

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

DECEMBER 2014

FINAL ISSUE



CONTENTS

2	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
3	INTRODUCTION
4	METHODOLOGY OUTLINE
5-10	ANALYSIS OF LVA RESULTS
6-7	Figure 1: Relative Ranking of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity of All Developmnet Sites in Gedling Borough
8	Figure 2: Relative Ranking of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity of All Developmnet Sites in Arnold
8	Figure 3: Relative Ranking of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity of All Developmnet Sites in Calverton
9	Figure 4: Relative Ranking of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity of Developmnet Sites in Other Settlements (excluding Arnold / Calverton / Ravenshead)
10	Figure 5: Relative Ranking of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity of All Deveopment Sites in Ravenshead
10	Figure 6: Relative Ranking of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity of Cumulative Developmnet Sites
11-220	APPENDIX A: PR0-FORMAS AND DATA SHEETS
11-44	Arnold
45-86	Calverton
87-110	Ravenshead
111-193	Other Sites
194-220	Cumulative Assessments
221-232	APPENDIX B: LVIA METHODOLOGY
221-232	LVA Methodology

REVISION SCHEDULE					
Rev	Date	Details	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by
1	November 2014	Draft	Rose Walker (Graduate Landscape Architect)	Nigel Weir (Associate Landscape Architect)	Nigel Weir (Associate Landscape Architect)
2	December 2014	Final issue	Rose Walker (Graduate Landscape Architect)	Nigel Weir (Associate Landscape Architect)	Nigel Weir (Associate Landscape Architect)

LIMITATIONS

URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited ("URS") has prepared this Report for the sole use of Gedling Borough Council ("Client") in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed (Proposal dated 29/9/2014). No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by URS.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by URS has not been independently verified by URS, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

The methodology adopted and the sources of information used by URS in providing its services are outlined in this Report. The work described in this Report was undertaken between 29/09/2014 and 02/12/2014 and is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the said period of time. The scope of this Report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

Where assessments of works or costs identified in this Report are made, such assessments are based upon the information available at the time and where appropriate are subject to further investigations or information which may become available.

URS disclaim any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the Report, which may come or be brought to URS' attention after the date of the Report.

Certain statements made in the Report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the Report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. URS specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this Report.

Where field investigations are carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to meet the stated objectives of the services. The results of any measurements taken may vary spatially or with time and further confirmatory measurements should be made after any significant delay in issuing this Report.

© This Report is the copyright of URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

OS Copyright. Contains Ordnance Survey Data © Crown Copyright and database right 2014. Reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data © Crown copyright 2014. All rights reserved. Licence number 0100031673. Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown Copyright, Licence No. LA1000021246. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2014 Gedling Borough Council appointed URS to undertake a Landscape and Visual Analysis ('LVA') of potential development sites. The LVAs will be used along with other information to make decisions about which sites should be allocated for development in the second part of the Local Plan. The impact that development will have on the landscape and on visual amenity are important factors to be weighed in the balance; therefore a systematic professional assessment of these impacts needs to be undertaken in order to fully understand the consequences of development on each site and to identify any emerging opportunities to mitigate these.

The LVAs assess a number of sites which are considered 'reasonable alternatives' for allocation. In total 88 sites have been assessed and where appropriate some of these sites are also assessed as 'clusters'. Each site has been assessed for both its impact on the landscape and its visual impact; reflected in a score for each which is combined to give an overall score of sensitivity. Equal weighting has been given to landscape and visual sensitivity and the elements of susceptibility and value which are combined to establish them.

A full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) suitable for a planning application, however, has not been undertaken because a full LVIA needs to respond to a specific development proposal, rather than just a general development type within a red line. However, the scale of work undertaken in this report is of sufficient detail to inform the preparation of the second part of the Local Plan.

For each site, or groups of sites, findings are presented in the form of an A3 pro-forma of landscape and visual sensitivity scoring based on a range of criteria with an accompanying plan which illustrates the characteristics and setting of the site and any recommendations for mitigation. The mitigation recommendations are provided for guidance to developers and have not been factored into the assessments of site sensitivity. The pro-forma outputs and data sheets are included as Appendix A, organised by settlement.

