

Appendix 2: Supporting document

For the

Landscape Sensitivity Study

Landscape and visual sensitivity
in relation to residential development

Land and Sculpture Design Partnership
Octagon House, Water Run, Hitcham, Suffolk
lsdp@btinternet.com
Tel: 01449 740272

CONTENTS

1.0 Approach and methodology

2.0 Results summary

3.0 Results tables

Land parcel 1 (character area in LAV1: Pit Meadow)

Land parcel 2 (character area in LAV2: Lavenham wood)

Land parcel 3 (character area in LAV3: Bridge Street road)

Land parcel 4 (character area in LAV4: Western meadows)

Land parcel 5 (character area in LAV5: Brights Drift)

Land parcel 6 (character area in LAV6: Clay Hill)

Land parcel 7 (character area in LAV7: The Common)

References and sources of Information

Addendum A1 Example landscape and visual sensitivity indicators

1 Approach and methodology

1.1 Approach

- 1.1.1 There is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach to assessing landscape sensitivity. In studies carried out to date, methods used vary in their emphasis, and are dependent on the geographical scope of a project and nature of the changes proposed. In this case, the parameters were well defined and the geographical area was relatively small. The study was undertaken immediately after the Landscape Character Assessment and draws heavily on its findings.
- 1.1.2 The methodology developed draws from a number of other studies (see: References) and draws on guidance in ‘Topic paper 6: Techniques and criteria for judging capacity and sensitivity’ and was developed with guidance from Phil Watson at Suffolk County Council. It also draws on definitions and concepts understood in Guidelines for Visual and Landscape Impact Assessment (version 3, 2013. Landscape Institute and IEMA).
- 1.1.3 The process involves a number of steps:
1. Identify landscape attributes - what is important and why (This draws on the Landscape Character Assessment)
 2. Identify visual attributes and key views
 3. Assess sensitivity of individual attributes
 4. Combine sensitivity judgements sequentially
 5. Define nature of landscape change – three residential development scenarios
 6. Assess the potential for mitigation effects of development
 7. Attribute overall sensitivity to each parcel, for each development scenario
 8. Propose appropriate landscape guidance/mitigation

Landscape capacity

- 1.1.4 The study avoids the use of the term ‘landscape capacity’ that is sometimes applied at the end of sensitivity studies. Capacity is concerned with quantifying the amount of development that can be accommodated in a landscape before significant detrimental effects result. Capacity is often used as the inverse of sensitivity, whereby a landscape of high sensitivity has a low capacity to absorb development, and one of low sensitivity might have a high capacity to absorb development.
- 1.1.5 Capacity conveys the notion that landscapes have a fixed ‘amount’ by which they can be changed, without significant effects. In reality consequences always result.
- 1.1.6 This study places confidence in sensitivity judgments alone as an objective basis for assessing site suitability, It conveys the relative ability of the land parcels to absorb development without going as far as attributing a quantitative aspect. The premise is that residential development should be more readily acceptable in the least sensitive areas, and where appropriate forms of mitigation would be possible.

Development scenarios

- 1.1.7 The study examines the sensitivity of the village edge to three different development scenarios. It aims to compare the ability of different parts of the village edge to support new development without significantly harming Lavenham’s exceptional character and the amenity of both its residents and visitors.
- 1.1.8 With the input of the parish council, three specific development scenarios were put forward against which to assess sensitivity. The numbers of dwellings suggested are intended to be representative of three scales of development only. They are not meant to represent fixed numbers, to avoid any fixed capacity being interpreted.

1.1.9 The parameters were:

- Small group development: (circa. 10 dwellings or less)
- Small estate development: (circa.20-25 dwellings)
- Large estate development: (circa. 50-60 dwellings)

These scenarios were selected for the following reasons:

- 10 is a useful starting point as it is the number at which affordable housing requirement is triggered (at 35%). The central tenet of the plan is to deliver affordable housing.
- The public consultation exercise determined an upper size of development should be 24 dwellings.
- To test the ability of the landscape to take a much larger development – the remainder of the Core Strategy apportionment in one development – approx. 60 dwellings.

Land parcels

- 1.1.10 In order to focus the sensitivity study on land where residential development could feasibly come forward, it focused on a ‘land parcel’ approach. The boundaries of the land parcels correspond with those of the landscape character areas, but do not comprise the entire character area. They comprise only the inner areas which share a boundary with the ‘built up area’ boundary. The outer boundaries of the parcels attempt to terminate at some recognisable landscape feature, such as a field boundary, watercourse or road. If there is no such feature, for example within a large field, a line is made to the nearest such boundary feature.
- 1.1.11 This ensures focus on the land directly encircling Lavenham, in the zone where residential development sites would be well related to the existing settlement. It does not take into account the suitability or availability of the land parcels for development; their proximity to the edge of the village is the only consideration for their inclusion.

1.1.12 The intention is to provide a useful comparative study yet it deliberately does not go as far as identifying individual development sites; the results of the study are not intended to suggest development areas or future settlement boundaries.

1.1.13 Locations at distance from the village are not included because development proposals would be unlikely to come forward in open countryside which has no relationship to the form of the existing settlement. Land parcels from each of the character areas around Lavenham are represented, except ‘LAV8 Clay Lane plateau’ which is omitted for this reason.

Key views

1.1.14 As part of the public NDP consultation process, residents were asked to give information about the views in and around the village that they particularly valued. This data was used to define a series of valued views that are presented in the NDP and is used in the sensitivity study. Twelve views were defined and they were categorized as either being a ‘Key’ view or ‘Other valued view’. ‘Key’ views are views in or out of the historic core and these are attributed greater value than other locally valued views, the rationale being that views experienced as part of the visitor experience by Lavenham’s tourists warrant a higher level of consideration.

1.1.15 The assessment of visual sensitivity considered whether parts of the land parcel fell within the ‘Key views’. If land falls within key views either in or out of the historic core of the village, the sensitivity was judged more highly.

The approach to value

- 1.1.16 Landscape value was considered at the point the individual judgments of landscape sensitivity were made. It was a factor used to adjust sensitivity judgments upwards where valued landscapes or features were at risk. The designations indicating value were Special Landscape Area, Ancient Woodland and Conservation Area status. The Special Landscape Area designation was attributed through the 2006 Babergh Local Plan and is currently under threat following the Babergh and Mid Suffolk's Local Plan Designations Review (2015). One output from the study was to redefine the SLA in the NDP and designate a new Lavenham Special Landscape Area.
- 1.1.17 In visual terms, value was integrated into the elements analysed, for example key views from the historic core, inter-visibility with the Conservation Area, or views experienced by visitors were considered indicators of higher value, for example.

1.2 Methodology

- 1.2.1 The starting point was to define the land parcel units from the Landscape Character Assessment. In line with the Landscape Character Assessment, the land parcels comprise land outside the 'built up area boundary' as defined in the Babergh Local Plan. The character assessment mapped and described 8 character areas around the village. Each area comprises land with a common pattern of landform, soil types, woodland cover, land use, settlement type and visual experience, for example. Each of the character areas, bar one, shares a boundary with the village edge. The exception 'LVA8 Clay Lane Plateau' was not selected as the basis of a land parcel owing to its separation from the village. There were only 7 land parcels, for this reason.

- 1.2.2 The studies employed a degree of both desktop work and fieldwork. For each of the 7 parcels a set of professional judgments were made relating to landscape and visual/perceptual sensitivity. These drew on the characteristics experienced in the field and described in the landscape character assessment. The fieldwork was carried out concurrently with the fieldwork aspect of the character assessment.

