wolds scarp would be prominent and at odds with the linear character of the village, and should be avoided;
- Any development should be small scale and well integrated, and should achieve a gradation of density to the outer edges;
- Any development brought forward should incorporate existing landscape boundaries such as hedgerows and riparian corridors, which would contribute to thesoftening of the settlement edge;
- Given the interface with the wider agricultural landscape, lit settlement edges should be avoided as far as possible;
Areas of historic landscape pattern should be conserved and integrated as part of a local green infrastructure network that links to existing public spaces and routes.

LCZ 3 Long Clawson Northwest

Looking northwest from a public footpath on the northwest edge of Long Clawson, looking out across the floodplain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settlement and settlement edge character, mitigation and enhancement potential</td>
<td>An exposed settlement edge to the north and west (e.g. early/mid-20th century dwellings in a linear/ribbon development form to the west, late 20th century cul-de-sacs to the north). This edge character provides a degree of enhancement and mitigation potential. Western settlement gateways on the rural road/lane network are integrated by virtue of hedgerows and mature hedgerow oaks – a positive, sensitive settlement approach. Influenced by the Long Clawson dairy complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography and skylines</td>
<td>A gently undulating landform which has relatively low susceptibility to change arising from development due to the low levels of topographic variation. Skyline character is largely undeveloped and the partly wooded ridge to the south of Long Clawson forms the backdrop to the settlement. Such skylines would be susceptible to change arising from development due to their undeveloped character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape scale and pattern including cultural pattern</td>
<td>A medium scale rectilinear field boundary hedgerow pattern frames an agricultural landscape of simple character. Hedgerow trees and occasional small farm woodland blocks and coverts, plus scattered farmsteads, create a degree of interest in variety in an otherwise repetitive, mixed arable and pastoral landscape. These characteristics would, in the main, not be unduly susceptible to change arising from residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and perceptual quality including landscape experience and tranquillity</td>
<td>A simple landscape of relatively muted colour palette and low levels of textural variation, but one of essentially rural, lightly settled character (the only settlement influences are the elongated linear village of Long Clawson and scattered, isolated farmsteads). As such, much of the landscape has a tranquil, relatively isolated character which would be susceptible to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views, visual character and intervisibility</td>
<td>Views are often framed and filtered by intervening hedgerows, although there are open views to the scarp by virtue of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCZ 3: Long Clawson Northwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sensitivity to residential development: Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>essentially flat landform across the area. Such views are an important part of the settlement’s setting and identity, and are therefore sensitive to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall landscape sensitivity: Judgement and comment

Overall landscape sensitivity of this LCZ to residential development is judged to be medium. This is due to the medium landscape scale and simplicity of landscape pattern, balanced against the strong rural character and instances of intervisibility with the scarp slope to the south.

Landscape guidance/principles in relation to development

4.127 The following strategic landscape principles are provided in relation to potential development within this LCZ:

- Small scale development which responds positively to the indented settlement edge to the north and west could be appropriate, provided it made use of a simple and muted materials palette in this relatively open landscape and taking account of views of this already extended village edge from the scarp;

- Any potential development in this LCZ would need to be drawn close to the existing settlement boundary, making use of low/long rooflines and a simple/muted materials palette to reduce visual impacts;

- Integration of any future development in this LCZ should seek to enhance and reinforce the native hedgerow and field boundary landscape structure, to secure assimilation within the wider landscape and greater levels of connectivity with the existing settlement form.
Local Green Space Assessment

4.128 A total of 25 existing and proposed POA have been considered within the settlement of Long Clawson (see Annexe 1 for full analysis).

4.129 The strength of appropriateness for the POA being protected as Local Green Space, in line with the NPPF, is determined through consideration of the spaces against the assessment criteria (see Table 3.5).

4.130 Two of the spaces within Long Clawson meet the established criteria:

- Recreation ground (No.10)
- Churchyard (No. 13)

4.131 The recreation ground (No.10) is a space that has not been previously considered as a POA, and was introduced by the assessor as a result of field survey. It is a multi-functional space with good accessibility, adjacent to the village hall and relates to the wider landscape. It is evidently a well-used and managed resource, valued by the community and should be conserved as a Local Green Space.

4.132 The churchyard is an important, visually prominent space that contributes to the historic core.
of the village in association with adjacent sites. It has good functionality, although there is opportunity to reinforce the characteristics and improve the ecological value of this space.

4.133 Other spaces within the settlement are clearly important to the village character and several of them are valuable in contributing to the heritage setting of Long Clawson, namely the village green (No.4), central field (No.11) and Manor Farmhouse garden (No.12). However, their functionality in relation to the established criteria is limited and they are not suitable for designation as Local Green Spaces. Some of these spaces should be enhanced and have the potential to meet the criteria. Others would be safeguarded through policy by virtue of their heritage value and purpose.

4.134 Many of the other spaces within the village have limited functionality in relation to the established criteria and are often privately owned, secluded spaces with little permeability. Although they contribute to the open texture of the village, they are not suitable for designation as Local Green Spaces. These spaces would be safeguarded through policy, where appropriate.