The guidance/methodology relating to completion of the pro-formas is included as Appendix B.

The relative ranking of sites, based on the sensitivity scoring, is presented in a series of spreadsheets and is mapped for the settlements of Arnold, Calverton and Ravenshead, for ease of reference. The detail of the individual assessments is contained in the pro-forma and accompanying data sheet.



View looking north across Calverton from the footpath at Fox Wood



View looking west towards Shelt Hill in Woodborough from the footpath which runs from Shelt Hill to Fox Covert

INTRODUCTION

Gedling Borough Council has worked with neighbouring authorities to prepare an aligned planning strategy. This plan, the Aligned Core Strategy, sets the overarching strategy and allocates a number of large strategic sites and was adopted by Gedling Borough Council on 10th September 2014.

Following on from the Aligned Core Strategy, the Council is preparing the second part of its Local Plan known as the Local Planning Document. This document will include more detailed policies for use in assessing planning applications and will also allocate a number of non-strategic sites.

As part of the Aligned Core Strategy process a Landscape Character Assessment 2009 ('LCA') has been prepared for the county of Nottinghamshire by Nottinghamshire County Council. The LCA has assessed the condition and character of larger parcels of land and divided the area into a number of Draft Policy Zones. These are areas of similar landscape character with a unique sense of place. The LCA, however, is a strategic assessment rather than a field by field, or site by site, assessment and it is therefore necessary to supplement that work in order to derive the evidence base for the allocation of development sites.

In order to make decisions about which sites should be allocated for future development, it will be necessary to consider a number of different factors. These factors include the impact on the landscape and the visual impact resulting from development of the site. Impacts on landscape and on visual amenity are important factors to be weighed in the balance; therefore a systematic professional assessment of these impacts needs to be undertaken in order to fully understand the consequences of development on each site and to identify any emerging opportunities to mitigate these.

The LVAs assess a number of sites which are considered by Gedling Borough Council to be 'reasonable alternatives' for allocation. In total 88 sites have been assessed and where appropriate some of these sites are also assessed as 'clusters' in order to determine cumulative effects. In addition, opportunities to potentially mitigate some of the effects of development on each site have been identified and mapped wherever possible.

Each site has been visited by a pair of Landscape Architects and assessed for both its landscape and visual sensitivity using a methodology based on the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute for Environmental Management & Assessment in 2013. A full Landscape and Visual Impact Analysis (LVIA) suitable for a planning application, however, has not been undertaken because a full LVIA needs to respond to a specific development proposal, rather than just a general development type within a red line. However, the scale of work undertaken in this report is of sufficient detail to inform the preparation of part 2 of the Local Plan.

For each site or groups of sites, findings are presented in the form of an A3 pro-forma with accompanying plan which illustrates the characteristics and setting. The pro-forma outputs and plans are grouped by settlement in Appendix A and are ordered by their site reference numbers.

METHODOLOGY OUTLINE

Various approaches to the assessment of the impacts of development on landscape and visual amenity have been considered, including the methodology used by Ashfield District Council and other Greater Nottingham authorities. This methodology was considered as a potential for the Gedling assessment and the pros and cons of the methodology were assessed accordingly. Whilst the Ashfield methodology was strong in terms of visual outputs and in identifying potential mitigation opportunities, it preceded the publication of "Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment" (referred to as GLVIA3) in 2013. It was considered that the Gedling LVA should conform with GLVIA3, which is the current guidance used by professionals in the assessment of landscape and visual effects and therefore a separate methodology was devised for the assessment in Gedling Borough.

The assessment has therefore been undertaken using a combination of the "Living Landscapes Project" methodology (2002), which formed the basis for the Nottinghamshire LCA, and "Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment" (2013), referred to as GLVIA3. Both rely on professional judgment, and a structured approach to assessment, based on evidence.