Step one: Attribute sensitivity to individual elements

- 1.2.3 In advance of the assessment a set of tables identifying the list of key landscape and visual and perceptual elements to be considered was devised. The categories were devised with reference to topic Paper 6 and other more recent studies. It split judgments into landscape judgments and visual and perceptual judgments. For each, conditions pointing to either 'high' 'medium' or 'low' sensitivity were described – see box below which defines sensitivity conditions. Where conditions fell between two values, this was indicated graphically on the results tables.
- 1.2.4 Sensitivity was considered towards residential development in general and did not, at this point, consider 'amount'.

Landscape sensitivity was based on a set of 5 elements:

- Landform
- Scale and enclosure
- Time-depth
- Settlement edge pattern
- Rarity and replaceability

Visual and perceptual sensitivity were considered together. Judgements were made on a set of 8 elements :

- Visual prominence
- Types of receptors
- Vulnerability of key outward views
- Vulnerability of key inward views
- Views from footpaths
- Views from principal routes

- Tranquillity /activity
- Aesthetic perceptions

1.2.5 Indicators for the eight elements are given below:

LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY

1. Landform

Rolling/undulating valley landscapes are more sensitive to residential development in landscape terms than flat landforms or those with comparatively little topographic variation (although in visual terms they are sometimes more able to contain impacts of development). Undeveloped valley sides are considered more sensitive than flatter plateau landscapes in landscape terms.

2. Pattern and enclosure

This refers to the combination of vegetative and field pattern variation. For example a landscape comprising a complex array of different habitats and/or land cover features such as long established intact hedgerows or ancient woodland, or will have a higher sensitivity to residential development than a simple open landscape with little structural elements.

3. Time depth

Consideration of the presence of indicators of the historic landscape. Settings of heritage features such as Listed Buildings, parkland, SMs, ancient woodland or simply where there is evidence that long established field patterns and boundary features endure. A landscape showing evidence of historic continuity with a strong sense of 'time depth' demonstrates (historic continuity) and intact cultural pattern will have a higher sensitivity to residential development than a landscape where cultural pattern is eroded or comparatively absent.

4. Settlement edge pattern

Consideration of the nature and form of the adjacent settlement edge. Landscapes adjoining long established, settlement edges where low density, historic settlement prevails, untouched by development of infrastructure will be more sensitive than those where the historic

settlement edge is no longer evident owing to modern development.

5. Rarity and replaceability

Consideration of how commonly the landscape, or its particular key features, are seen or how readily they could be recreated. Landscapes which are rare, or would be hard to replicate, are more sensitive than those which are seen frequently, or would be easy to replicate.

VISUAL SENSITIVITY

1. Visual prominence

This considers how generally visible a landscape is from the (publicly accessible) surrounding landscape, settlement edges, highways or rights of way. Land that is visually prominent, owing to the combined effects of landform, tree cover or settlement is more visually sensitive than land which is hard to view.

2. Types of receptors

This aims to assess the sensitivity of those viewing the landscape. Sensitive viewers are tourists and residents, particularly those experiencing views from Listed Buildings or from within the Conservation Area. Less sensitive are viewers engaged in travel or at their place of work, for example.

3 & 4. Vulnerability of key outward and inward views

Consideration of visual sensitivity in relation to the valued outward and inward views, identified by the community through the NDP consultation. Higher sensitivity is attributed to land easily seen as part of one or more of the key views, lower sensitivity is attributed where land is not seen within any of the key views.

5. Views from footpaths

This comprises a measure of how far footpaths users are likely to be affected by views of residential development. Where multiple footpaths would be within the visual envelope of a development, sensitivity would be higher than for land which is not easily viewed from points on footpaths.

6.Views from principal routes

The principle routes are considered to be the main roads into Lavenham from three directions: the Bury Road (A1141) Brent Eleigh Road (A1141) and Sudbury Road (B1071). Land that is easily viewed from any of these main principal routes is deemed more sensitive than land that is only visible from minor routes.

7. Tranquility/activity

Aspects including traffic noise, movement from people or vehicles, sense of remoteness and tranquillity. Landscapes with a higher degree of remoteness and tranquility will have a higher sensitivity to residential development.

8.Aesthetic perception

This is the most subjective of all the judgments. It covers sensitivity in terms of aesthetic attributes such as interplay of landform and landscape structure, texture, naturalness, the presence or absence of detracting features or human activity. More sensitive landscapes have a more aesthetically pleasing combination of features, likely indicated by complexity, variety, and naturalness, and absence of human scale features.

The steps taken

- 1.2.6 Once the judgement of ‘high’ ‘medium’ or ‘low’ for each set of elements was complete, the overall judgement of landscape or visual/perceptual sensitivity was made by reviewing the distribution of judgements, together with information about ‘value’.
- 1.2.7 With reference to the analysis criteria an overall landscape sensitivity judgment was defined for each land parcel, supported by colour-coded mapping. The process strived to be as objective as possible and relied on application of professional judgement. The results tables included a narrative of what is sensitive, and why, to help inform guidance.
- 1.2.8 Maps are presented at LSS-02 and LSS-03 to show landscape and visual sensitivity judgements for each parcel.

Step two: Attribute combined sensitivity

- 1.2.9 The next stage was to combine the two judgements to reach a measure of ‘Combined sensitivity’. A five-point scale was used to give greater differentiation between land parcels.

Matrix M1: showing derivation of COMBINED SENSITIVITY VALUE

Landscape sensitivity	High	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH
	Med	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH
	Low	LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM
		Low	Medium	High
		Visual and perceptual sensitivity		

- 1.2.10 This matrix shows how the separate landscape and visual sensitivity judgments combine:

Step three: ‘mitigatability’ of development scenarios

- 1.2.11 Mitigation means measures that strive to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse effects caused by a development, or change in land use. This study assumes that site designers will aim to prevent and avoid adverse effects through, primarily, careful and responsive site selection, site design, ground modelling, and access design, for example. Secondary mitigation measures include screening developments with boundary planting.
- 1.2.12 This study asserts that the potential to mitigate adverse effects is another function of sensitivity. Areas where successful mitigation would be feasible would have lower sensitivity. Areas where mitigation measures would be unachievable or have little impact, or would be detracting features in their own right, are considered more vulnerable and, therefore, more sensitive.
- 1.2.13 The ‘mitigatability’ of three development scenarios (small group / small estate / large estate) was judged on a three-point scale for each land parcel. The ability to mitigate effectively, in each case, was either judged:
 - GOOD:** Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character
 - MODERATE:** Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character
 - LIMITED:** Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character

Step four: Attribute overall sensitivity

- 1.2.14 The final value reached was called ‘Overall sensitivity’ and is a function of the land parcels’ combined sensitivity against the potential for successful mitigation.

Step five: Landscape guidance

- 1.2.15 Finally, the sensitivity information was used to compile a set of guidance notes which discussed the scope for development, and identified any particular landscape or visual sensitivity issues which could act as constraints to development. Landscape guidance was devised to ensure any change is responsive to landscape character.

Matrix M2: showing derivation of OVERALL SENSITIVITY value:

Scope for mitigation	LIMITED	Medium-low	Moderate	Moderate-high	High	High
	MODERATE	Low	Medium-low	Moderate	Moderate-high	High
	GOOD	Low	Low	Medium-low	Moderate	Moderate-high
		Low	Medium-low	Medium	Medium-high	High
Combined sensitivity						

2 Results summary

- 2.1.1 Each land parcel has a set of detailed result tables (see section 3 of this document) and the results are also presented in mapped format on drawings LSS-02 to 03.
- 2.1.2 The table below summarises the results of the results of the landscape, visual and combined sensitivity judgments.

