

**JUHRING AND HOBBS FIELDS INFRASTRUCTURE PROPOSALS, SAINT HILL
MANOR, SAINT HILL GREEN, EAST GRINSTEAD**

PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AT JUHRING FIELD OF A HARD
SURFACED CAR PARK (113 SPACES PLUS 6 DISABLED) WITH LIGHTING, WAITING
AREA STRUCTURE, GRASSED SURFACE CAR PARK (FOR UP TO 570 TEMPORARY
SPACES), ACCESS ONTO SAINT HILL ROAD AND DEMOLITION OF A DISUSED BARN,
AND CONSTRUCTION AT HOBBS FIELD OF A HARD SURFACED ACCESS ROAD,
EARTHWORKS, FOUNDATIONS, REFECTORY WASHROOM BUILDING, UTILITIES
COMPOUND AND LANDSCAPING

**LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL
IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

1232-ENP-SI-00-RP-L-90904

on behalf of COSRECI

October 2025

Enplan, St Anne's House, 111 High Street, Lewes, East Sussex, BN7 1XY Offices also at Milton Keynes
Directors: PG Russell-Vick DipLA CMLI • MA Carpenter BA(Hons) MRTPI • RJ Hodgetts BA(Hons) DipLA CMLI

 01273 007807

 info@enplan.net

 www.enplan.net

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	6
2.0	METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH	8
3.0	LANDSCAPE RELATED PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT	11
	National Planning Policy Framework.....	11
	Planning Practice Guidance.....	12
	The Protected Landscapes Duty	12
	Local Plan	13
	High Weald AONB Management Plan	17
	Design Guidance	18
	<i>National Design Guide</i>	18
	<i>Mid Sussex Design Guide 2020</i>	19
4.0	LANDSCAPE CONTEXT	20
	Published Landscape Character Assessments.....	20
	National Context.....	20
	District Context.....	21
	Site Context and Site Description	22
5.0	THE PROPOSALS	26
	Development Proposals	26
	<i>Juhring Field</i>	26
	<i>Hobbs Field</i>	27
	Materials and Landscape Proposals.....	28
6.0	LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	29
	Visual Impact Assessment.....	29
	<i>Zone of Theoretical Visibility</i>	29
	<i>Visual Effects</i>	30
	Table 1: Summary of Visual Effects	30
	Landscape Value, Susceptibility and Sensitivity.....	37
	Landscape Effects	38
	Nighttime Effects.....	40
	Effects on the Core Components of Character of the National Landscape ..	42

7.0 CONCLUSIONS.....	49
APPENDICES	51
APPENDIX A: Visual Receptor Value Criteria.....	51
APPENDIX B: Visual Receptor Susceptibility	51
APPENDIX C: Visual Receptor Sensitivity Criteria	52
APPENDIX D: Magnitude of Visual Effects Criteria	53
APPENDIX E: Landscape Value Criteria	54
APPENDIX F: Landscape Susceptibility Criteria.....	54
APPENDIX G: Landscape Sensitivity Criteria	55
APPENDIX H: Magnitude of Landscape Effects Criteria	56
APPENDIX I: Overall Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects Criteria (Significance)	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 – Site Location

Figure 2 – High Weald National Landscape

Figure 3 – Landscape Character Areas

Figure 4 – Topographical Context

Figure 5 – Significant Vegetation

Figure 6 – Scheme Proposals

Figure 7 – Juhring Field Proposals

Figure 8 – Hobbs Field Proposals

Figure 9 – Waiting Area Structure

Figure 10 – Refectory Washroom Building

Figure 11 – Zone of Theoretical Visibility for Juhring Field

Figure 12 – Zone of Theoretical Visibility for Hobbs Field

Figure 13 – Combined Zone of Theoretical Visibility

Figure 14 – Photographic Viewpoint Locations

Figure 15 – Photographic Viewpoint 1

Figure 16 – Photographic Viewpoint 2

Figure 17 – Photographic Viewpoint 3

Figure 18 – Photographic Viewpoint 4

Figure 19 – Photographic Viewpoint 5

Figure 20 – Photographic Viewpoint 6

Figure 21 – Photographic Viewpoint 7

Figure 22 – Photographic Viewpoint 8

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Enplan (planning, landscape and environmental consultants) was appointed by COSRECI (Church of Scientology), the applicant, in September 2024 to undertake the landscape design for this proposal and to prepare this Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA considers the effects of the proposal for the construction at Juhring Field of a hard surfaced car park (for 113 spaces plus 6 disabled), with lighting, a waiting area (with a shelter), a grassed surface car park (for up to 570 temporary spaces) access onto Saint Hill Road and demolition of a disused barn, and the construction at Hobbs Field of a hard surfaced access route, earthworks, foundations, a 'Refectory Washroom' building and fenced utilities compound.
- 1.2 Enplan has a long association with landscape design and assessment work for the applicant at Saint Hill Manor. The practice has been responsible for landscape design and implementation work around the manor house, the existing car park, The Castle, the Café Pavilion and the QUAL College building and LVIA work for an extension to The Castle, the Café Pavilion and QUAL College building.
- 1.3 The application site of Juhring and Hobbs Fields lies within the land owned by the applicant at Saint Hill Manor, Saint Hill Green, East Grinstead (refer to Figure 1). Juhring and Hobbs Fields do not lie within the grounds and gardens associated with the manor house but rather these two fields have been acquired in comparatively recent times, although the applicant has been able to use them with agreement for temporary uses prior to acquisition. Juhring Field lies to the north-west of the main entrance drive to Saint Hill Manor and south of the East Grinstead Sports Club playing fields. Hobbs Field lies to the south-west of Juhring Field, divided from it by woodland, and to the immediate west of The Castle and Café Pavilion buildings, both set close to the western boundary of the manor house's grounds.
- 1.4 The application site is set within open countryside, for planning purposes, and within the High Weald National Landscape (refer to Figure 2). Saint Hill Manor is a Grade II Listed Building. It has fine grounds and gardens, but these are not a Registered Park and Garden.
- 1.5 The baseline position against which this LVIA has been undertaken is the current position on the ground. There are no extant planning permissions for the land within the application site.

- 1.6 The study area for this assessment has been defined to incorporate all parts of the landscape that potentially may have a view of the proposals (referred to later in this report as the Zone of Theoretical Visibility or ZTV) and is a slightly wider area that is sufficient in size to define the broad landscape context of the site.

2.0 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

- 2.1 The approach to the landscape and visual appraisal is in accordance with the 3rd Edition ‘*Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*’ (GLVIA3). The assessment has been led by a Chartered Landscape Architect with over 40 years of experience in landscape and visual impact assessment.
- 2.2 The study area has been determined by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) exercise outlined below. This has determined the largest ‘envelope’ of likely effects, these being the visual effects.
- 2.3 A desktop study was undertaken to review available information in relation to topography, geology, land use, vegetation and landscape policy constraints, Public Rights of Way, a range of relevant landscape publications covering the landscape including assessments. The study reviewed the following specific information; all landscape and environmental designations and policies at local and national levels, existing OS geological and topographical mapping at 1:25,000 and 1:10,000 scales and selected aerial photographs.
- 2.4 Several site visits have been undertaken by the main assessor and the support team from late 2024 to late summer 2025, and, therefore, in both summer and winter conditions. The assessor and team are familiar with the appearance of the application site and local landscape through all four seasons.
- 2.5 A visual impact assessment was undertaken of the proposed development (this means all parts of the proposed development unless specifically stated) from a number of selected viewpoints based upon a recognised methodology. The viewpoints have been selected because they are for the most part ‘worst case’ or at least notable views and represent a typical direction or type of view from the various available directions towards the site. They are not all of the available views.
- 2.6 The viewpoint photographs illustrate a range of representative publicly accessible views of the site (Figures 15 to 22). The photography and the visual representations have been undertaken in accordance with the Landscape Institute’s Technical Guidance Note 06/19¹.
- 2.7 The extent to which these findings would result in material harm to the visual amenity of the Public Rights of Way, public highways or, if applicable, from public open space was

¹ Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Landscape Institute, Technical Guidance Note 06/19

evaluated and from these conclusions were drawn as to the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the landscape.

- 2.8 An assessment of local landscape character was undertaken, including the site and adjoining areas. As there are up to date published landscape character assessments of an appropriate scale for considering the potential effects of a development proposal such as this, this assessment relies on these assessments for the determination of the various landscape character areas. The local character assessment work identifies the principal elements and features, the key characteristics and the value to be attached to the landscape character areas (as published) and the elements and key characteristics of the local area.
- 2.9 For the assessment of landscape effects, professional judgements have been made regarding landscape value, landscape susceptibility and landscape sensitivity. The process of landscape assessment, as advocated by the GLVIA3, involves the individual assessments and combining of these for value and for susceptibility, specifically to the type of development envisaged, to evaluate the landscape's overall sensitivity. As the Site and its landscape context lie within a nationally designated landscape, a full assessment of landscape value as defined in the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 02/21² has not been undertaken. As with the visual assessment, the assessment of the magnitude of landscape effects has considered both the illustrative scheme and the maximum parameters scheme, but the final assessment outcomes are based on the maximum parameters.
- 2.10 Tables 1 to 3 in Appendix A set out the criteria for the assessments of the value and susceptibility of visual receptors (i.e. people, typically pedestrians, walkers and residents at home) and, in combining these, to determine an overall assessment of visual receptor sensitivity. These are compatible with the principles outlined in paragraphs 6.30 – 6.41 of GLVIA3. Such categories are not strict, and receptors may be more or less sensitive within each category, depending on the particular circumstances. Table 4, Appendix A, sets out the terms and criteria used in the visual impact assessment to describe the magnitude of visual effects. The visual effects assessment is based on a detailed visual impact assessment undertaken at some 8 viewpoints. These viewpoints have been selected to represent a range of views from publicly accessible locations, representative

² Assessing landscape value outside national designations, Landscape Institute, Technical Guidance Note 02/21

of the views experienced by the potentially sensitive receptors (refer to Figure 14 for their location).