The proposed development site analysis represents a more fine grained landscape character assessment within the hierarchical context of the Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment 2009 and also considers the visual aspects of potential development and opportunities for mitigation of impacts of development.

Key characteristics of landform, settlement pattern, land cover, tree cover are assessed in relation to the Site, Study Area and Policy Zone. In accordance with GLVIA3 methodology, the Study Area is defined primarily by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and professional judgment. The assessment relates to sensitivity of the Study Area defined by the ZTV mapping. The ZTV mapping is based on new built development assumed to be 7m in height (a two storey house) within the development site and takes into consideration existing woodland within the model (assumed to be 13m high) and existing built development (assumed to be 7m high).

A scoring system has been used for each part of the analysis leading to an overall score. The basis of the scoring has been set out in a pro-forma sheet and applies to the development of the site before any mitigation is implemented. The overall score is the sum total of each of the scores for the categories of Landscape Value, Landscape Susceptibility, Visual Value, and Visual Susceptibility. In accordance with the GLVIA3 methodology, susceptibility and value are the key determinants of sensitivity for both landscape and visual effects.

- Landscape Susceptibility + Landscape Value = Landscape Sensitivity
- Visual Susceptibility + Visual Value = Visual Sensitivity
- Landscape Sensitivity + Visual Sensitivity = Overall Score

Landscape Value is defined as the relative value that is attached to landscape by society; Landscape Susceptibility is defined as the ability of the landscape to accommodate a type of development – in this case housing and mixed use - without

undue negative consequences; Landscape Sensitivity is defined as the combined judgment of value and susceptibility.

Visual Value is defined as the relative value that is attached to views by visual receptors; Visual Susceptibility is defined as the ability of the visual receptors to accommodate the specific development type – in this case housing and mixed use - without undue negative consequences; Visual Sensitivity is defined as the combined judgment of value and susceptibility.

Judgements of Landscape Value, Landscape Susceptibility, Visual Value and Visual Susceptibility are all equally important when assessing a site and therefore are all equally weighted, as are judgments of Landscape Sensitivity and Visual Sensitivity. In this assessment, scoring is applied on a description system of High / Medium / Low and allocated a numerical value. This number enables each category to be weighted equally when feeding through into the overall score for the site. The overall site score is used for ranking the sites only and provides the relative sensitivity of each site when gauged against the others in this assessment.

This allows sites to be compared and contrasted with one another in landscape and visual terms. The scores and written analysis will be used by the Council as part of a separate assessment for the identification of sites to allocate for future housing development. This assessment will balance all of the relevant factors, not just landscape and visual sensitivity.

On a national scale, Gedling's landscape is of relatively low quality - there are few national designations and the landscape tends to be only of local significance. Given this general low quality, assessing the sites on an absolute basis (e.g. high value landscapes having national designations) is considered to be inappropriate. Consideration of sites relative to other areas of the borough results in an easier distinction between sites of higher and lower sensitivity within a local context.

Detailed guidelines for making judgments in completing the pro-formas are provided in Appendix B. Completion of the pro-formas was undertaken by landscape architects working in pairs in order to enable reasoned discussion and consistency of judgement and to avoid individual bias.





View looking south-east across the former Gedling Colliery site (soon to be Gedling Country Park) towards Gedling Village

ANALYSIS OF LVA RESULTS

As set out above and explained in the methodology in Appendix B, each of the 88 potential development sites has been allocated a combined score based on landscape and visual sensitivity. This allows relative ranking of all of the sites within Gedling Borough but also ranking by settlement. The data behind the scoring is recorded on the pro-forma for each site accompanied by the mapping sheet which indicates;

- Site location
- A series of photographs
- A Zone of Theoretical Visibility map
- A map which shows landscape and planning designations relevant to the assessment, LCA policy zones, photograph locations, key views into the site and recommendations for mitigation.

Indicative recommendations for mitigation of potential landscape and visual effects have been identified on a site by site basis, but not factored into the assessment of sensitivity. The assessments of landscape and visual sensitivity therefore excludes mitigation.