Table 2.1.2

Character Area	Land parcel No.	Landscape sensitivity	Visual/ Perceptual Sensitivity	Combined sensitivity
01 Pit Meadow	1	HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM -HIGH
02 Lavenham Wood	2	LOW	LOW	LOW
03 Bridge Street Road	3	MEDIUM	LOW	MEDIUM -LOW
04 West meadows	4	HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM -HIGH
05 Brights Drift	5	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
06 Clay Hill	6	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
07 The Common	7	HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM -HIGH

2.1.3 The combined sensitivity was then applied to the ability of the landscape to assimilate development through the potential for successful mitigation. The results are summarised below:

Table 2.1.3

Land parcel	Land parcel No.	Potential to mitigate effects of:		
		Small group development	Small Estate development	Large Estate development
01 Pit Meadow	1	GOOD	GOOD	MEDIUM
02 Lavenham Wood	2	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD
03 Bridge Street Road	3	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	LIMITED
04 West meadows	4	GOOD	MEDIUM	LIMITED
05 Brights Drift	5	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED
06 Clay Hill	6	LIMITED	LIMITED	LIMITED
07 The Common	7	MEDIUM	LIMITED	LIMITED

2.1.4 The overall sensitivity to each development scenario is summarised below in table form, and presented in mapped format in drawings LSS-04 to 06.

Table 2.1.4

Land parcel	Land parcel No.	Overall sensitivity to Small group development	Overall sensitivity to Small Estate development	Overall sensitivity to Large Estate development
01 Pit Meadow	1	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE-HIGH
02 Lavenham Wood	2	LOW	LOW	LOW
03 Bridge Street Road	3	MODERATE-LOW	MODERATE-LOW	MODERATE
04 West meadows	4	MODERATE	MODERATE-HIGH	HIGH
05 Brights Drift	5	MODERATE-HIGH	MODERATE-HIGH	MODERATE-HIGH
06 Clay Hill	6	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH
07 The Common	7	MODERATE-HIGH	HIGH	HIGH

3 Results tables

	Land Parcel No: 1
Landscape character area:	LAV1 – Pit Meadow The character area comprises the relatively uniform valley side, west of the Brett, to the south of Lavenham.
Relevant landscape character area:	The land parcel is a single large arable field enclosed by hedged Bears Lane to the west, a thick plantation belt to the south and the village edge to the east and north, including the Lavenham Press site in the NE. For location see figure: LSS-01.
Land parcel location and description:	Statutory landscape designations: none Non statutory/policy designations: Area within the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area (<i>note: this designation is at risk</i>). Relationship to Conservation Area: Adjoins the Conservation Area boundary along its northern perimeter – this comprises the rear gardens of (listed) properties along Water Street, including The Priory, and a section of the High Street.
Noteworthy features:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land parcel itself is featureless but the thick plantation belt along its southern boundary forms a dense screening feature. • Western boundary with Bears Lane – a hedged lane with strong historic character • Relationship with the Conservation Area – see above

Table A: Landscape considerations				LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Physical / landscape	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Landform	Plateau type landscape	Valley bottom landscape	Valley side landscape	<p>The land parcel is judged to have HIGH landscape sensitivity. The area is within the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area and adjoins the Conservation Area so the area also has high cultural value.</p> <p>Valley side landscapes are sensitive to development and effects can also be experienced on adjacent character areas below.</p> <p>It has a long established, well-defined, green interface with the village. It partly adjoins sensitive, listed settings such as the large garden of Lavenham Priory – a sensitive receptor. It is contiguous with The Meadows social housing area to the west, so is well related settlement to the west. It is separated by a well-vegetated lane – the character of this lane should be conserved as it is an intact historic feature.</p> <p>Aspects of lesser sensitivity are that it is open, featureless farmland - there would be no vegetative features directly at risk from siting development on this parcel.</p>
Pattern and enclosure	Simple, large scale open; network of hedges eroded – remnant features vegetation only	Medium scale, Hedges are gappy with some tree cover	Small scale, complex, intact network of hedges and regular hedgerow trees	
Time- depth	Little indication of time-depth	Some indication of time-depth	Strong indication of time-depth	
Settlement edge pattern	Shares abrupt interface with existing settlement, aspects of modern development already present	Settlement edge indistinct pattern, some modern elements	Porous edge to settlement, or buffered by historic landscape pattern	
Rarity and replaceability	Character or threatened features are common and seen regularly in parish and/or are readily replaceable	Character or threatened features somewhat common	Character or threatened features are rare and/or difficult to replaceable	

Table B: Visual and perceptual considerations				VISUAL & PERCEPTUAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Visual and perceptual	Lower sensitivity	Moderate sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Visual prominence	Conditions combine to make views of land generally difficult to experience	Some views available where conditions allow	Visually prominent, part of view from many points and routes	<p>The land parcel has elements of low and high visual sensitivity that balance out at a judgment of MEDIUM.</p> <p>The land parcel is not prominent in views either from the village or principal routes through Lavenham owing to the substantial screening belt and screening effect of dwellings in the valley bottom. The likelihood of potential views from Lady Street need to be assessed in more detail.</p> <p>A footpath runs along the northern boundary providing direct views in. The land is also seen clearly from the opposite valley side, on footpaths on Clay Hill. This view is sensitive as it comprises the historic village with its characteristic well vegetated valley side location.</p> <p>There are very sensitive views out from private property curtilages in the Conservation Area including the Grade I listed Lavenham Priory which must be a primary consideration of any development proposed on adjacent land.</p>
Types of receptors experiencing visual change	Users of low sensitivity; e.g. road users, people at work	Moderately sensitive; e.g. some views from dwellings or small number of Listed Buildings	Highly sensitive; visitors, direct views from Listed Building and/or Conservation Area	
Vulnerability of Key outward views	Landscape not easily seen within key views out from Historic Core	Part of landscape seen in some views from Historic Core	Landscape is seen directly from Historic Core	
Vulnerability of Key inward views	No intervisibility with Historic Core	Part of Historic core perceived at some distance	Direct and/or close range views to Conservation Area	
Views from Footpaths	No views from footpaths	Views from a few points on footpaths and/or at longer range	Direct views from multiple footpaths or at close range	
Views from principal routes	Limited visibility from principle routes	Moderately visible in views from principal routes	Dominant in view from one or more principal routes	
Tranquility /activity	Rarely tranquil, regular of human activity seen and/or heard	Moderate tranquility; some human activity seen and/or heard	Relatively remote and tranquil, little human activity seen or heard	
Aesthetic perception	Simple and uniform in texture; sense of naturalness eroded; human scale features apparent	Moderately varied texture, reasonably good degree of naturalness; some features of human scale	Complex and varied texture, high degree of naturalness with few features of human scale	

Table C: Combined sensitivity judgement

SENSITIVITY	PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
	VISUAL / PERCEPTUAL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
= COMBINED SENSITIVITY		LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope					ANALYSIS:
Scope for effective mitigation	SMALL GROUP	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	<p>This assessment assumes development would be focused towards the top of the slope where development could be better assimilated. A plateau edge location will be less obtrusive than mid slope locations.</p> <p>Larger estates will likely need to advance down the slope with the risk of creating a uniform, valley side roofscape.</p> <p>Effects could be minimised by responding to the existing valley side settlement patterns. The historic built form is low density, interspersed with open space and substantial tree cover. There is variation in materials and colours. The interface with open countryside is well vegetated and green. Replicating such aspects would help assimilate new development into the existing framework.</p>
	SMALL ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	
	LARGE ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	

Table E: Overall sensitivity judgement						
OVERALL SENSITIVITY	SMALL GROUP development:	Moderate	SMALL ESTATE development:	Moderate	LARGE ESTATE development:	Moderate high

Table F: GUIDANCE FOR LAND PARCEL NO. 1
<p>In addition to the Lavenham Landscape Guidelines, the following is relevant to this land parcel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some scope for development towards the plateau edge. Development down the valley side would have a much greater adverse impact. • Ensure retention of all existing natural boundary features including ditches, hedges and hedgebanks, and trees. • Provide substantial boundary planting creating a landscape buffer between the development, open countryside and the Conservation Area to the north. • The interface with the Conservation Area, needs particular careful attention. Harmful effects on views out from Lavenham Priory and other listed buildings are not acceptable. • Ensure any highways design has as little impact as possible to conserve the character of Bears Lane. • Existing patterns in the east-west boundary hedges could be replicated as well as efforts to restore historic field patterns lost during the 20th century.