- 2.11 For landscape character effects, as per the principles outlined in paragraphs 5.38 – 5.57 of GLVIA3, assessments have been made as to landscape value and landscape susceptibility and, in combining these, to determine overall landscape sensitivity. The criteria used for assessing these are reproduced at Tables 5 to 7, Appendix A, and the magnitude of landscape effects at Table 8.
- 2.12 The general premise of the methodologies developed and practised by the landscape profession is essentially a test of the degree of change to a particular scene, in which the proposed elements are perceived to be different to the character of that scene, and which usually result in an adverse effect where the proposal is not in character with that scene. Typically, for green field sites in rural scenes the general proposition is that new built forms are assessed to be out of keeping with character, thus having an adverse effect. This assessment adopts the approach whereby, on the precautionary basis, the effects would be adverse unless the contrary is demonstrated. GLVIA 3 advocates that effects should be identified as being adverse, neutral or beneficial. To this end all effects in this assessment can be considered to be adverse unless specifically stated.

3.0 LANDSCAPE RELATED PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 This section describes the background of relevant national, regional and local planning policies, in so far as they relate to landscape matters, against which the development proposals will be determined.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was last updated in February 2025. The NPPF defines three overarching objectives for the planning system to contribute to achieving sustainable development; these are economic, social and environmental. For the environmental objective, at Paragraph 8(c), the planning system should contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.
- 3.3 Within Section 15 “*Conserving and enhancing the natural environment*”, paragraph 187 requires that the planning policies and decisions contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, inter alia, “*protecting and enhancing valued landscapes....*” and by “*recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*”. Paragraph 189 accords great weight to the conservation and enhancement of landscape and scenic beauty in protected landscapes, such as National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now National Landscapes), highlighting that such landscapes have the “*highest status of protection in relation to these issues*”. The scale and extent of development in these designated landscapes should be “*limited*”. The NPPF distinguishes landscapes that are “*valued*”, from those that are not, and attaches greater weight to those that are designated.
- 3.4 Paragraph 190 requires that major development in AONBs (now National Landscapes) should be refused other than in exceptional circumstances, where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. At part c), such applications should include assessments of detrimental effects on the environment and landscape, and the extent to which these could be moderated.
- 3.5 Within the NPPF Section 12 “*Achieving well-designed places*”, Paragraph 135 requires that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, establish a strong sense of place, using the

arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit.

Planning Practice Guidance

- 3.6 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that the NPPF “is clear that plans should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and that strategic policies should provide for the conservation and enhancement of landscapes. This can include nationally and locally designated landscapes but also the wider countryside”³
- 3.7 The PPG confirms how development proposals will be treated within National Landscapes. It sets out that all development “*will need to be located and designed in a way that reflects their status as landscape of the highest quality*”⁴.

The Protected Landscapes Duty

- 3.8 DEFRA published guidance for relevant authorities in December 2024⁵ that sets out how the Protected Landscapes duty is intended to operate and provides guidance to relevant authorities as to how to comply with it. Under this, relevant authorities must “*seek to further*” the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes, which replaces the previous duty to “*have regard to*” their statutory purposes. The statutory purposes of National Landscapes are “*conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty*”.
- 3.9 Considering what is reasonable and proportionate in fulfilling such duties is decided by the relevant authority and should account for the specific function being exercised. For local planning authorities this includes drafting and delivering policies and strategies, such as Local Plans. When considering furthering the purposes, local planning authorities should consider the relevant Protected Landscapes’ Management Plans. Local planning authorities have an ‘active’, not passive duty to, as far as reasonably practical, “*seek to avoid harm and contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, special qualities, and key characteristics of Protected Landscapes*”.

³ 036 Reference ID: 8-036-20190721

⁴ 041 Reference ID: 8-041-20190721

⁵ Guidance for relevant authorities on seeking to further the purposes of Protected Landscapes, DEFRA, 16th December 2024

Local Plan

- 3.10 The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 was adopted in 2018. The District Plan 2021-2039 Submission Draft (Regulation 19) was submitted in July 2024 and is presently at Hearing (currently adjourned).

Current Development Plan

- 3.11 The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 includes various policies with relevance to landscape and visual matters, as set out below:

- 3.12 Policy DP12: Protection & Enhancement of the Countryside states that:

“The countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty.

Development will be permitted in the countryside, defined as the area outside of built-up area boundaries on the Policies Map, provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District, and:

- it is necessary for the purposes of agriculture; or*
- it is supported by a specific policy reference either elsewhere in the Plan, a Development Plan Document or relevant Neighbourhood Plan.”*

- 3.13 The supporting text for Policy DP12 sets out that the primary objective of the District Plan with respect to countryside is to protect it by minimising the land needed for development and preventing development that does not need a countryside location. At the same time, it seeks enhancement through supporting the rural economy accommodating “*well-designed, appropriate new forms of development and changes in land use where a countryside location is required and where it does not adversely affect the rural environment*”.

- 3.14 Policy DP16: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty requires that:

“Development within the High Weald AONB...will only be permitted where it conserves or enhances natural beauty and has regard to the High Weald AONB Management Plan, in particular;

- the identified landscape features or components of natural beauty and to their setting;*
- the traditional interaction of people with nature, and appropriate land management;*
- character and local distinctiveness, settlement pattern, sense of place and setting of the AONB; and*
- the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage.”*

-
- 3.15 Policy DP16 also states that *“Development on land that contributes to the setting of the AONB will only be permitted where it does not detract from the visual qualities and essential characteristics of the AONB, and in particular should not adversely affect the views into and out of the AONB by virtue of its location or design.”*
- 3.16 The key objective of Policy DP26 – Character and Design is, *“To promote well located and designed development that reflects the District’s distinctive towns and villages, retains their separate identity and character and prevents coalescence.....and to protect values characteristics of the built environment for their historical and visual qualities.”*
- 3.17 Policy DP37 – Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows states that, *“The District Council will support the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland and hedgerows, and encourage new planting. In particular, ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees will be protected...development that will damage or lead to loss of trees, woodland or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/ or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted.”*
- 3.18 Policy DP37 also states that, *“Proposals for new trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of suitable species, usually native, and where required for visual, noise or light screening purposes, trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of a size and species that will achieve this purpose.”*

Emerging Local Plan Review

- 3.19 The emerging Local Plan is at an advanced stage, although currently on hold due to challenges. The Submission Draft (Regulation 19) includes a range of countryside, landscape and design related policies relevant to this LVIA.
- 3.20 Draft Policy DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside is similar in approach to the current Policy DP12, as set out above. In addition to Policy DP12, draft Policy DPC1 requires that:

“Development proposals will need to demonstrate they are informed by landscape character. The Mid Sussex Landscape Character Assessment, the West Sussex County Council Strategy for the West Sussex Landscape, the Capacity of Mid Sussex District to Accommodate Development Study and other available landscape evidence (including that specific to the High Weald AONB and that gathered to support Neighbourhood Plans) will be used to assess the impact of development proposals on the rural and landscape character.....

For major applications, a Landscape Strategy will need to be provided to identify how the natural features and characteristics of a site have been retained and incorporated into the landscape structure and design of the site and how they have informed the landscaping proposals for the site.”

- 3.21 The application site does not lie within any of the Landscape Character Areas identified in the 2014 Capacity of Mid Sussex District to Accommodate Development Study.
- 3.22 Draft Policy DPC4: High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty states that:

“The scale and extent of development within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) should be limited. Major development will not be supported and will not be permitted other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.

Development within the High Weald AONB, as shown on the Policies Maps, will only be permitted where it conserves and enhances landscape and scenic beauty of the area, with reference to the components of natural beauty set out in the High Weald AONB Management Plan, and has regard to the High Weald AONB Management Plan, in particular:

- The identified components of natural beauty, as set out in the High Weald AONB Management Plan, and to their setting.*
- The traditional interaction of people with the landscape and nature, and appropriate land management.*

- *The historic landscape, character and local distinctiveness, landscape features, historic settlement pattern, sense of place and setting of the AONB.*
- *The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage.*

Development proposals should demonstrate a positive contribution to the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan.....”

3.23 Draft Policy DPN4: Trees, Woodlands and hedgerows seeks the protection of these landscape features and requires specifically that *“Development (including construction and operational activities) that is adjacent to irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees must incorporate appropriate buffers and/or root protection areas. Development that will damage or lead to the loss of trees, woodland or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted.”* Proposals for new trees, woodland and hedgerows must be of suitable usually native species and appropriately sized for their objective and use.

3.24 The supporting text to draft Policy DPN8: Light Impacts and Dark Skies notes that the High Weald is characterised by *“having some of the darkest skies in the south-east of England.”* The policy states that:

“Development proposals must demonstrate that all opportunities to reduce light pollution (including sky glow, glare and light spillage) have been taken including minimising impacts on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes including protected landscapes.....