The relative ranking of all of the sites is presented in Figure 1 "Relative Ranking of Development Sites". The sites are ranked from 1 to 88 with the top site, number 1, being the site which has fewest landscape and visual constraints to housing development. Graphically, the sites most suitable for development have a predominance of green shading, those with more constraints, whether landscape or visual include amber shading, whilst the sites least suitable for housing development include a predominance of red shading.

The use of this traffic light colouring of green for go, amber for caution and red for stop allows an immediate understanding of sensitivity zones between sites and across the borough.

In addition to the overall relative ranking of sites in relation to each other, across Gedling Borough, the assessment also allows an understanding of relative sensitivities by settlement as set out in Figures 2 to 5. A separate colour coding, of shaded blue, has been used for the settlement mapping rankings.

FIGURE 1: RELATIVE RANKING OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL SENSITIVITY OF DEVELOPMENT SITES IN GEDLING BOROUGH (ALL SITES).

Location	Site No	Site name	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity	Visual Value	Visual Susceptibility	Visual Sensitivity	Overall	Rank
Ravenshead	6/532	South Side of Kirkby Road	9	11	20	10	9	19	39	1
Calverton	6/662	Hollinwood Lane/North Green	13	9	22	10	9	19	41	2
Burton Joyce	6/29	Lambley Lane (23)	14	9	23	10	9	19	42	3
Calverton	6/664	Calverton Miners Welfare, land adj Hollinwood Lane	14	9	23	10	9	19	42	3
Calverton	6/544	Main Street/Hollinwood Lane (Land Adj To)	12	9	21	10	11	21	42	3
Ravenshead	6/670	Kighill Lane (15a & 19)/Longdale Lane (170 & 172)	14	9	23	10	9	19	42	3
Gedling	6/13	Lambley Lane/Spring Lane	11	11	22	10	11	21	43	7
Lambley	6/767	Spring Lane (156)	13	11	24	10	9	19	43	7
Papplewick	6/764	Land adj. to 115 Mansfield Road	11	9	20	10	13	23	43	7
Burton Joyce	6/469	Millfield Close (Safeguarded Land)	14	9	23	10	11	21	44	10
Calverton	6/587	Mansfield Lane (Whitehaven Farm)	10	13	23	10	11	21	44	10
Ravenshead	6/843	26 Kighill Lane Site 2 (land rear of)	16	9	25	10	9	19	44	10
Ravenshead	6/845	28 Kighill Lane Site 1	16	9	25	10	9	19	44	10
Burton Joyce	6/537	Land to the North of Orchard Close	15	9	24	10	11	21	45	14
Linby	6/535	Greenacres	14	9	23	13	9	22	45	14
Calverton	6/772	Broom Farm, Mansfield Lane	13	9	22	13	11	24	46	16
Woodborough	6/762	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 1)	11	9	20	13	13	26	46	16
Woodborough	6/840	Plemont	14	9	23	10	13	23	46	16
Burton Joyce	6/860	Trent Valley Road A612 (Land Adj Railway)	12	11	23	10	15	25	48	19
Calverton	6/588	Mansfield Lane (250)	12	13	25	13	11	24	49	20
Ravenshead	6/39	Longdale Lane/Kighill Lane	13	13	26	10	13	23	49	20
Woodborough	6/832	109 Main Street	16	9	25	15	9	24	49	20
Woodborough	6/833	111 Main Street	16	9	25	15	9	24	49	20
Arnold	6/654	Lodge Farm Lane Site B	15	11	26	13	11	24	50	24
Calverton	6/37	Long Acre Lodge	13	9	22	13	15	28	50	24
Gedling	6/542	Linden Grove	13	9	22	13	15	28	50	24
Ravenshead	6/86	Larch Farm Public House	13	11	24	13	13	26	50	24
Woodborough	6/776	Land at Broad Close/Private Road	15	9	24	13	13	26	50	24
Arnold	6/49	Brookfields Garden Centre	14	11	25	13	13	26	51	29
Arnold	6/48	Lodge Farm Lane	14	11	25	13	13	26	51	29
Burton Joyce	6/539	Glebe Farm, Burton Joyce	13	11	24	16	11	27	51	29
Calverton	6/36	Lampwood Close	16	9	25	13	13	26	51	29
Calverton	6/540	Land to the South of Crookdole Lane	13	9	22	16	13	29	51	29
Woodborough	6/836	Main Street (119)	16	11	27	15	9	24	51	29
Ravenshead	6/841	Land at Kighill Lane	14	15	29	10	13	23	52	35
Arnold	6/778	Land to the west of the A60 Redhill	16	13	29	10	13	23	52	35
Ravenshead	6/659	Main Road (9 & 11, Land Adj To)	13	13	26	13	13	26	52	35
Woodborough	6/763	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 2,3,4)	13	9	22	16	15	31	53	38
Ravenshead	6/669	Kighill Lane (18)	14	17	31	10	13	23	54	39
Calverton	6/649	Woods Lane	15	9	24	19	13	32	56	40
Calverton	6/834	Woodview Farm	16	11	27	18	11	29	56	40
Ravenshead	6/536	Nottingham Road (183)	13	15	28	13	15	28	56	40
Bestwood	6/27	Westhouse Farm	15	11	26	13	17	30	56	40
Woodborough	6/828	Park Avenue (land south of)	14	15	29	13	15	28	57	44