	Land Parcel No: 2
Relevant landscape character area:	LAV2 – Lavenham Wood The character area comprises land to the west of Bears Lane, south of the village, as far as Peek Lane to the west. It is fairly flat arable farmland into which incursions have been made in the 20 th by residential estates, including post-war social housing at The Meadows, ribbon development along Melford Road and Sudbury Roads, and The Glebe estate
Land parcel location and description:	The land parcel comprises a block of land adjacent to the built up area from Bears Lane in the east to Peek Lane in the west, it is bisected by the Sudbury Road and Melford Roads which split it into three parts. For location see figure: LSS-01.
Indicators of value:	Statutory landscape designations: none Non-statutory /policy designations: Ancient woodland – Lavenham Wood to the south (SSSI) The easternmost field is within the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area. Relationship to Conservation Area: No shared boundaries. No significant intervisibility
Noteworthy features:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lavenham Wood between the Sudbury and Melford Roads is a strong block of skyline woodland. • Eastern boundary with Bears Lane – a hedged lane with strong historic character • Western boundary with an historic green lane – Peek Lane (BOAT)

Table A: Landscape considerations				LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS:
Physical / landscape	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Landform	Plateau type landscape	Valley bottom landscape	Valley side landscape	The land parcel is judged to have LOW landscape sensitivity. Its plateau location is less sensitive than the adjoining valley sides. The farmland is fairly open and it is likely development could be located without loss of landscape features or direct impact on the ancient woodland. The interface with the existing estate development is abrupt and there are often weak boundaries. New development could offer scope for improving this relationship.
Pattern and enclosure	Simple, large scale open; network of hedges eroded – remnant features vegetation only	Medium scale, Hedges are gappy with some tree cover	Small scale, complex, intact network of hedges and regular hedgerow trees	
Time- depth	Little indication of time-depth	Some indication of time-depth	Strong indication of time-depth	
Settlement edge pattern	Shares abrupt interface with existing settlement, aspects of modern development already present	Settlement edge indistinct pattern, some modern elements	Porous edge to settlement, or buffered by historic landscape pattern	
Rarity and replaceability	Character or threatened features common and seen regularly in parish and/or are readily replaceable	Character or threatened features somewhat common	Character or threatened features are rare and/or difficult to replaceable	

Table B: Visual and perceptual considerations				VISUAL & PERCEPTUAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Visual and perceptual	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Visual prominence	Conditions combine to make views of land generally difficult to experience	Some views available where conditions allow	Visually prominent, part of view from many points and routes	<p>On balance, the landscape parcel is judged to have LOW visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The land parcel is not prominent in views either from the historic village or principal routes through Lavenham, owing to screening from existing estate or ribbon development.</p> <p>There is no intervisibility with the Clay Hill valleyside and its footpaths.</p> <p>Modern development has eroded this landscape. The incursions of development into the landscape in a piecemeal way, and the weakness of its boundaries in some places, create detracting features and poor relationships.</p>
Types of receptors experiencing visual change	Users of low sensitivity; e.g. road users, people at work	Moderately sensitive; e.g. some views from dwellings or small number of Listed Buildings	Highly sensitive; visitors, direct views from Listed Building and/or Conservation Area	
Vulnerability of Key outward views	Landscape not easily seen within key views out from Historic Core	Part of landscape seen in some views from Historic Core	Landscape is seen directly from Historic Core	
Vulnerability of Key inward views	No intervisibility with Historic Core	Part of Historic core perceived at some distance	Direct and/or close range views to Conservation Area	
Views from Footpaths	No views from footpaths	Views from a few points on footpaths and/or at longer range	Direct views from multiple footpaths or at close range	
Views from principal routes	Limited visibility from principle routes	Moderately visible in views from principal routes	Dominant in view from one or more principal routes	
Tranquility /activity	Rarely tranquil, regular of human activity seen and/or heard	Moderate tranquility; some human activity seen and/or heard	Relatively remote and tranquil, little human activity seen or heard	
Aesthetic perception	Simple and uniform in texture; sense of naturalness eroded; human scale features apparent	Moderately varied texture, reasonably good degree of naturalness; some features of human scale	Complex and varied texture, high degree of naturalness with few features of human scale	

Table C: Combined sensitivity judgement						
SENSITIVITY	PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE	LOW	MEDIUM		HIGH	
	VISUAL / PERCEPTUAL	LOW	MEDIUM		HIGH	
= COMBINED SENSITIVITY		LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope					ANALYSIS:
Scope for effective mitigation	SMALL GROUP	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	There is reasonably good scope to mitigate adverse effects of development in this land parcel depending on location. There are areas that could assimilate a larger development with little impact to either the landscape character or visual conditions owing to its well screened, plateau top location and eroded condition. There would be scope to improve existing weak boundaries with positive blocks of new development with buffer planting.
	SMALL ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	
	LARGE ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	

Table E: Overall sensitivity judgement						
OVERALL SENSITIVITY	SMALL GROUP development:	Low	SMALL ESTATE development:	Low	LARGE ESTATE development:	Low

Table F: GUIDANCE FOR LAND PARCEL NO. 2

In addition to the Lavenham Landscape Guidelines, the following is relevant to this land parcel:

- There is scope within this land parcel for residential development. Larger estates could possibly be accommodated provided they were carefully sited – the land to the south of Meadow Close has the greatest potential to assimilate a larger development.
- Further work would identify the areas where development could be most easily accommodated.
- Opportunities exist to restore hedged field boundaries and increase woodland cover.
- Opportunities exist improve the existing settlement edge and restore historic field patterns lost during the 20th century.

	Land Parcel No: 3
Relevant landscape character area:	LAV3 – Bridge Street Road The character area comprises land to the west of Lavenham, to the west of the permanent meadows that constitute character area LAV4. It is bounded by the railway line to the north, and Melford Road to the south.
Land parcel location and description:	The land parcel is split into two blocks, one to the rear of Green Willows and the Council depot, and another to the north and west of the tennis/cricket club grounds on Bridge Street Road. For location see figure: LSS-01.
Indicators of value:	Statutory landscape designations: none Non-statutory /policy landscape designations: none Relationship to Conservation Area: No significant intervisibility. A well-used footpath connects Potland Lane, along the rear of the sports club and a field boundary, to Bridge Street Road.
Noteworthy features:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peek Lane (BOAT) is a historic green lane which connects Bridge Street with the rear of Green Willows/Harwood Place and forms part of the boundary of the area. Land parcel is not well related to the village, it shares little of its boundaries with existing settlement boundaries. The exception is to the south where it adjoins Green Willows and the council depot (a potential development site). The rest of the area adjoins the tennis and cricket club grounds.