Artificial lighting proposals (including outdoor lighting, floodlighting and new street lighting) should be minimised in terms of intensity and number of fittings. The applicant must demonstrate all of the following:

1. *The minimum amount of lighting necessary to achieve its purpose is specified or otherwise justified on safety or security grounds.*
2. *The design and specification of the lighting would minimise sky glow, glare and light spillage in relation to the visibility of the night sky, local amenity and local character.*
3. *The means of lighting would be unobtrusively sited.*
4. *Low energy lighting is used.*
5. *There would not be an adverse impact on wildlife such as through consideration of the appropriate siting, fitting, design, colour and temperature of lighting.*

Development proposals must carefully consider the design and layout of parking arrangements to avoid headlight nuisance.....”

- 3.25 Policy DPB1: Character and Design seeks that new design respect the high quality built and natural environment of Mid Sussex. The policy requires that:

“All new development must be designed in accordance with the Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). All new development must be of high quality and must respond appropriately to its context, be inclusive and prioritise sustainability. This includes the design and layout of new buildings and streets, alterations to existing buildings and the design of surrounding spaces.

All development proposals will be required to demonstrate all of the following, to ensure that development:

Understanding the Context

- 1. Reflects the distinctive character of the towns and villages and protects their separate identity, heritage assets and valued townscapes.*
- 2. Is sensitive to the countryside including the topography.....”*

High Weald AONB Management Plan

- 3.26 The ‘English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010’, published by DEFRA, provides policy guidance for local planning authorities, others with statutory functions and those with roles in the management of such areas. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 requires relevant local authorities to jointly prepare, publish and subsequently review a Management Plan for AONBs. It requires that these plans formulate their policies for the management of the designated landscape and for the carrying out of their functions in relation to it. Management Plans are adopted by local planning authorities but whilst they do not constitute land use planning policies as such, they are a component of plan-making and the decision-making process of planning applications. The status of the AONB Management Plans means that their policies are a material consideration and should be afforded considerable weight when determining planning applications for proposals which affect the AONB. The National Planning Practice Guidance confirms this⁶, and supports the principle that they should be taken into account by local planning authorities in making Local Plans and when considering planning applications.

⁶ National Planning Practice Guidance: Natural Environment: Landscape: Paragraph 4

-
- 3.27 The High Weald AONB Management Plan 2024-2029 (5th Edition)⁷ sets out the policy aspirations and framework for the 15 authorities jointly responsible for the management of the AONB. The Management Plan sets out a Statement of Significance for the AONB (page 16 of the document) and defines eight core components of character that make the High Weald a recognisable, distinct and homogenous area. These include the following: (1) Natural Systems (geology, soils, water and climate), (2) Settlement, (3) Routeways, (4) Woodland, (5) Fieldsapes and heath, (6) Dark night skies, (7) Aesthetic and perceptual qualities and (8) Land-based economy and rural living. The natural beauty is derived from its “*essentially rural and small-scale landscape character, rich in wildlife and cultural features*”.

Design Guidance

National Design Guide

- 3.28 The 2019 National Design Guide (NDG) forms part of the suite of supporting planning guidance of the Framework and is based on national planning policy, practice guidance and objectives for good design as set out in the Framework. The NDG addresses the question of how we recognise well-designed places, by outlining and illustrating the Government’s priorities for well-designed places through ten characteristics. These characteristics reflect the Government’s priorities and provide a common overarching framework. More specific guidance can then be locally formulated, such as the High Mid Sussex Design Guide⁸.
- 3.29 The ten characteristics include ‘Context’, ‘Identity’ and ‘Built Form’. ‘Context’ is defined as “*the location of the development and the attributes of its immediate, local and regional surroundings*”. Paragraph 42 states that:

“Well-designed new development is integrated into its wider surroundings, physically, socially and visually. It is carefully sited and designed, and is demonstrably based on an understanding of the existing situation, including:

- the landscape character and how places or developments sit within the landscape, to influence the siting of new development and how natural features are retained or incorporated into it;*
- patterns of built form, including local precedents for routes and spaces and the built form around them, to inform the layout, form and scale;*

⁷ The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2024-2029, published by the High Weald Joint Advisory Committee

⁸ Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020

- *the architecture prevalent in the area, including the local vernacular and other precedents that contribute to local character, to inform the form, scale, appearance, details and materials of new development.....”*

3.30 Paragraph 43, however, highlights that *“well-designed places do not to copy their surroundings in every way. It is appropriate to introduce elements that reflect how we live today, to include innovation or change such as increased densities, and to incorporate new sustainable features or systems”*.

Mid Sussex Design Guide 2020

3.31 The Mid Sussex Design Guide seeks to provide clear design principles that aim to deliver high quality development that responds appropriately to its context and prioritises sustainability in the design process. The Design Guide is primarily aimed at larger residential and commercial schemes but is also relevant to smaller and non-residential schemes.

3.32 Several of the defined design principles are relevant to this proposal, these include:

- DG1: Character Study – understanding the context, including landscape character.
- DG2: Site Appraisal – appraise site characteristics, key constraints and opportunities
- DG3: Work with the site’s natural features and resources
- DG5: Water features and sustainable drainage systems
- DG7: Respond to topography and strategic views

4.0 LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

Published Landscape Character Assessments

4.1 The relevant published landscape character data and related assessments include the following:

- National Character Area Profile: High Weald (NCA 122)⁹;
- A Landscape Character Assessment for Mid Sussex 2005.

National Context

4.2 At a national level the application site lies within National Character Area (NCA) 122 High Weald. The key characteristics, relevant to this assessment, are defined as:

- *“A faulted landform of clays, sand and soft sandstones with outcrops of fissured sandrock and ridges running east–west, deeply incised and intersected with numerous gill streams forming the headwaters of a number of the major rivers – the Rother, Brede, Ouse and Medway – which flow in broad valleys.....*
- *A dispersed settlement pattern of hamlets and scattered farmsteads and medieval ridgetop villages founded on trade and non-agricultural rural industries, with a dominance of timber- framed buildings with steep roofs often hipped or half-hipped, and an extremely high survival rate of farm buildings dating from the 17th century or earlier.*
- *Ancient routeways in the form of ridgetop roads and a dense system of radiating droveways, often narrow, deeply sunken and edged with trees and wild flower-rich verges and boundary banks. Church towers and spires on the ridges are an important local landmark. There is a dense network of small, narrow and winding lanes, often sunken and enclosed by high hedgerows or woodland strips. The area includes several large towns such as Tunbridge Wells, Crowborough, Battle and Heathfield and is closely bordered by others such as Crawley, East Grinstead, Hastings and Horsham.*
- *An intimate, hidden and small-scale landscape with glimpses of far reaching views, giving a sense of remoteness and tranquillity yet concealing the highest density of timber-framed buildings anywhere in Europe amidst lanes and paths.*
- *Strong feeling of remoteness due to very rural, wooded character. A great extent of interconnected ancient woods, steep-sided gill woodlands, wooded heaths and shaws in generally small holdings with extensive archaeology and evidence of long-term management.*

⁹ <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5851972632576000>

- *Extensive broadleaved woodland cover with a very high proportion of ancient woodland with high forest, small woods and shaws, plus steep valleys with gill woodland.*
- *Small and medium-sized irregularly shaped fields enclosed by a network of hedgerows and wooded shaws, predominantly of medieval origin and managed historically as a mosaic of small agricultural holdings typically used for livestock grazing.....”*

District Context

4.3 The application site lies within Landscape Character Area 6: High Weald (LCA6) of the Mid Sussex Landscape Character Assessment (refer to Figure 3). The assessment dates from 2005 and was not prepared in accordance with current landscape character assessment guidance from 2013. However, the assessment is relied upon by the Council, and it forms part of the current evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.

4.4 The summary and the relevant key characteristics of LCA6 to this proposal are defined as:

“The High Weald Forest Ridge. Numerous gill streams have carved out a landscape of twisting ridges and secluded valleys. The ancient, densely-wooded landscape of the High Weald is seen to perfection in the area. Includes the township of East Grinstead.

- *Wooded, confined rural landscape of intimacy and complexity, perceived as attractive, locally secluded and tranquil.*
- *Complex sandstone and clay hilly landscape of ridges and secluded valleys centred on the western end of Forest Ridge of the High Weald plateau deeply cut by numerous gill streams and with sandrock crags.....*
- *Includes major reservoir at Ardingly and adjoins Weir Wood Reservoir.*
- *Significant woodland cover, a substantial portion of it ancient, including some larger woods and a dense network of hedgerows and shaws, creates a sense of enclosure, the valleys damp, deep and secluded.....*
- *Dense network of twisting, deep lanes, droveways, tracks and footpaths.*
- *Dispersed historic settlement pattern on high ridges, hilltops and high ground, the principal settlements East Grinstead and some expanded and smaller villages.*
- *Some busy lanes and roads including along the Crawley–East Grinstead corridor.....*

- *Designed landscapes and exotic treescapes associated with large country houses.”*

4.5 The section within the landscape character assessment on ‘Landscape and visual sensitivities’ highlights the following relevant points:

- *“Woodland cover limits the visual sensitivity of the landscape and confers a sense of intimacy, seclusion and tranquillity.*
- *Unobtrusive settlement pattern in many parts.....*
- *Dense network of twisting, deep lanes, droveways, tracks and footpaths provides a rich terrain for horse-riding, cycling and walking and for the appreciation of nature.*
- *Long views along valleys and ridges have a high sensitivity to the impact of new urban development, modern farm buildings, masts and pylons and new roads.*
- *Settlement pattern currently sits well within the rural landscape although there is a danger of the cumulative visual impact of buildings and other structures.*
- *Legacy of designed landscapes and treescapes.”*