FIGURE 1 CONTINUED: RELATIVE RANKING OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL SENSITIVITY OF DEVELOPMENT SITES IN GEDLING BOROUGH (ALL SITES)										
Location	Site No	Site name	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity	Visual Value	Visual Susceptibility	Visual Sensitivity	Overall	Rank
Calverton	6/33	Hollinwood Lane/Long West Croft	13	17	30	13	15	28	58	45
Woodborough	6/42	Lowdham Lane	17	15	32	15	11	26	58	45
Calverton	6/661	Land at Broom Farm	15	19	34	13	13	26	60	47
Woodborough	6/827	Lingwood Lane (land adj Rose Marie cottage)	17	13	30	13	17	30	60	47
Arnold	6/50	Killisick Lane	14	15	29	18	15	33	62	49
Bestwood	6/28	Broad Valley Farm	16	13	29	16	17	33	62	49
Woodborough	6/660	Land South of Smalls Croft	17	11	28	13	21	34	62	49
Gedling	6/12	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm)	13	21	34	13	15	28	62	49
Gedling	6/658	Mapperley Golf Course	16	13	29	18	15	33	62	49
Ravenshead	6/648	Land at Beech Avenue/Fishpool	15	19	34	13	15	28	62	49
Woodborough	6/777	Land on Shelt Hill adj 67	14	21	35	13	15	28	63	55
Burton Joyce	6/586	Stoke Bardolph Farm and Land	20	17	37	16	11	27	64	56
Gedling	6/457	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm View)	17	19	36	13	15	28	64	56
Papplewick	6/460	Hayden Lane	15	17	32	13	19	32	64	56
Lambley	6/838	Stables - Site A	16	17	33	21	11	32	65	59
Lambley	6/672	Land adj Steeles Way/Orchard Rise	19	15	34	18	13	31	65	59
Calverton	6/45	Georges Lane/Gorse Close	18	15	33	13	19	32	65	59
Arnold	6/466	New Farm (SUE)	16	15	31	16	19	35	66	62
Burton Joyce	6/30	Woodside Road (Land Off)	16	23	39	16	11	27	66	62
Gedling	6/459	Lambley Lane (Willow Farm)	16	15	31	16	19	35	66	62
Arnold	TBC	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 1)	16	15	31	21	17	38	69	65
Calverton	6/665	Warren Place	16	21	37	15	17	32	69	65
Calverton	6/774	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site A)	19	17	36	21	15	36	72	67
Burton Joyce	6/31	Hillside Farm	16	21	37	15	21	36	73	68
Calverton	6/35	Mansfield Lane (Flatts Hill)	15	21	36	18	19	37	73	68
Arnold	6/458	New Farm (Site D)	16	23	39	16	19	35	74	70
Calverton	6/775	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site B)	19	21	40	21	13	34	74	70
Arnold	TBC	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 2)	18	23	41	18	17	35	76	72
Arnold	6/51	Howbeck Road (Land East)	17	23	40	18	19	37	77	73
Arnold	6/671	Extension of Howbeck Road	14	23	37	18	23	41	78	74
Arnold	6/454	New Farm (Site A)	18	23	41	18	19	37	78	74
Woodborough	6/43	Old Manor Farm (Land adj to)	19	21	40	13	25	38	78	74
Arnold	6/455	New Farm (Site B)	17	25	42	18	19	37	79	77
Arnold	TBC	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 3)	16	23	39	20	21	41	80	78
Calverton	6/47	Park Road/Hollinwood Lane	19	23	42	15	23	38	80	78
Calverton	6/780	Ramsdale Park Golf Course	18	21	39	18	23	41	80	78
Lambley	6/52	Spring Lane	17	21	38	19	23	42	80	78
Lambley	6/839	Spring Lane (Land Off) - Site B	19	21	40	21	19	40	80	78
Lambley	6/831	Catfoot Lane	19	21	40	18	23	41	81	83
Lambley	6/538	Land Off Spring Lane	19	21	40	21	21	42	82	84
Arnold	6/462	New Farm (Site E)	17	25	42	18	23	41	83	85
Arnold	6/456	New Farm (Site C)	20	25	45	20	19	39	84	86
Woodborough	6/44	Bank Hill	21	21	42	18	25	43	85	87
Woodborough	6/835	40 Shelt Hill	17	25	42	20	25	45	87	88