Table A: Landscape considerations				LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS:
Physical / landscape	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Landform	Plateau type landscape	Valley bottom landscape	Valley side landscape	<p>The land parcel appears to have, on balance, low landscape sensitivity. It is open, generally featureless farmland - there are no landscape designations indicating value and there are few features directly at risk from siting development here.</p> <p>However, the poor relationship with the existing village is a critical factor. The land parcel is isolated from the main village. Whilst the landscape is judged to have some ability to assimilate residential development here, there is the potential for it to disrupt the character of Melford Road further, and have an urbanizing effect on the countryside. On land adjacent to Bridge Street Road a similar urbanizing effect would be felt as development would break through the existing green buffer zone provided by the sports clubs grounds and the permanent grassland adjacent, and have a strong impact on the landscape.</p> <p>The landscape sensitivity is judged at MEDIUM.</p>
Pattern and enclosure	Simple, large-scale open; network of hedges eroded – remnant features vegetation only	Medium scale, Hedges are gappy with some tree cover	Small scale, complex, intact network of hedges and regular hedgerow trees	
Time- depth	Little indication of time-depth	Some indication of time-depth	Strong indication of time-depth	
Settlement edge pattern	Shares abrupt interface with existing settlement, aspects of modern development already present	Settlement edge indistinct pattern, some modern elements	Porous edge to settlement, or buffered by historic landscape pattern	
Rarity and replaceability	Character or threatened features are common and seen regularly in parish and/or are readily replaceable	Character or threatened features somewhat common	Character or threatened features are rare and/or difficult to replaceable	

Table B: Visual and perceptual considerations				VISUAL & PERCEPTUAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Visual and perceptual	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Visual prominence	Conditions combine to make views of land difficult to experience	Some views available where conditions allow	Visually prominent, part of view from many points and routes	<p>The land parcel is judged to have LOW visual and perceptual sensitivity. The land parcel is isolated and not experienced from the historic core although part of the area falls within one of the 'defined views'. The fringes of the parcel and the adjoining parcel to the south experience high recreational use by walkers. Effects are more likely to be experienced by local residents than tourists. The parcel is not seen from the main road network.</p>
Type of receptors experiencing visual change	Users of low sensitivity; e.g. road users, people at work	Moderately sensitive; e.g. some views from dwellings or small number of Listed Buildings	Highly sensitive; visitors, direct views from Listed Building and/or Conservation Area	
Vulnerability of Key outward views	Landscape not easily seen within key views out from Historic Core	Part of landscape seen in some views from Historic Core	Landscape is seen directly from Historic Core	
Vulnerability of Key inward views	No intervisibility with Historic Core	Part of Historic core perceived at some distance	Direct and/or close range views to Conservation Area	
Views from Footpaths	No views from footpaths	Views from a few points on footpaths and/or at longer range	Direct views from multiple footpaths or at close range	
Views from principal routes	Negligible visibility from principle routes	Moderately visible in views from principal routes	Dominant in view from one or more principal routes	
Tranquility /activity	Rarely tranquil, regular of human activity seen and/or heard	Moderate tranquility and some human activity seen and/or heard	Relatively remote and tranquil, little human activity seen or heard	
Aesthetic perception	Simple and uniform in texture; sense of naturalness eroded; human scale features apparent	Moderately varied texture, reasonably good degree of naturalness; some features of human scale	Complex and varied texture, high degree of naturalness with few features of human scale	

SENSITIVITY	PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
	VISUAL / PERCEPTUAL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
= COMBINED SENSITIVITY		LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope					ANALYSIS:
Scope for effective mitigation	SMALL GROUP	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	The land north of Bridge Street Road with its fairly open nature, and rural character provides little framework to help assimilate development, especially given the deep green buffer on the village edge here. New development would be poorly related to and integrated with existing built form. However, secondary mitigation measures, such as (substantial) screening planting could be effective at containing the visual effects and could form part of measures to restore and enhance character as condition is poor in places. Smaller sized developments would be a better fit than a large estate which Land at Green Meadows feels less rural owing to the existing residential land use and is less visually prominent.
	SMALL ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	
	LARGE ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	

OVERALL SENSITIVITY	SMALL GROUP development:	Moderate low	SMALL ESTATE development:	Moderate low	LARGE ESTATE development:	Moderate
---------------------	--------------------------	--------------	---------------------------	--------------	---------------------------	----------

Table F: GUIDANCE FOR LAND PARCEL NO. 3

In addition to the Lavenham Landscape Guidelines, the following is relevant to this land parcel:

- There is some scope within this land parcel for residential development in landscape and visual terms, however land here is isolated from the main village. The land to the rear of Green Willows is least sensitive but most distant.
- Further work would identify the areas where development could be most easily accommodated.
- Opportunities exist to restore hedged field boundaries and increase woodland cover.
- Opportunities exist improve the existing settlement edge and restore historic field patterns lost during the 20th century.

	Land Parcel No: 4
Relevant landscape character area:	LAV4 - Western meadows The area comprises a series of meadows bounding the village on its west side, from a narrow strip just north of the old railway line to as far south as the playing fields on Bridge Street road
Land parcel location and description:	The land parcel includes almost the entire character area, as most of it is proximate to the settlement edge. For location see figure: LSS-01.
Indicators of value:	Statutory landscape designations: none Non statutory / Policy designations: None Relationship to Conservation Area: Setting of Grade I listed building (church) partly within land parcel. Limited views from Conservation Area.
Noteworthy features:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prominent church tower is landmark in southern end of the parcel • Railway walk forms strong linear feature in valley bottom to the north, screens wider views • Intact network of hedges and tall trees usually contain views

Table A: Landscape considerations				LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Physical / landscape	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Landform	Plateau type landscape	Valley bottom landscape	Valley side landscape	The land parcel is judged to have HIGH landscape sensitivity. These areas of permanent grassland may have been under grass for centuries because their seasonally wet nature precludes their usefulness for arable cropping. The poorly drained soils are the reason they have remained as pasture and retained their network of hedgerows and hedgerow trees. They represent a relatively intact historic landscape and modern development has not intruded. This character type is rare and it would be difficult to replace.
Pattern and enclosure	Simple, large scale open; network of hedges eroded – remnant features vegetation only	Medium scale, Hedges are gappy with some tree cover	Small scale, complex, intact network of hedges and regular hedgerow trees	
Time- depth	Little indication of time-depth	Some indication of time-depth	Strong indication of time-depth	
Settlement edge pattern	Shares abrupt interface with existing settlement, aspects of modern development already present	Settlement edge indistinct pattern, some modern elements	Porous edge to settlement, or buffered by historic landscape pattern	
Rarity and replaceability	Character or threatened features are common and seen regularly in parish and/or are readily replaceable	Character or threatened features somewhat common	Character or threatened features are rare and/or difficult to replaceable	

Table B: Visual and perceptual considerations				VISUAL & PERCEPTUAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Visual and perceptual considerations	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Visual prominence	Conditions combine to make views of land difficult to experience	Some views available where conditions allow	Visually prominent, part of view from many points and routes	<p>On balance, the land parcel is judged to have MEDIUM visual and perceptual sensitivity. The meadows are often visually well contained and not easily experienced. The old railway line and the continuous developed frontage of the High Street to the north and east generally prevent views into this area; although some visibility from the Brights Drift character area is possible at distance. Much of the parcel has no visual relationship with the Historic Core – the meadows in the north of the parcel particularly. Some sensitive views are possible from points in the western/southern part of the parcel, where the lanes are important routes for local walkers, but tall hedges continue to provide enclosure and screening. Here, the tall church tower looms overhead and is a very prominent landmark. There is high recreation use by walkers through and on the perimeter of the parcel. The proximity to the village and main road mean that it is not always tranquil. Timber fencing is often the only human scale element seen and the overall effect of attractive pastoral land use prevails.</p>
Type of receptors Experiencing visual change	Users of low sensitivity; e.g. road users, people at work	Moderately sensitive; e.g. some views from dwellings or small number of Listed Buildings	Highly sensitive; visitors, direct views from Listed Building and/or Conservation Area	
Vulnerability of Key outward views	Landscape not easily seen within key views out from Historic Core	Part of landscape seen in some views from Historic Core	Landscape is seen directly from Historic Core	
Vulnerability of Key inward views	No intervisibility with Historic Core	Part of Historic core perceived at some distance	Direct and/or close range views to Conservation Area	
Views from Footpaths	No views from footpaths	Views from a few points on footpaths and/or at longer range	Direct views from multiple footpaths or at close range	
Views from principal routes	Negligible visibility from principle routes	Moderately visible in views from principal routes	Dominant in view from one or more principal routes	
Tranquility /activity	Rarely tranquil, regular of human activity seen and/or heard	Moderate tranquility and some human activity seen and/or heard	Relatively remote and tranquil, little human activity seen or heard	
Aesthetic perception	Simple and uniform in texture; sense of naturalness eroded; human scale features apparent	Moderately varied texture, reasonably good degree of naturalness; some features of human scale	Complex and varied texture, high degree of naturalness with few features of human scale	