4.6 Key land management guidelines identified include:

- *“Maintain and restore the historic pattern and fabric of the woodland and agricultural landscape for scenic, nature conservation and recreational purposes.*
- *Avoid skyline development and ensure that any new development has a minimum impact on long and other views and is integrated within the landscape.....*
- *Extend existing woodland areas rather than creating new woodland features, reinforcing existing, distinctive landscape patterns.....*
- *Plant trees in drifts and avoid straight lines running across the grain of the land.*
- *Conserve, strengthen and manage existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees and re-plant hedgerows where they have been lost.....*
- *Minimise the effects of adverse incremental change by seeking new development of high quality that sits well within the landscape and reflects local distinctiveness.”*

Site Context and Site Description

4.7 The site of Saint Hill Manor is located to the south-west of East Grinstead, adjoining Saint Hill Green on the junction of Saint Hill Road and West Hoathly Road (refer to Figure 1). To the north-east of Saint Hill Road is East Grinstead Rugby Club with three pitches, floodlit training area, car park and clubhouse. To the north is the East Grinstead Sports Club. This has a full-sized, high quality cricket pitch, a floodlit and fenced 4G soccer and multi-use sports pitch, a floodlit, full-sized, high-quality water-based hockey pitch and nine other floodlit and fenced hard surfaced outdoor sports facilities for tennis,

netball etc. It has two smaller and one large hard surfaced car parks and a substantial clubhouse and indoor sports building. Both sports clubs occupy the slightly higher and flatter ground at the top of this High Weald ridge, whilst Saint Hill Manor occupies the land as it slopes away from the ridgeline, down to the south-east and south (refer to Figure 4). All of this is set within a substantially wooded context, as is characteristic of the ridges of the High Weald (refer to Figure 5). These ridges typically provide the main communication links through the High Weald and historically have been the focus for settlement.

- 4.8 The Saint Hill Manor grounds and associated land extend from the high ground of the spur from the East Grinstead ridge at Saint Hill in the north and through to the local valley floor in the south. The manor house is set part way down this slope, sited below the horizon line, and faces due south, benefitting from long views across its grounds and across the High Weald to a major ridge to the south at Sharpthorne.
- 4.9 The manor house is a Grade II Listed Building built in the early 18th Century of ashlar stone to three-storeys with two and single-storey flanking wings and a projected front on stone columns. It is set on broad formal landscaped terracing surrounded by its grounds and gardens. A stone-built lodge and gates mark the original drive approach from the east from Saint Hill Road. A more contemporary drive alignment continues west then north from the manor, looping back to Saint Hill Road.
- 4.10 The grounds comprise landscaped areas planted with non-native parkland species contemporary with the house, based around the 'original' pre-manor landscape of native woodland. The parkland trees include the mature cedars on the rise behind the house, as well as more relatively recent additions of more exotic species and shrubberies. The grounds fall down from the manor house to the to a minor valley where a lake feature has been created by damming the stream and valley.
- 4.11 Within the grounds, The Castle is the largest single building other than the manor house, and there are a number of smaller buildings clustered in groups throughout the site based around former uses such as the stables for example. The 20th Century Castle building complex is a substantial predominantly single storey but with some two-storey elements, built in a U-shaped form set around a central landscaped courtyard. It has a castellated parapet with a flat roof. To the south of The Castle is the contemporary café pavilion (or Refectory, as it is known) set into the south-facing lawns.

-
- 4.12 The current main access to Saint Hill Manor is from the newer access onto Saint Hill Road. A 20th Century gate and gatehouse building are located at the entrance, from where the drive sweeps to the south and down to The Castle and manor house. The existing car park lies to the east of the drive. This is hard surfaced, lit and landscaped. It has capacity for 132 cars.
- 4.13 The manor house and The Castle can be seen fleetingly from within the wider landscape to the south and, together with the prominent evergreen trees within the landscaped grounds, form a notable and an attractive horizon line within the landscape in these occasional views. However, generally the manor house, The Castle and grounds are visually well contained by the woodland within the grounds to the north and east and by the wooded nature of the local landscape generally.
- 4.14 The two fields that form the application site, Juhring Field and Hobbs Field respectively, form part of the Saint Hill Manor landholding but these have only been acquired in recent times, relatively, and are not part of the grounds and parkland that are contemporary with the 18th Century manor house. Both fields have been used on a temporary basis by the applicant for events for many years, including the provision of car parking in relation to those events.
- 4.15 Juhring Field lies between the drive and the northern boundary with the East Grinstead Sports Club cricket pitch. The field itself is relatively featureless, laid to grass, with a lone semi-mature oak tree located about centrally within the field. The topography is slightly domed and rises to the south where the field adjoins woodland within the landholding, part of which is Ancient Woodland. The land slopes away more steeply to the west where some more scrubby woodland is establishing itself on this steeper landform. The northern boundary with the Sports Club includes a track which joins Saint Hill Road, some self-seeded trees, some of which are semi-mature oaks, and a line of tall, clipped evergreen cypresses aligned along the boundary with the Sports Club. The eastern boundary is against, what is called the Lodge and its gardens, a residential building within the landholding that runs parallel with Saint Hill Road. Close to the northern edge of Juhring Field is a disused timber framed barn building.
- 4.16 Juhring Field can be seen from Saint Hill Road and from the Sports Club, but the views are partial and filtered through the vegetation along its northern edge. Otherwise, the field itself is almost entirely screened from the surrounding landscape.
- 4.17 Hobbs Field lies to the west of The Castle. It slopes from the north, down to its south-western corner, and quite steeply along the western edge. It is set to the south of the woodland that borders Juhring Field to the north. Like Juhring Field, it too is relatively

featureless with strong vegetated boundaries to the west and south. The boundary to the east with the grounds of Saint Hill Manor is more open with only sporadic vegetation along this edge and the western elevation of The Castle overlooks the field.

- 4.18 Hobbs Field is more visually open in the local landscape than Juhring Field with long views from it and back to it from the wooded High Weald and elevated topography to the west, south and south-east (although views of it from publicly accessible locations are rare as the visual impact assessment sets out). There are no views of it from the north or north-east, from Saint Hill Road for example, as is the case with Juhring Field. Their respective visual contexts are, therefore, quite different to each other. The extent to which Hobbs Field is visible from publicly accessible locations from the west, south and south-east is explored below in the assessment section.

5.0 THE PROPOSALS

Development Proposals

- 5.1 The development proposals seek to rationalise some of the uses that the applicant requires to run day to day activities and to host various temporary events throughout the year. These include establishing an arrangement for car parking with related construction, access to and from Juhring Field to Saint Hill Road, a permanent construction access route to Hobbs Field from Saint Hill Road and the earthworks and engineering for the applicant's annual IAS event hosted there. A waiting area structure is proposed to be located next to the hard surfaced parking area in Juhring Field, and a washroom building is proposed at the eastern edge of Hobbs Field, to support the applicant's annual IAS event.

Juhring Field

- 5.2 The proposals for Juhring Field (refer to Figures 6 and 7) are:
- A hard surfaced car park (113 spaces plus 6 disabled) landscaped and with column mounted lighting (4 no. x 6m high, twin-headed luminaires, within the parking area and low level lighting bollards beside the new access drive, all coloured black) and bollard lighting (of the car park and footways), to be accessed by a new drive from the existing drive from a point opposite to the existing car park and beyond the existing security gate. The car parking would be in four rows with a looped internal route and sited parallel along the boundary with the Lodge and its garden. Its design, use of materials and planting, would be similar to and in-keeping with the existing car park to the east to the drive.
 - Within the hard surfaced car park would be a waiting area (refer to Figure 9). The waiting area would include a shelter for arrivals by taxi or car drop offs, and for arriving coaches during the applicant's larger events. The building would be single storey, clad in stone under a flat, green roof.
 - A grassed car park for up to 570 temporary, occasional cars for use during events constructed using a cellweb type construction that would be soiled with a rootzone and grassed. This would require some earthworks (balanced cut and fill) to provide a suitable even gradient across the site, including some build-up of levels at the western edge. A minimum 15m wide set-back between the new earthworks or construction and the Ancient Woodland and other woodland on the southern boundary would be maintained. Pedestrian routes across the car park

would be part of the cellweb construction but would be gravel backfilled rather than soiled and grassed.

- The grassed car park would include the electrics and footings for the erection of demountable, temporary lights, that would only be erected and operated for the annual IAS event.
- A 6m wide gravel-filled cellweb construction access route parallel with the northern boundary, from Saint Hill Road leading to Hobbs Field. This would form part of the car park circulation and provide construction access to Hobbs Field for the annual IAS event.
- The disused barn by the northern boundary would be demolished. Several existing self-seeded trees would be removed. The lone semi-mature oak tree in the middle of Juhring Field would be retained.

Hobbs Field

5.3 The proposals for Hobbs Field (refer to Figures 6 and 8) include:

- The continuation of the 6m wide cellweb construction access route into and across part of Hobbs Field, although this length of the construction access route across Hobbs Field would be filled with rootzone and grassed.
- Cut and fill earthworks up to +/- 2m to form a level and roughly rectangular shaped levelled-area for the annual event. This would be grassed.
- The construction of trench foundations, again for the event. These would be sunk into the ground.
- Adjacent to the eastern boundary and close to and parallel with the rear of the existing refectory a washroom building would be sited (refer to Figure 10). This would be slightly cut into the slope. Like the waiting area shelter this too would be single storey, clad in stone, under a flat, green roof. To the south of it would be a utilities compound enclosed with a 1.8m high close boarded fence.