FIGURE 2: RELATIVE RANKING OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL SENSITIVITY OF DEVELOPMENT SITES IN ARNOLD

Locality	Site No	Site name	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity	Visual Value	Visual Susceptibility	Visual Sensitivity	Overall	Rank
Arnold	6/654	Lodge Farm Lane Site B	15	11	26	13	11	24	50	4
Arnold	6/49	Brookfields Garden Centre	14	11	25	13	13	26	51	6
Arnold	6/48	Lodge Farm Lane	14	11	25	13	13	26	51	6
Arnold	6/778	Land to the west of the A60 Redhill	16	13	29	10	13	23	52	8
Arnold	6/50	Killisick Lane	14	15	29	18	15	33	62	9
Arnold	6/466	New Farm (SUE)	16	15	31	16	19	35	66	13
Arnold	TBC	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 1)	16	15	31	21	17	38	69	15
Arnold	6/458	New Farm (Site D)	16	23	39	16	19	35	74	16
Arnold	TBC	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 2)	18	23	41	18	17	35	76	17
Arnold	6/51	Howbeck Road (Land East)	17	23	40	18	19	37	77	18
Arnold	6/671	Extension of Howbeck Road	14	23	37	18	23	41	78	19
Arnold	6/454	New Farm (Site A)	18	23	41	18	19	37	78	19
Arnold	6/455	New Farm (Site B)	17	25	42	18	19	37	79	21
Arnold	TBC	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 3)	16	23	39	20	23	41	80	22
Arnold	6/462	New Farm (Site E)	17	25	42	18	23	41	81	24
Arnold	6/456	New Farm (Site C)	20	25	45	20	19	39	84	25
Carlton	6/13	Lambley Lane/Spring Lane	11	11	22	10	11	21	43	1
Carlton	6/767	Spring Lane (156)	13	11	24	10	9	19	43	1
Carlton	6/860	Trent Valley Road A612 (Land Adj Railway)	12	11	23	10	15	25	48	3
Carlton	6/542	Linden Grove	13	9	22	13	15	28	50	4
Carlton	6/12	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm)	13	21	34	13	15	28	62	9
Carlton	6/658	Mapperley Golf Course	16	13	29	18	15	33	62	9
Carlton	6/457	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm View)	17	19	36	13	15	28	64	12
Carlton	6/459	Lambley Lane (Willow Farm)	16	15	31	16	19	35	66	13
Carlton	6/52	Spring Lane	17	21	38	19	23	42	80	22