Table C: Combined sensitivity judgement						
SENSITIVITY	PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
	VISUAL / PERCEPTUAL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
= COMBINED SENSITIVITY		LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope					ANALYSIS:
Scope for effective mitigation	SMALL GROUP	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	<p>This parcel is very sensitive in landscape terms but is less sensitive in visual terms owing to its generally enclosed, well vegetated character. It has little relationship with the historic core of the village, except those meadows furthest south/west which can be seen as part of the setting to the church. Areas such as those to the rear of Norman Way and Deacons Close are particularly hard to experience.</p> <p>There is decreasing scope for successful mitigation with increasing development size. The small scale, enclosed character with intact hedges could suggest a framework for mitigation through similarly continuous screening planting.</p>
	SMALL ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	
	LARGE ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	

Table E: Overall sensitivity judgement						
OVERALL SENSITIVITY	SMALL GROUP development	Moderate	SMALL ESTATE development	Moderate-high	LARGE ESTATE development	High

Table F: GUIDANCE FOR LAND PARCEL NO. 4

In addition to the Lavenham Landscape Guidelines, the following is relevant to this land parcel:

- Development may be acceptable in areas with lower visual sensitivity.
- Development must be avoided where both landscape and visual sensitivity is high, for example where it would significantly harm the setting of key heritage features such as Lavenham church.
- Ensure siting of new development is closely related to existing village
- Reflect grain of field boundary patterns
- Ensure retention of all existing natural features including ditches, hedges and hedgebanks, and trees.
- Provide substantial planted buffers that help integrate development, linking into network of existing boundaries

	Land Parcel No: 5
Relevant landscape character area:	LAV5 – Brights Drift The character area comprises plateau farmland to the north of Lavenham between the A1141 to the north and to Bridge Street in the west. It includes the old airfield and a complex of large agricultural buildings at Brights Farm. It is fairly open, with long views to the far valley side with large field sizes. Some pockets of woodland, hedges and remnant isolated boundary oaks.
Land parcel location and description:	The land parcel comprises the gently sloping land north of the railway line adjacent to the recently planted community woodland to the west of the Bury Road bridge, and east of Park Road. For location see figure: LSS-01.
Indicators of value:	Statutory landscape designations: none Non-statutory /policy designations: none Relationship to Conservation Area: No significant intervisibility
Noteworthy features:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The old railway and adjacent meadow system is a strong, well vegetated linear feature and severs this land parcel from the village

Table A: Landscape considerations				LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS:
Physical / landscape	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Landform	Plateau type landscape	Valley bottom landscape	Valley side landscape	The land parcel is judged to have MEDIUM landscape sensitivity. It is open, featureless farmland and contrasts strongly with the character of the low lying, enclosed meadows to the south. There would be few features directly at risk from siting development here but it is sensitive in that it has a poor relationship with existing settlement edge. Development here would not fit the pattern and constitute an obtrusive break into open countryside.
Pattern and enclosure	Simple, large scale open; network of hedges eroded – remnant features vegetation only	Medium scale, Hedges are gappy with some tree cover	Small scale, complex, intact network of hedges and regular hedgerow trees	
Time- depth	Little indication of time-depth	Some indication of time-depth	Strong indication of time-depth	
Settlement edge pattern	Shares abrupt interface with existing settlement, aspects of modern development already present	Settlement edge indistinct pattern, some modern elements		
Rarity and replaceability	Character or threatened features are common and seen regularly in parish and/or are readily replaceable	Character or threatened features somewhat common	Character or threatened features are rare and/or difficult to replaceable	

Table B: Visual and perceptual considerations				VISUAL & PERCEPTUAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Visual and perceptual	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Visual prominence	Conditions combine to make views of land difficult to experience	Some views available where conditions allow	Visually prominent, part of view from many points and routes	<p>On balance, the land parcel is judged to have MEDIUM visual and perceptual sensitivity. The land parcel is not readily experienced from the historic core; the old railway line and the continuous developed frontage of the High Street generally prevent views into this area. The fringes of the parcel and the adjoining parcel to the south experience high recreational use by walkers. Effects are more likely to be experienced by local residents than tourists. Glimpses in are briefly possible on the Bury Road just north of the bridge but this parcel is not seen from the main road network.</p>
Type of receptors Experiencing visual change	Users of low sensitivity; e.g. road users, people at work	Moderately sensitive; e.g. some views from dwellings or small number of Listed Buildings	Highly sensitive; visitors, direct views from Listed Building and/or Conservation Area	
Vulnerability of Key outward views	Landscape not easily seen within key views out from Historic Core	Part of landscape seen in some views from Historic Core	Landscape is seen directly from Historic Core	
Vulnerability of Key inward views	No intervisibility with Historic Core	Part of Historic core perceived at some distance	Direct and/or close range views to Conservation Area	
Views from Footpaths	No views from footpaths	Views from a few points on footpaths and/or at longer range	Direct views from multiple footpaths or at close range	
Views from principal routes	Negligible visibility from principle routes	Moderately visible in views from principal routes	Dominant in view from one or more principal routes	
Tranquility /activity	Rarely tranquil, regular of human activity seen and/or heard	Moderate tranquility and some human activity seen and/or heard	Relatively remote and tranquil, little human activity seen or heard	
Aesthetic perception	Simple and uniform in texture; sense of naturalness eroded; human scale features apparent	Moderately varied texture, reasonably good degree of naturalness; some features of human scale		

SENSITIVITY	PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
	VISUAL / PERCEPTUAL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
= COMBINED SENSITIVITY		LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope					ANALYSIS:
Scope for effective mitigation	SMALL GROUP	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	Owing to the severance created by the linear belt of railway/meadow landscape, and the simple open nature of the landscape, it would be hard to integrate development sympathetically into this land parcel. The abrupt, linear edge and lack of existing features provide little to help assimilate development it would be discordant with the existing pattern, whatever the size of the development. However, secondary mitigation measures, such as screening planting would be broadly effective at containing the visual effects and could reflect the character of the adjacent railway line belt.
	SMALL ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	
	LARGE ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	

OVERALL SENSITIVITY	SMALL GROUP development:	Moderate high	SMALL ESTATE development:	Moderate high	LARGE ESTATE development:	Moderate high
----------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------------	---------------

Table F: GUIDANCE FOR LAND PARCEL NO.5

In addition to the Lavenham Landscape Guidelines, the following is relevant to this land parcel:

- Residential development is not generally appropriate in this land parcel. It would represent a break into open countryside, through the existing strong settlement edge provided by the well-vegetated old railway line.
- The far eastern part of the parcel is the least sensitive part of the parcel, where it adjoins existing settlement along Bury Road but it has recently planted up as a community woodland so is unlikely to come forward. Detailed work at a site level would be needed to assess potential impacts of development here.
- Other land use change would have to demonstrate regard for the character of the area, and seek opportunities to restore hedged field boundaries and increase woodland cover.