Materials and Landscape Proposals

- 5.4 The hard surfaced, permanent car park would be surfaced in permeable asphalt with resin bound gravel footways and conservation granite kerbs. Lighting would consist of four LED cut-off twin-headed luminaires on 6m high columns for the car park and twelve bollards along the new drive access all painted black, to match the lighting in the existing car park. Bollard lighting of the extended footpath by the main drive would match the existing timber light units (fourteen in total at 6m spacing) used around the existing car park and drive. Eighteen black downlighter bollards would be installed to light the footpaths along the edges of the hard surfaced car park. There would be no permanent lighting of the grassed car park, although the footings and electrical supply for temporary demountable lighting would be proposed. Further details of the lighting strategy are set out in the Design and Access Statement.
- 5.5 The grassed and gravel-filled cellweb construction would all be require appropriately engineered sub-structures, depending on the anticipated loads. The materials currently being considered for the cellweb are manufactured by Geosynthetics Ltd and include Total Traffic Expave (TTE) for access routes and areas of heavy loading, and Golpla for the car parking.
- 5.6 Along the western edge of the existing drive and within the hard surfaced car park, the soft landscape proposals include for the continuation of the tree, shrub and perennial planting mix used within the existing car park and driveway area. A drainage swale would be provided along the western edge of the parking area; this would be planted with a native perennial and shrub mix amongst multi and single stem trees.
- 5.7 Planting along the northern boundary of Juhring Field would be of indigenous tree and shrub species, designed to provide supplementary screening to the existing trees and vegetation along the edge with the Sports Club.
- 5.8 Further details of the design and landscape strategy are set out in the Design and Access Statement.

6.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Visual Impact Assessment

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

- 6.1 Three separate Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) are illustrated at Figures 11, 12 and 13. These are computer generated based on 3D LiDAR topographical data which includes buildings and vegetation within the model. These are 'working tools', to assist the assessment, in particular with identifying potential viewpoints within the landscape, but should not be interpreted too literally for the reasons provided below.
- 6.2 The three ZTVs are based on the theoretical visibility of a grid of 3m high markers across the two fields. This represents the height of the built structures, but with the markers at 3m in height, this allows for the heights of vehicles on Juhring Field. The ZTV for Hobbs Field has its height markers set at 3m on a grid across the whole area, the same as for Juhring Field. This allows for the height of the washroom building on the eastern boundary and the +/-2m level changes. The ZTV excludes the lighting for reasons set out below. The ZTVs illustrate areas from where there could be open views of one or more markers on each field, or in-combination in the third ZTV, shown in purple, and a separate area from where there could be views through vegetation in winter, again of one or more markers, shown in green. These represent a 'worst-case' scenario for 3m high structures and, in practice, as the assessment reveals, the actual extent of potential views would be considerably smaller than the ZTVs suggest.
- 6.3 The 6m high lighting columns are not included in the ZTV because these would be imperceptible from beyond a few hundred metres from the site and a ZTV with markers at 6m would, therefore, provide a false impression of the real visibility of the development in the wider landscape. The visual effects of the lighting columns during daylight hours are included in the visual assessment of local views and a specific nighttime effects assessment section is also provided.
- 6.4 The extent of potential views includes near views from the north and east, but from these directions actual views are restricted to locations close to the site. The ridgeline and elevated location of the site results in an extensive potential viewshed to the west, south and to a lesser extent, the south-east, out to around 4km from the application site. In

practice, these development proposals are likely to be imperceptible at distances of beyond 2km.

- 6.5 For Juhring Field, the ZTV (refer to Figure 11) indicates limited open views to the north and only filtered views to the north-east. To the west, south and south-east the ZTV indicates a large area of potential views but the great majority of which would be filtered views, through vegetation, in winter.
- 6.6 For Hobbs Field, the ZTV (refer to Figure 12) indicates a similar extent of view but with more 'patches' of open views from the west, south and south-east. These areas have all been considered as potential viewpoints where these intersect with publicly accessible locations. Views to the development on Hobbs Field from the north and west would be highly restricted.
- 6.7 The third ZTV (refer to Figure 13) represents the combined ZTV of the proposed development on both parts of the site.

Visual Effects

- 6.8 The assessment of visual effects and the value, susceptibility and sensitivity of the visual receptors is set out in the table below, together with a description of the view, the assessment of the magnitude of effect at Year 1, the significance of that effect together with a commentary. The viewpoint locations are illustrated on Figure 14 with photographs provided for each of the seven selected viewpoints at Figures 15 to 22.

Table 1: Summary of Visual Effects

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor Value/ Susceptibility/ Sensitivity	Dist. from centre of the relevant part of the application site	View Location	Magnitude of Change at Year 1	Significance at Year 1	Commentary
1. View from Saint Hill Manor, Main Entrance off Saint Hill Road Refer to Figure 15	Walkers, Cyclists, Equestrians: Low + Moderate = Moderate sensitivity Vehicle users: Low + Moderate-Low	Circa 130m	View from a highway	Slight adverse	Moderate-Minor / Minor adverse	A narrow, glimpsed view between the built structures that form the gateway. The current view is across the open, grassed, southern part of Juhring Field to the Ancient Woodland on the southern edge of the field beyond. The planted frontage between the existing drive and new drive and around

	= Low sensitivity					the new drive would form a landscaped edge. The new drive would not be visible, as this would be set lower than the adjacent landform. Several low level bollard lights would be visible in the view. The grassed parking area, beyond the new drive, would not be perceptibly different to the current open, grassed area of the field, except when the temporary parking was in place during events. Soe parts of the gravel walkways could be just visible. The waiting area structure would not be visible. There would be no view of the Hobbs Field proposals.
2. View from Saint Hill Road, by Rockwood Park Refer to Figure 16	Walkers, Cyclists, Equestrians: Low + Moderate = Moderate sensitivity Vehicle users: Low + Moderate-Low = Low sensitivity	Circa 190m	View from a highway	Slight adverse (in winter, screened in summer)	Moderate-Minor / Minor adverse (in winter, screened in summer)	View from Saint Hill Road across the south-east corner of the East Grinstead Sports Club grounds to the northern edge of Juhring Field. In winter the vegetation along the northern boundary partially screens and filters views of the main part of the field. The woodland along the southern edge of the field is partially visible. The wide context of the view includes the ball protection fencing along Saint Hill Road, the floodlit and fenced 4G pitch and the clubhouse/indoor sports building. In summer, the hedgerow and trees provide an almost complete screen of the view into Juhring Field. Six existing trees in the view would be removed: one purple maple on the corner of the existing junction, two evergreen cypresses and one semi-mature beech on the south side of the Juhring Field access, all for highway sightline purposes, and two self-sown semi-mature oaks within the site to allow for an access route. The loss of the oaks would slightly further

						open views into Juhring Field in winter. There loss would not be visible in summer. In winter, the northernmost part of the hard surfaced car park, with parking, and part of the access road would just be visible at the improved junction with Saint Hill Road. During events temporary car parking would also be visible. One lighting column associated with the parking would be visible through a gap in the vegetation. The waiting area structure would not be visible. Views of these elements of the proposals would be substantially screened in summer. There would be no view of the Hobbs Field proposals.
3. View from Saint Hill Road, by entrance to Saint Hill Sports Club Refer to Figure 17	Walkers, Cyclists, Equestrians: Low + Moderate = Moderate sensitivity Vehicle users: Low + Moderate-Low = Low sensitivity	Circa 250m	View from a highway	Slight adverse	Moderate-Minor / Minor adverse	View from Saint Hill Road across the main body of the East Grinstead Sports Club cricket pitch to the northern edge of Juhring Field. In winter, the vegetation along the northern boundary partially screens and filters views of the main part of Juhring Field. The woodland along the southern edge of the field is partially visible. The wide context of the view includes the ball protection fencing along Saint Hill Road, the floodlit and fenced 4G pitch and the clubhouse/indoor sports building. In summer, the filtered views through and under the boundary vegetation remain although these are more restricted than in the winter. Three existing trees in the view would be removed; one purple maple on the corner of the existing junction for sightline purposes (although this loss would be almost imperceptible in this view) and two self-sown semi-mature oaks within the site to allow for an access route. The loss of the oaks would

						slightly open views into Juhring Field. In winter, the western half of the hard surfaced car park, with parking, the waiting area structure, four lighting columns and part of the access road would be visible through the gaps in the vegetation but at a greater distance from the viewer than at Viewpoint 2, and so, would form a smaller part of the view. During events temporary car parking would also be visible. Several light columns associated with the parking would be visible through the gaps in the vegetation. These views would diminish slightly in summer. There would be no view of the Hobbs Field proposals.
4. View from Public Right of Way by East Grinstead Sports Club Car Park Refer to Figure 18	Walkers: Very High + High/Moderate = High sensitivity	Circa 320m	View from a Public Right of Way	Negligible adverse	Moderate-Minor adverse	View from the Public Right of Way that runs from Saint Hill Road, through the Sports Club, to the countryside to the west. The section with a potential view is beside the Sports Club's main car park. The foreground of the view is dominated by the car park with some partial views available to the cricket pitch and 4G pitch beyond. The proposals on Juhring Field would be barely perceptible, including the lighting, in this view. The waiting area structure would not be visible. There would be no view of the Hobbs Field proposals.
5. View from Public Right of Way to West of Site Refer to Figure 19	Walkers Very High + High/Moderate = High sensitivity	Circa 700m	View from a Public Right of Way	No change	No change	View from the continuation of the Public Right of Way considered at Viewpoint 4. At this location the setting is entirely rural with a view towards the proposals. However, any view of the