FIGURE 3: RELATIVE RANKING OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL SENSITIVITY OF DEVELOPMENT SITES IN CALVERTON

Site No	Site name	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity	Visual Value	Visual Susceptibility	Visual Sensitivity	Overall	Rank
6/662	Hollinwood Lane/North Green	13	9	22	10	9	19	41	1
6/664	Calverton Miners Welfare, land adj Hollinwood Lane	14	9	23	10	9	19	42	2
6/544	Main Street/Hollinwood Lane (Land Adj To)	12	9	21	10	11	21	42	2
6/587	Mansfield Lane (Whitehaven Farm)	10	13	23	10	11	21	44	4
6/772	Broom Farm, Mansfield Lane	13	9	22	13	11	24	46	5
6/588	Mansfield Lane (250)	12	13	25	13	11	24	49	6
6/37	Long Acre Lodge	13	9	22	13	15	28	50	7
6/36	Lampwood Close	16	9	25	13	13	26	51	8
6/540	Land to the South of Crookdole Lane	13	9	22	16	13	29	51	8
6/649	Woods Lane	15	9	24	19	13	32	56	10
6/834	Woodview Farm	16	11	27	18	11	29	56	10
6/33	Hollinwood Lane/Long West Croft	13	17	30	13	15	28	58	12
6/661	Land at Broom Farm	15	19	34	13	13	26	60	13
6/45	Georges Lane/Gorse Close	18	15	33	13	19	32	65	14
6/665	Warren Place	16	21	37	15	17	32	69	15
6/774	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site A)	19	17	36	21	15	36	72	16
6/35	Mansfield Lane (Flatts Hill)	15	21	36	18	19	37	73	17
6/775	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site B)	19	21	40	21	13	34	74	18
6/47	Park Road/Hollinwood Lane	19	23	42	15	23	38	80	19

FIGURE 4: RELATIVE RANKING OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL SENSITIVITY OF DEVELOPMENT SITES IN OTHER SETTLEMENTS (excluding Arnold/Calverton/Ravenshead).									
Settlement	Site No.	Site Name	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity	Visual Value	Visual Susceptibility	Visual Sensitivity	Overall
Bestwood	6/27	Westhouse Farm	15	11	26	13	17	30	56
Bestwood	6/28	Broad Valley Farm	16	13	29	16	17	33	62
Burton Joyce	6/29	Lambley Lane (23)	14	9	23	10	9	19	42
Burton Joyce	6/469	Millfield Close (Safeguarded Land)	14	9	23	10	11	21	44
Burton Joyce	6/537	Land to the North of Orchard Close	15	9	24	10	11	21	45
Burton Joyce	6/539	Glebe Farm, Burton Joyce	13	11	24	16	11	27	51
Stoke Bardolph	6/586	Stoke Bardolph Farm and Land	20	17	37	16	11	27	64
Burton Joyce	6/30	Woodside Road (Land Off)	16	23	39	16	11	27	66
Burton Joyce	6/31	Hillside Farm	16	21	37	15	21	36	73
Gedling	6/13	Lambley Lane/Spring Lane	11	11	22	10	11	21	43
Gedling	6/542	Linden Grove	13	9	22	13	15	28	50
Gedling	6/12	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm)	13	21	34	13	15	28	62
Gedling	6/658	Mapperley Golf Course	16	13	29	18	15	33	62
Gedling	6/457	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm View)	17	19	36	13	15	28	64
Gedling	6/459	Lambley Lane (Willow Farm)	16	15	31	16	19	35	66
Lambley	6/767	Spring Lane (156)	13	11	24	10	9	19	43
Lambley	6/672	Land adj Steeles Way/Orchard Rise	19	15	34	18	13	31	65
Lambley	6/838	Stables - Site A	16	17	33	21	11	32	65
Lambley	6/52	Spring Lane	17	21	38	19	23	42	80
Lambley	6/839	Spring Lane (Land Off) - Site B	19	21	40	21	19	40	80
Lambley	6/831	Catfoot Lane	19	21	40	18	23	41	81
Lambley	6/538	Land Off Spring Lane	19	21	40	21	21	42	82
Linby	6/535	Greenacres	14	9	23	13	9	22	45
Papplewick	6/764	Land adj. to 115 Mansfield Road	11	9	20	10	13	23	43
Papplewick	6/460	Hayden Lane	15	17	32	13	19	32	64
Woodborough	6/762	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 1)	11	11	22	13	11	24	46
Woodborough	6/840	Plemont	14	9	23	10	13	23	46
Woodborough	6/832	109 Main Street	16	9	25	15	9	24	49
Woodborough	6/833	111 Main Street	16	9	25	15	9	24	49
Woodborough	6/776	Land at Broad Close/Private Road	15	9	24	13	13	26	50
Woodborough	6/836	Main Street (119)	16	11	27	15	9	24	51
Woodborough	6/763	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 2,3,4)	13	9	22	16	15	31	53
Woodborough	6/828	Park Avenue (land south of)	14	15	29	13	15	28	57
Woodborough	6/42	Lowdham Lane	17	15	32	16	11	27	59
Woodborough	6/827	Lingwood Lane (land adj Rose Marie cottage)	17	13	30	13	17	30	60
Woodborough	6/660	Land South of Smalls Croft	17	11	28	13	21	34	62
Woodborough	6/777	Land on Shelt Hill adj 67	14	21	35	13	15	28	63
Woodborough	6/43	Old Manor Farm (Land adj to)	19	21	40	13	25	38	78
Woodborough	6/44	Bank Hill	21	21	42	18	25	43	85
Woodborough	6/835	40 Shelt Hill	17	25	42	20	25	45	87