	Land parcel No. 6
Relevant landscape character area:	LAV6 – Clay Hill The character area comprises the rolling valley side east of Lavenham, from the A1141 Bury Road in the north to beyond Clay Lane in the south.
Land parcel location and description:	The land parcels selected for assessment are the fields immediately next to the edge of the village along the western edge of the character area. They can be accessed from Norman Way, Park Road and Potland Lane. For location see figure: LSS-01.
Indicators of value:	Statutory landscape designations: none Non-statutory /policy designations: South of Preston Road, the area is within the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area. Relationship to Conservation Area: The western part of the parcel is included in the Conservation Area. There is significant inter-visibility with the historic core.
Noteworthy features:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very attractive and distinctive rolling topography • The river Brett winds through the valley bottom and forms the eastern edge to the village • Forms part of setting to medieval east side of Lavenham • A number of well used footpaths traverse the valley side • Lower Road and Frog Hall Lane have historic lane character

Table A: Landscape considerations				LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS:
Physical / landscape	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Landform	Plateau type landscape	Valley bottom landscape	Valley side landscape	<p>The land parcel is judged to have HIGH landscape sensitivity. Its attractive, rolling valley side character would be unable to assimilate development without significant effect. The character of the farmed valley sides have been partly eroded, with significant boundary loss, and the condition of some hedgerows and the river corridor could be improved. However, a strong sense of the underlying ancient landscape pattern remains, there are no detracting features and the backdrop of the historic village adjacent exerts a strong influence.</p> <p>The river corridor constitutes a strong historic edge to the village on its east side, any break beyond this would be obtrusive.</p>
Pattern and enclosure	Simple, large scale open; network of hedges eroded – remnant features vegetation only	Medium scale, Hedges are gappy with some tree cover	Small scale, complex, intact network of hedges and regular hedgerow trees	
Time- depth	Little indication of time-depth	Some indication of time-depth	Strong indication of time-depth	
Settlement edge pattern	Shares abrupt interface with existing settlement, aspects of modern development already present	Settlement edge indistinct pattern, some modern elements	Porous edge to settlement, or buffered by historic landscape pattern	
Rarity and replaceability	Character or threatened features common and seen regularly in parish and/or are readily replaceable	Character or threatened features somewhat common	Character or threatened features are rare and/or difficult to replaceable	

Table B: Visual and perceptual considerations				VISUAL & PERCEPTUAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Visual and perceptual	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Visual prominence	Conditions combine to make views of land generally difficult to experience	Some views available where conditions allow	Visually prominent, part of view from many points and routes	<p>The visual sensitivity of this is land parcel is HIGH. The dramatic rolling valleyside is a key component of the views out from Prentice and Bolton Streets. For this reason the area included within the views is designated as part of the Conservation Area, it forms part of the setting of Lavenham’s medieval core. Development east of the river would constitute a break into open countryside, be generally prominent and be hard to mitigate against.</p> <p>However, there may be areas in the north of the parcel with lower sensitivity. More detailed work would be needed to assess this.</p>
Types of receptors experiencing visual change	Users of low sensitivity; e.g. road users, people at work	Moderately sensitive; e.g. some views from dwellings or small number of Listed Buildings	Highly sensitive; visitors, direct views from Listed Building and/or Conservation Area	
Vulnerability of Key outward views	Landscape not easily seen within key views out from Historic Core	Part of landscape seen in some views from Historic Core	Landscape is seen directly from Historic Core	
Vulnerability of Key inward views	No intervisibility with Historic Core	Part of Historic core perceived at some distance	Direct and/or close range views to Conservation Area	
Views from Footpaths	No views from footpaths	Views from a few points on footpaths and/or at longer range	Direct views from multiple footpaths or at close range	
Views from principal routes	Limited visibility from principle routes	Moderately visible in views from principal routes	Dominant in view from one or more principal routes	
Tranquility /activity	Rarely tranquil, regular of human activity seen and/or heard	Moderate tranquility; some human activity seen and/or heard	Relatively remote and tranquil, little human activity seen or heard	
Aesthetic perception	Simple and uniform in texture; sense of naturalness eroded; human scale features apparent	Moderately varied texture, reasonably good degree of naturalness; some features of human scale	Complex and varied texture, high degree of naturalness with few features of human scale	

Table C: Combined sensitivity judgement						
SENSITIVITY	PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
	VISUAL / PERCEPTUAL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
= COMBINED SENSITIVITY		LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope					ANALYSIS:
Scope for effective mitigation	SMALL GROUP	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	There is little scope to mitigate the adverse effects that development in this area would cause, regardless of development size. New development would form a break across the traditional settlement boundary of the river corridor which would be inappropriate. The undulating topography is a key limiting factor, development would be prominent on these valley sides and cause significant adverse visual effects. Belts of screening planting would be partly successful although not wholly in accordance with prevailing vegetation patterns east of the Brett.
	SMALL ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	
	LARGE ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	

Table E: Overall sensitivity judgement						
OVERALL SENSITIVITY	SMALL GROUP development:	High	SMALL ESTATE development:	High	LARGE ESTATE development:	High

Table F: GUIDANCE FOR LAND PARCEL NO.6

In addition to the Lavenham Landscape Guidelines, the following is relevant to this land parcel:

- Owing to the high landscape and visual sensitivity, residential development is not appropriate to the east of the river channel.
- There may be some areas in the north of the parcel, adjoining existing settlement, that are less sensitive, but more detailed work at a site level would be needed to assess potential impacts of development here.
- Other land use change would have to demonstrate regard for the character of the area and not cause harm to key views from the historic core.
- Opportunities to improve condition of river corridor and remove invasive species should be sought.

Land Parcel No. 7	
Relevant landscape character area:	LAV7 – The Common The character area generally comprises the valley bottom of the Brett, south of The Common/Lower Road. It is a mix of Public Open Space and grazing meadows.
Land parcel location and description:	The land parcel is the only part of the character area where development is feasible. It is a small area of undeveloped meadow land at the foot of the valley side, west of Lower Road. For location see figure: LSS-01.
Indicators of value:	Statutory designations: none Non-statutory /policy designations: South of Preston Road, the area is within the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area Relationship to Conservation Area: The parcel is entirely within the Conservation Area.
Noteworthy features:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meadows are on the edge of the grid of medieval streets and are integrated into the grain of the historic core. Historic brickworks were located here The meadows have some very mature trees along their boundaries. Lower Road, adjacent to river, has a strong historic lane character.


Physical / landscape	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Landform	Plateau type landscape	Valley bottom landscape 	Valley side landscape	<p>The land parcel is judged to have HIGH landscape sensitivity.</p> <p>It is a very sensitive village edge setting contiguous with the oldest parts of the village. Strong time-depth indicators endure such as the small field size, intact vegetated boundaries and enduring meadow land-use. There are few detracting features. The character of Lower Road is also sensitive.</p>
Pattern and enclosure	Simple, large scale open; network of hedges eroded – remnant features vegetation only	Medium scale, Hedges are gappy with some tree cover	Small scale, complex, intact network of hedges and regular hedgerow trees	
Time- depth	Little indication of time-depth	Some indication of time-depth	Strong indication of time-depth	
Settlement edge pattern	Shares abrupt interface with existing settlement, aspects of modern development already present	Settlement edge indistinct pattern, some modern elements	Porous edge to settlement, or buffered by historic landscape pattern	
Rarity and replaceability	Character or threatened features common and seen regularly in parish and/or are readily replaceable	Character or threatened features somewhat common	Character or threatened features are rare and/or difficult to replaceable	