						Juhring or Hobbs Field proposals would be fully screened by intervening vegetation, including the lighting.
6. View from West Hoathly Road Refer to Figure 20	Walkers, Cyclists, Equestrians: Low + Moderate = High sensitivity Vehicle users: Low + Moderate-Low = Low sensitivity	Circa 1.1km	View from a highway	Negligible adverse	Moderate-Minor adverse	View from West Hoathly Road where it runs along a ridgeline offering views to the north and south. The view north along this section of the road provides glimpses of Saint Hill Manor, backed by its striking evergreens, and The Castle. The narrowness of the lane means this is not a comfortable route for pedestrians, who are likely to choose other routes. The northern and higher part of Hobbs Field is just visible over and between intervening vegetation. The access road would not be visible. The earthworks would be barely perceptible. The uppermost part and the grassed roof of the washroom building would just be visible, but at this distance (over 1km) these too would be barely perceptible. These views would diminish slightly in summer. The Juhring Field proposals would not be visible.
7. View from Public Right of Way, West of Standen House and Gardens Refer to Figure 21	Walkers Very High + High/Moderate = High sensitivity	Circa 900m	View from a Public Right of Way	No change	No change	View from a Public Right of Way that runs parallel with the drive to Standen House. At this location, there is an open view from this elevated position to the north-west towards Saint Hill Manor. The manor house is almost entirely screened in this view, but part of The Castle is visible as is part of the café pavilion. The floodlights on the training pitch of East Grinstead Rugby Club are visible in this view. A small part of Hobbs Field is visible through a few gaps in the vegetation (in winter). The access road would not be visible. The earthworks would

						be imperceptible. The washroom building would not be visible, screened by intervening vegetation. These views would diminish in summer. The Juhring Field proposals would not be visible.
8. View from Public Right of Way, South of Plawhatch Lane Refer to Figure 22	Walkers Very High + High/Moderate = High sensitivity	Circa 3.1km	View from a Public Right of Way	No change	No change	A typically characteristic High Weald long view from a Public Right of Way. Uncommon due to the heavily wooded character of much of the landscape, these views from elevated ridges across the landscape to other wooded horizons, punctuated by notable buildings, are a special feature of the National Landscape. This northerly view from a position below the main ridge occupied by Sharpthorne, includes the tower of East Grinstead Church and part of the town on its ridge, Standen House, with its eye-catching tower, and the upper storey and roofline of Saint Hill Manor. Part of The Castle is also just visible. However, neither Hobbs or Juhring Fields are visible, nor would the development proposals be perceptible either.

6.9 In summary, the visual effects on receptors would be as follows:

- Higher sensitivity and slower moving receptors, such as pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians using Saint Hill Road and the Public Right of Way through the Sports Club, would have occasional, narrow glimpses and partial views of small parts of the development proposals. The hard surfaced car park, and cars parked on it, would be largely screened behind the vegetation along Saint Hill Road but could be partially glimpsed from the gateway entrance (Viewpoint 1), and from the section of Saint Hill Road alongside the Sports Club cricket pitch (Viewpoints 2 and 3). Some of the lighting columns would be just visible but difficult to perceive due to the slim nature of these elements and the dark colour of the columns and lanterns. The waiting area structure would only be glimpsed from the northern section of Saint Hill Road, from in the vicinity of Viewpoint 3 at the entrance to the Sports Club, but its low level and nature of the materials would make it difficult to perceive. In any case, the context of the views across the cricket pitch includes the ball protection fencing in the foreground, the 4G pitch with its fencing and floodlighting, the car parks and clubhouse and indoor sports buildings. These are the dominant features in these views, and the development proposals would have a minor effect on these views. People travelling in vehicles would be moving more quickly and would be likely to barely perceive the proposals. The grassed surface car park area would appear, in these views and at these distances, much as the grassed surface of Juhring Field at present, and there would be little perceptible visual change consequently. The temporary car parking would be visible during the various events. However, this is a use that is temporary and there would, therefore, be very limited visual change to the current visual baseline because of this.
- The use of the ZTVs and careful fieldwork has not identified any nearby views of Juhring or Hobbs Fields from the Public Right of Way network to the west of the application site. These are countryside views and walkers on these rights of way are likely to be of higher sensitivity (Viewpoint 5). However, these views would be unaffected.
- The highways and Public Rights of Way network on the higher ground in the mid-distance (around 1km) to the south and south-east do provide for some open views towards Saint Hill Manor and the application sites. Views for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians on West Hoathly Road (Viewpoint 7) and walkers on the Public Right of Way close to Standen House (Viewpoint 6) experience these

open views, albeit through gaps in the intervening vegetation. However, the proposals on Hobbs Field (Juhring Field proposals would be fully screened) due to their low-key nature would be barely perceptible.

- The ZTV work and fieldwork have confirmed that whilst the ZTVs show a wide extent of potential views of the development proposals, the opportunities to view the application site or the development proposals on it, would be highly limited from the wider landscape (i.e. over 2km out to 4km). Viewpoint 8 has been identified as one of these very few views. It provides for a typically characteristic High Weald long view, from one high ridgeline to other wooded ridgelines, punctuated by prominent buildings, such as Saint Hill Manor. However, the application site and development would be screened in this view and, in any case, too distant to be perceptible. Accordingly, these characteristic long views across the National Landscape would be protected.

- 6.10 The visual impact assessment has identified all of the main potential visual receptors, and the effects of the development proposals have been carefully considered. The assessment concludes that the magnitude and significance of the adverse visual change to users of Saint Hill Road would be minor and limited in extent. These are the only near views of the development proposals. Mid-distance views from the higher ground to the south and south-east would have some views, but the magnitude and significance of visual effects would be negligible. Long views, characteristic of the High Weald, would be protected. The visual effects of the development proposals would be minimal.

Landscape Value, Susceptibility and Sensitivity

- 6.11 Recent guidance issued by the Landscape Institute¹⁰ indicates that nationally designated landscapes are to be regarded as being of *High* landscape value (refer to the definitions at Appendix A Table 6). Whilst GLVIA3 identifies that there may be a variation of characteristics and value across designated areas, it is generally accepted such variation in values does not alter or undermine the high value of such designation overall. The application site evidently shares many of the key characteristics of the High Weald National Landscape, such as its rolling topography, woodland and hedgerows and the long views from some parts of the site. The local landscape includes the buildings, car parking, lighting and other infrastructure of the Saint Hill Manor grounds, East Grinstead

¹⁰ Assessing Landscape Value outside of National Designations: Technical Guidance Note 02/21, May 2021

Sports Club and East Grinstead Rugby Club. Notwithstanding the *High* landscape value of the National Landscape, the presence and character of these three existing facilities do reduce aspects of the landscape value locally, including the scenic value but in particular the sense of rurality and remoteness. Overall, this landscape does not share the notable perceptual characteristics with the wider High Weald to the south, for example, where high scenic value and relatively high levels of tranquillity and sense of remoteness are highly evident.

- 6.12 Notwithstanding the variations in character and qualities across the site and immediate landscape, it is considered appropriate that the National Landscape should prevail in the assessment of landscape value. Accordingly, the site and its immediate landscape context, as defined above, is considered to be of *High* value, albeit with qualifications noted above.
- 6.13 The assessment of landscape susceptibility of the application site and its local landscape context is based on judgements of the degree of susceptibility of the landscape to the specific form of development envisaged. The landscape susceptibility of the application site, and its immediate landscape context, to further car parking development, some lighting, small-scale built form and other infrastructure is considered to be *Moderate to Low*. The landscape susceptibility of the wider landscape of the National Landscape, beyond the local landscape context, is evidently much more susceptible but the landscape effects of the development are essentially limited to the local area.
- 6.14 Combining value and sensitivity generates an assessment of the site and its immediate landscaped context landscape sensitivity and it is considered that the sensitivity is *Moderate*.

Landscape Effects

- 6.15 Assessments of the magnitude of landscape effects are concerned with making “*judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and whether it is short or long term in duration*”¹¹. Assessing the potential magnitude of the landscape effect requires consideration of the area and scale of the landscape that it is considered appropriate to consider for the purposes of assisting a decision-maker.
- 6.16 The consideration of landscape character effects takes two parts; the first relates to changes to the fabric of landscape features on the site and, the second, a consideration

¹¹ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2013, Glossary, page 158

of how these changes would alter the key characteristics of the landscape of the site and its context.