FIGURE 5: RELATIVE RANKING OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL SENSITIVITY OF DEVELOPMENT SITES IN RAVENSHEAD

Site No	Site name	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity	Visual Value	Visual Susceptibility	Visual Sensitivity	Overall	Rank
6/532	South Side of Kirkby Road	9	11	20	10	9	19	39	1
6/670	Kighill Lane (15a & 19)/Longdale Lane (170 & 171)	14	9	23	10	9	19	42	2
6/843	26 Kighill Lane Site 2 (land rear of)	16	9	25	10	9	19	44	3
6/845	28 Kighill Lane Site 1	16	9	25	10	9	19	44	3
6/39	Longdale Lane/Kighill Lane	13	13	26	10	13	23	49	5
6/86	Larch Farm Public House	13	11	24	13	13	26	50	6
6/841	Land at Kighill Lane	14	15	29	10	13	23	52	7
6/659	Main Road (9 & 11, Land Adj To)	13	13	26	13	13	26	52	7
6/669	Kighill Lane (18)	14	17	31	10	13	23	54	9
6/536	Nottingham Road (183)	13	15	28	13	15	28	56	10
6/648	Land at Beech Avenue/Fishpool	15	19	34	13	15	28	62	11

FIGURE 6: RELATIVE RANKING OF LANDSCAPE/VISUAL SENSITIVITY OF CUMULATIVE DEVELOPMENT SITES

Site name	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity	Visual Value	Visual Susceptibility	Visual Sensitivity	Overall	Rank
Calverton (North East)	15	15	30	13	9	22	52	1
Ravenshead (South)	14	17	31	13	11	24	55	2
Ravenshead (North)	14	16	30	15	15	30	60	3
Bestwood	16	13	29	16	17	33	62	4
Burton Joyce	30	42	72	-	-	-	72	5
Calverton (South)	18	17	35	19	21	40	75	6
Woodborough	34	46	80	-	-	-	80	7
Lambley	18	23	41	20	21	41	82	8
Calverton (North West)	17	23	40	18	25	43	83	9
New Farm (East of A60)	17	25	42	18	23	41	83	9
Howbeck Road	17	23	40	21	23	44	84	11
New Farm (West of A60)	19	25	44	20	25	45	89	12