Table B: Visual and perceptual considerations				VISUAL & PERCEPTUAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS
Visual and perceptual	Lower sensitivity	Medium sensitivity	Higher sensitivity	
Visual prominence	Conditions combine to make views of land generally difficult to experience	Some views available where conditions allow	Visually prominent, part of view from many points and routes	<p>The visual sensitivity of this is land parcel is MEDIUM</p> <p>The parcel is seen from Lower Road in the area where it joins Clay Lane but further north the hedged character prevents views in at closer range. It is hard to experience views into the meadows from within the village itself.</p> <p>Some of the most direct views are experienced from the footpaths on the other side of the valley on Clay Hill (LAV6) where the parcel is seen as a soft edge to the village and its vegetation helps absorb the built form on the valley side. It is a key component of the low density, soft character of the historic part of the village.</p>
Types of receptors experiencing visual change	Users of low sensitivity; e.g. road users, people at work	Moderately sensitive; e.g. some views from dwellings or small number of Listed Buildings	Highly sensitive; visitors, direct views from Listed Building and/or Conservation Area	
Vulnerability of Key outward views	Landscape not easily seen within key views out from Historic Core	Part of landscape seen in some views from Historic Core	Landscape is seen directly from Historic Core	
Vulnerability of Key inward views	No intervisibility with Historic Core	Part of Historic core perceived at some distance	Direct and/or close range views to Conservation Area	
Views from Footpaths	No views from footpaths	Views from a few points on footpaths and/or at longer range	Direct views from multiple footpaths or at close range	
Views from principal routes	Limited visibility from principle routes	Moderately visible in views from principal routes	Dominant in view from one or more principal routes	
Tranquility /activity	Rarely tranquil, regular of human activity seen and/or heard	Moderate tranquility; some human activity seen and/or heard	Relatively remote and tranquil, little human activity seen or heard	
Aesthetic perception	Simple and uniform in texture; sense of naturalness eroded; human scale features apparent	Moderately varied texture, reasonably good degree of naturalness; some features of human scale	Complex and varied texture, high degree of naturalness with few features of human scale	

Table C: Combined sensitivity judgement						
SENSITIVITY	PHYSICAL LANDSCAPE	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
	VISUAL / PERCEPTUAL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
= COMBINED SENSITIVITY		LOW	MEDIUM-LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM-HIGH	HIGH

Table D: Assessment of mitigation scope					ANALYSIS:
Scope for effective mitigation	SMALL GROUP	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	There is some scope for mitigation on the brick works meadows as there is an existing network of mature vegetation to link into and space for buffer planting. However, the valleyside location means it is unlikely that the roofscapes could be entirely screened. Small developments are most mitigatable here. It remains a visually important space, providing green space on the edge of the historic core. Lower Lane is also important to local character and it would be vulnerable to adverse effects from upgrading it to current highways standards.
	SMALL ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	
	LARGE ESTATE	GOOD Mitigation of adverse effects feasible and likely to be sympathetic to character	MEDIUM Some scope for effective mitigation measures; not wholly discordant with character	LIMITED Prevailing conditions mean mitigation difficult or likely to be discordant with character	

Table E: Overall sensitivity judgement						
OVERALL SENSITIVITY	SMALL GROUP development:	Moderate high	SMALL ESTATE development:	High	LARGE ESTATE development:	High

Table F: GUIDANCE FOR LAND PARCEL NO.7

In addition to the Lavenham Landscape Guidelines, the following is relevant to this land parcel:

- Owing to the high landscape and visual sensitivity, as well as other constraints, residential development is generally not appropriate on the flood plain.
- There may be some scope for limited development in the meadows west of Lower Road but more detailed work at a site level would be needed to assess potential impacts of development here.
 - Development must not cause significant harm to key views out of the historic core, or to views back to the village edge from Clay Hill.
 - The vegetative features are important part of the character of the village edge and must be retained.
 - Ensure any highways design has as little impact as possible to conserve the character of Lower Road.
- Other land use change would have to demonstrate a high regard for the character of the area and its visual prominence.

References

The following documents were referred to in formulating the methodologies for this report:

Guidance on assessing the sensitivity of the landscape of the East of England. LUC/Landscape East (2011)

Topic paper 6: Techniques and Criteria for judging Capacity and sensitivity. The Countryside Agency/Scottish Natural Heritage (2002)

Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) Third Edition. Landscape Institute and IEMA (2013)

An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment. Christine Tudor - Natural England, (2014)

Natural England, National Character Areas

Suffolk County Council Landscape Character Assessment

Tewkesbury Borough Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study. Toby Jones Associates (2014)

Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study. LUC (2014)

Landscape sensitivity study for land south of Little Wymondley. LUC/ North Hertfordshire District Council (2013)

Landscape Sensitivity to Wind Turbine and Solar PV Development DRAFT REPORT. Milton Keynes Council/Gillespies LLP (2015)

Addendum A1 Example landscape and visual sensitivity indicators

Conditions that may indicate sensitivity value:		
	Landscape indicators	Visual indicators
High	<p>Distinctive and/or representative landscape character that is, because of its nature, vulnerable</p> <p>Valued landscape character intact with few detracting features or elements. Features and elements themselves in good condition.</p> <p>Evidence of extensive "Time Depth" (patterns and features representative of the evolution of the landscape through time.)</p> <p>The presence of distinct, characteristic or valued landscape features and elements that are vulnerable to residential development and that may not be replaced or substituted.</p> <p>Limited opportunities for mitigation without detrimental effects on the prevailing character.</p>	<p>The land parcel is exposed or prominent.</p> <p>The land parcel is exposed to visual receptors with a medium to high sensitivity to new residential development in the view.</p> <p>The land parcel is exposed to a large number of visual receptors.</p> <p>There are limited opportunities for screening or mitigation within the land parcel or the screening would in itself cause adverse visual effects.</p> <p>Development within the land parcel would bring about a notable change in settlement form or pattern, which in turn would be prominent.</p> <p>Development within the land parcel might cause the loss of established views or views of valued features and elements in the landscape</p>
Medium	<p>There are recognisable characteristics within the land parcel that relate to the wider landscapes of which some are vulnerable.</p> <p>There are landscape features and elements within the land parcel worthy of retention and enhancement.</p> <p>The land parcel displays a degree of time depth with patterns and features reflecting aspects of the evolution of the landscape.</p> <p>Some opportunities exist to mitigate residential development using characteristic features and elements.</p>	<p>Some screening is provided by existing settlement, vegetation or topography.</p> <p>The land parcel is exposed to some visual receptors including a limited number with medium and high sensitivity to new residential development.</p> <p>There is some limited visual mitigation potential within the land parcel (screening and precedent visual elements).</p> <p>Development within the land parcel might cause a slight perception of a change in settlement form and pattern but not notable or material</p>
Low	<p>The prevailing character of the land parcel is not distinctive, nor typical</p> <p>The character within the land parcel is fragmented with detracting features and elements.</p> <p>Features and elements are in poor or declining condition and are not in themselves "valued".</p> <p>Limited or no "time depth" apparent within the land parcel.</p> <p>Opportunities exist within the land parcel to mitigate residential development using characteristic features and elements of the landscape.</p>	<p>The land parcel is effectively screened by settlement, vegetation or topography from the majority of surrounding vantages.</p> <p>The land parcel is exposed to a limited number of low to medium sensitivity visual receptors.</p> <p>There is appropriate and effective mitigation potential within the land parcel where the mitigation will not in itself become prominent or cause adverse visual effects.</p> <p>The land parcel relates well to the existing settlement form and pattern.</p> <p>Opportunities exist for new residential development within the land parcel to deliver improvements in the visual environment.</p> <p>Development could occur within the land parcel with no or limited loss of established and valued views or views of valued features and elements.</p>