- 6.17 In terms of the landscape elements that would be lost or altered, these can relate only to the site, and would include changes to the site's topography, introduction of hard surfacing, column-mounted lighting and cellweb reinforced grass and gravel areas and the two new small-scale buildings. There would be some tree loss but other than the maple, close to Saint Hill Road, all of the other trees are semi-mature and do not make a particular contribution to landscape character. In any case, many other trees would be retained and a full landscape scheme, including tree planting, is proposed. There would also be the introduction of several positive, characteristic landscape elements that would assist in countering the other changes. These include the new hedgerow, tree and scrub planting, and introduction of a new wet, planted swale.
- 6.18 Changes to the topography of the site would be required to establish the level area for the IAS event in Hobbs Field (cut and fill to approximately +/-2m), and more minor regrading of the landform of Juhring Field for the parking areas and suitable gradients for the roads. The current domed landform of Juhring Field would be largely unaltered once the car park structure had been established. The more significant change to the intrinsic character of the site would be the introduction of the hard surfacing, lighting and new buildings. Together these would represent a *Moderate* adverse landscape change to the application site, which for a site of *Moderate* susceptibility would be of *Moderate* adverse significance.
- 6.19 Within the local landscape context around the site, and as perceived from these adjoining areas, there would be some *Slight-Negligible* adverse landscape effects to key perceptual characteristics, such as the sense of rurality, tranquillity, and scenic value of the landscape. These would be of *Moderate-Minor to Minor* adverse significance.
- 6.20 Beyond the local landscape context, in the context of the wider National Landscape, the landscape effects of the proposals would be imperceptible, and there would be no change to the landscape character and value.
- 6.21 Overall, it is considered that the magnitude of the landscape effects on the National Landscape as a whole, would be *Slight* adverse, which would be of *Moderate-Minor* significance.

Nighttime Effects

- 6.22 A Lighting Strategy is set out in the Design and Access Statement. The lighting proposals include four LED twin-headed, full cut-off luminaires on 6m high columns, all painted black, to match the lighting in the existing car park. Bollard lighting of the extended footpath by the main drive would match the existing timber light units (fourteen in total) used around the existing car park and drive. Seven black downlighter bollards would be installed to light the footpaths along the edges of the hard surfaced car park and six along the footpath leading to the main drive. There would no fixed lighting of the grassed car park. The new structures and buildings would require low-level external lights. These would be PIR operated and limited to downlighters from the building overhangs.
- 6.23 The assessment of nighttime effects is based on the structured approach advocated by “*Lighting in the Countryside: Towards Good Practice*”, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, published 1997 (Chapter 6: Environmental Assessment). There is no background information on dark skies and current lighting levels in the High Weald National Landscape and there is no specific guidance on external lighting specific to the National Landscape, although there is some guidance in the High Weald AONB Housing Design Guidance¹² related to street lighting in residential development. This essentially requires the use of external lighting to be minimised wherever possible.
- 6.24 The key issues related to light pollution in general include:
- Urban sky glow - Brightening of the night sky as a result of artificial light (potentially relevant)
 - Glare - Uncomfortable brightness of a light source when viewed against a dark background (potentially relevant)
 - Light trespass - Light spill beyond the boundary of a property (potentially relevant)
 - Unattractive visual environment - Visual intrusion caused by lighting equipment and structures (potentially relevant)
 - Adverse effects against scientific research and astronomy - Harm caused to scientific observations etc. (not considered relevant).
- 6.25 The Lighting Strategy sets the following broad parameters:

¹² The High Weald AONB: High Weald Housing Design Guide 2019

- The minimum lighting necessary to be used to light the hard surface car parking area. This comprises a single line of four 6m high LED luminaires for the car parking and uses full cut-off equipment that minimises light spillage beyond the area. These units would be the same as the existing lighting in the current car park.
- Lighting of footways limited to bollard lighting. Where this lighting forms part of the current drive lighting, the bollards would be the same as the existing bollards used widely across the Saint Hill Manor grounds. Where bollards are required to light the new footways, these would be downlighter bollards in black, to minimise the spread of light and to minimise light spillage.
- The external lighting for the two buildings would be PIR controlled and limited to downlighters set in the buildings' roof overhangs to minimise light spillage.

6.26 Current external light sources in the local landscape context include:

- Lighting within the Saint Hill Manor grounds, including column mounted lights in the existing car park and bollard lights across areas of the grounds and around the existing buildings.
- Floodlighting of the 4G sports pitch, hockey pitch and nine other surfaced pitches of the East Grinstead Sports Club. This lighting is used sporadically during evenings only, depending on pitch usage, but when used is highly noticeable, particularly from Saint Hill Road.
- Floodlighting of the training pitch of the East Grinstead Rugby Club. This lighting is used sporadically during winter evenings only but when used is highly noticeable, but from the south at Saint Hill Green and south of this along West Hoathly Road.

6.27 The nighttime context of the development proposals, therefore, has a range of existing external light sources, some of which have a significant visual nighttime effect, albeit for relatively short periods. In contrast to this local landscape context, the wider landscape of the National Landscape to the south of Saint Hill Manor is comparatively dark and this is characteristic of the valued dark skies referenced in the High Weald Management Plan. The nighttime character of the local landscape context is, therefore, uncharacteristic of the wider National Landscape.

-
- 6.28 The effects of the proposed lighting in this context are related to the nighttime character and the extent to which the proposed lighting would be perceived and would change the character. The visual impact assessment has identified that the lighting columns, and the hard surfaced areas and footways to be lit, would only be visible by receptors on Saint Hill Road and that the views of the lighting would be partial or glimpsed and generally filtered by intervening vegetation. The luminaires and location of the lights and bollards would ensure that there would be no views of the lights themselves (other than the few additional timber bollards used to match the existing along the drive). These would be directional to prevent spillage to other areas. What would be seen would be the lit surfaces and other elements in these areas.
- 6.29 The lit areas would be slightly more noticeable at night when lit, where the immediate context was otherwise dark, than when seen during daylight hours. In these conditions, there would be a *Slight* adverse nighttime visual effect. In conditions when other external light sources in the local context were operational, for example the Sports Club's 4G pitch, the additional lighting of the development proposals would be visible, but much less noticeable than when the context was darker. In these conditions, the nighttime visual effects would be *Negligible*.

Effects on the Core Components of Character of the National Landscape

- 6.30 Table 2 below identifies 7 Positive and Slightly Positive outcomes (including Neutral to Slightly Positive), some 15 Neutral outcomes and some 3 Slightly Negative outcomes. There would be no outright Negative outcomes. This indicates that the scheme has the potential to make an overall positive contribution to the Character Components identified in the Management Plan.

Table 2: Analysis of the Proposals against the Character Components of the High Weald National Landscape

<i>Character Component No.</i>	<i>Management Plan Character Component</i>	<i>Assessment of Positive/Neutral/Negative Effect</i>
Natural Systems		
G1	To restore the natural function of rivers, water courses and water bodies.	Neutral to slightly positive No overall increase in flood risk plus provision of new SUDS attenuation swale feature
G2	To protect landform and geological features including sandstone outcrops.	Slightly negative The existing topographical form would be altered to form the new development, but the general character of the sloping site would be retained. There would be effects on geological features, including sandstone outcrops.
G3	To pursue net zero across the High Weald without compromising its characteristic landscape beauty.	Neutral Subject to detailed design the development would comply with low-energy building techniques and landscape sensitive on site energy renewable generation as required by policy and standards.
G4	To restore soil health across the High Weald.	Neutral An area of existing soils would be disturbed with some permanent loss of topsoils from this site due to built development, although there is the potential for the reuse of these soils in other High Weald locations. Elsewhere, topsoils within the site would be retained in present locations, undisturbed, to form part of the landscape and enhanced ecological habitats of the open spaces.

Settlement		
S1	To protect the historic pattern and character of settlements.	Neutral Development of this scale will have no negative effects on settlement character.
S2	To enhance the architectural quality of the High Weald and ensure new development reflects the character of the High Weald in its siting, scale, layout and design.	Positive Part of this objective can only be addressed through a more detailed design stage which would come through a Reserved Matters application. To the extent that is relevant at outline, the use of High Weald Housing Design Guide to assist the design, the use of traditional architectural detailing, use of native planting for boundaries and use of local landscape character in a new landscape scheme with improved connectivity, helps to ensure that the proposal would fully address this objective.
S3	To conserve the distinct built heritage of the High Weald.	Neutral There would be no adverse effects on the character and setting of heritage assets (designated and non-designated), or direct effects on historic traditional buildings and built features distinct to the High Weald area, including the historic public realm (e.g., traditional signs, railings, milestones and paving treatments).
Routeways		
R1	To maintain the historic pattern, morphology and features of routeways.	Neutral There would be no adverse effects on historic routeways such as sunken lanes. Existing Public Rights of Way, existing at the boundaries of the site, would not be directly impacted.

R2	To protect and enhance the ecological function of routeways.	Neutral There would be no direct adverse effects on routeways or their condition or habitats.
Woodland		
W1	To maintain the existing extent of woodland and particularly ancient woodland.	Neutral No direct adverse effects on existing woodland or Ancient Woodland. There would be some small scale individual tree loss.
W2	To enhance the ecological quality and functioning of woodland at a landscape scale.	Neutral No opportunities to enhance the ecological qualities and functioning of woodland at a landscape scale.
W3	To protect the archaeology and historic assets of AONB woodlands.	Neutral No direct effects on the archaeology and historic assets of National Landscape woodlands.
W4	To increase the output of sustainably produced high-quality timber and underwood for local markets.	Neutral to slightly positive Opportunity to specify the use of sustainable High Weald sourced timber products in the external works of the development. For example, the use of hazel and chestnut in fencing.
Field and Heath		
FH1	To secure agriculturally productive use for the fields of the High Weald, especially for local markets, as part of sustainable land management.	Neutral Hobbs Field would continue to be used for grazing when not being used for the IAS event. Juhring Field hasn't been used for agriculture for a long period. There would be no effect on agriculture as a result of the development.
FH2	To maintain the pattern of small irregularly shaped fields bounded by hedgerows and woodlands.	Neutral The field structure would be retained.

FH3	To enhance the ecological function of field and heath as part of the complex mosaic of High Weald habitats.	Positive Indigenous tree, hedge and shrub planting plus wet meadow species mix used in the new swale feature.
FH4	To protect individual archaeological features as well as historic assets and pattern of fields and heath.	Neutral Desk based assessment for archaeology suggests no significant buried archaeology likely and no effects on heritage assets. For the pattern of fields refer to FH2 above.
Dark Skies		
DS1	To preserve the dark skies of the High Weald AONB by minimising light pollution, obtrusive external lighting and internal light spill from domestic, commercial and public premises in both existing and new developments within the High Weald, and from highways lighting.	Slight negative There would be some inevitable increase in nighttime effects as a result of the built development. Street lighting and other sources of external lighting would be minimised.
DS2	To protect wildlife and habitats from light pollution across the High Weald.	Neutral Foraging resources and commuting routes for bats at the site, such as hedgerows and trees around the perimeter, are to be retained, thus the ecological functionality of the site in a local context should remain unchanged.

Aesthetic and Perceptual Qualities		
PQ1	To increase opportunities for learning about and celebrating the High Weald's character and aesthetic qualities, and to promote and facilitate contributions by communities and individuals to the conservation and enhancement of the High Weald.	Slightly positive The proposals provide improved access to the Saint Hill manor and, therefore, to the appreciation of the High Weald National Landscape.
PQ2	To protect the unspoilt rural landscape with its intrinsic sense of naturalness, valued views, and the extent of green space which foster experiences of rurality and tranquillity.	Slightly negative There would be some loss of intrinsic naturalness, sense of rurality and tranquillity to the local landscape context, but there would be no change to these qualities in the der context of the national Landscape.
PQ3	To foster and promote equitable access and informal enjoyment of the High Weald landscape and the integrated management of its resources for the enjoyment of natural beauty by all.	Positive Equitable accessibility of all internal routes would be provided including those links to the existing Public Rights of Way network.

Land-based economy and related rural life		
LBE1	To improve returns from, and thereby increase entry and retention in, farming, forestry, horticulture and other land management activities that conserve and enhance natural beauty.	Neutral No opportunity to enhance this objective.
LBE2	To reconnect settlements and residents with the surrounding countryside, and maintain and improve rural amenities and services that support communities within the context of the rural settlement pattern.	Slightly positive The development would enhance opportunities for new and existing residents alike to access the surrounding countryside.
LBE3	To improve amenities, infrastructure (including the provision of appropriate affordable housing), and skills development for rural communities and related sectors that contribute positively to conserving and enhancing natural beauty	Neutral No opportunity to enhance this objective

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The application site is set within open countryside, for planning purposes, and within the High Weald National Landscape. Juhring and Hobbs Fields lie within the land owned by the applicant at Saint Hill Manor, Saint Hill Green, East Grinstead. Juhring and Hobbs Fields do not lie within the grounds and gardens associated with the manor house but rather these two fields have been acquired in comparatively recent times, although the applicant has been able to use them with agreement for temporary uses prior to acquisition.
- 7.2 The development proposals seek to rationalise some of the temporary uses and structures that the applicant requires to run day to day activities and to host various temporary events throughout the year. These include establishing an arrangement for car parking with related construction, access to and from Juhring Field to Saint Hill Road, a permanent construction access route to Hobbs Field from Saint Hill Road and the earthworks and engineering for the applicant's annual IAS event hosted there. A waiting area structure is proposed to be located next to the hard surfaced parking area in Juhring Field, and a washroom is proposed at the eastern edge of Hobbs Field, to support the applicant's annual IAS event.
- 7.3 The visual impact assessment has identified all the main potential visual receptors, and the effects of the development proposals have been carefully considered. The assessment concludes that the magnitude and significance of the adverse visual change to users of Saint Hill Road would be minor and limited in extent. These are the only near views of the development proposals. Mid-distance views from the higher ground to the south and south-east would have some views, but the magnitude and significance of visual effects would be negligible. Long views, characteristic of the High Weald, would be protected. The visual effects of the development proposals would be minimal.
- 7.4 Changes to the topography of the site would be required to establish the level area for the IAS event in Hobbs Field (cut and fill to approximately +/-2m), and more minor regrading of the landform of Juhring Field for the parking areas and suitable gradients for the roads. The current domed landform of Juhring Field would be largely unaltered once the car park structure had been established. There would be some tree loss but other than the purple maple, close to Saint Hill Road, all of the other trees are semi-mature and do not make a particular contribution to landscape character. In any case, the context has many other trees which would be retained and a full landscape scheme,

including tree planting, is proposed. The more significant change to the intrinsic character of the site would be the introduction of the hard surfacing, lighting and new buildings and a structure. Together these would represent a *Moderate* adverse landscape change to the application site, which for a site of *Moderate* susceptibility would be of *Moderate* adverse significance.

- 7.5 Within the local landscape context around the site, and as perceived from these adjoining areas, there would be some *Slight-Negligible* adverse landscape effects to key perceptual characteristics, such as the sense of rurality, tranquillity, and scenic value of the landscape. These would be of *Moderate-Minor to Minor* adverse significance. Beyond the local landscape context, in the context of the National Landscape, the landscape effects of the proposals would be imperceptible, and there would be no change to the landscape character and value. Overall, it is considered that the magnitude of the landscape effects on the National Landscape as a whole, would be *Slight* adverse, which would be of *Moderate-Minor* significance.
- 7.6 The lit areas would be slightly more noticeable at night when lit, where the immediate context was otherwise dark, than when seen during daylight hours. In these conditions, there would be a *Slight* adverse nighttime visual effect. In conditions when other external light sources in the local context were operational, for example the Sports Club's 4G pitch, the additional lighting of the development proposals would be visible, but much less noticeable than when the context was darker. In these conditions, the nighttime visual effects would be *Negligible*.
- 7.7 In respect of paragraph 190 of the NPPF, Policies DP12 and DP16 of the Local Plan and draft Policies PPC1 and DPC4 of the Submission Draft (Regulation 19) Local Plan, the design of the development proposals has been landscape led and focussed on moderating, mitigating and eliminating landscape and visual harms to the National Landscape and to the countryside generally. There would be some adverse landscape and visual effects, but these would be both limited in degree, restricted to the site itself and only a small part of the local landscape context. These would represent negligible harms to the character and appearance of the National Landscape and the countryside.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Visual Receptor Value Criteria

Value of Location or View	Description
Very High or National Value	A scenic view in a landscape that has been designated at a national level, and is a view from a national long distance trail or promoted routes in these landscapes, or a recognised view to or from a distinctive feature designated at a national level, e.g. Scheduled Ancient Monument, Listed Building and Registered Historic Park & Garden.
High or County Value	A view from within a designated landscape or a popular view recognised in publications and/or visitor guides for promoted routes and locations of interest.
Moderate or Community Value	A view in an undesignated landscape which may be locally valued and displays evidence of responsible use.
Low or Unvalued	Where the landscape has been despoiled and there is evidence that society does not value the view or landscape.
Private Value	A private view, e.g. from a residential property, that is likely to be valued by the occupants.

APPENDIX B: Visual Receptor Susceptibility

Receptor Group	Location Susceptibility
Residents	High - would view the proposed development in the primary views from their property (e.g. principal living rooms and sitting areas in gardens), would be stationary or moving slowly about their property, would see the development on a daily basis, could be orientated towards the development, and would value these views. High/Moderate - would view the proposed development in the secondary views from their property (e.g. bedrooms and driveway), would be stationary or moving slowly at these locations, would see the development on a daily basis, could be orientated towards the development, and would value these views. Moderate - would view the proposed development from limited locations on their property (e.g. bathrooms and attic windows), would be stationary or moving slowly at these locations, would see the development on a daily basis, could be orientated towards the development, and would value these views.
Recreational receptors	High - are stationary or moving slowly (e.g. walking, cycling or horse riding), can be orientated towards the development, are at that location primarily in order to enjoy the view/landscape.

	High/Moderate - are stationery or moving slowly (e.g. walking, cycling or horse riding), can be orientated towards the development, are at that location primarily in order to enjoy the view/landscape but also for other purposes. Moderate - are stationery or moving slowly, can be orientated towards the development, may be at that location in order to enjoy the view/landscape but would have another primary purpose for being there (e.g. playing sport).
Road and rail users (motorists, passengers, bus and train travellers)	High/Moderate – in locations where they are moving steadily/swiftly, can be orientated towards the development, are likely to be at that location primarily in order to enjoy the view/landscape. Moderate - in locations where they are moving steadily/swiftly, can be orientated towards the development, may be at that location in order to enjoy the view/landscape but may also have other purposes (e.g. journey to work). Moderate/Low - in locations where they are moving swiftly, with a direction of travel that is oblique or side-on to the development, are likely to be travelling for a purpose other than in order to enjoy the view (e.g. higher speed long distance travel).
Outdoor workers	Moderate - outdoor workers and school children in locations where they may be moving slowly, can be orientated towards the development, may experience the view on a daily basis, may be at that location in order to enjoy the view but will have other purposes. Medium/Low - outdoor workers in locations where they may be moving slowly, can be orientated towards the development, may experience the view on a daily basis, but are at that location primarily to undertake activities unconnected with the view.
Indoor workers	Low - indoor receptors with limited views in this direction, who are in that location primarily to undertake activities unconnected with the view.

APPENDIX C: Visual Receptor Sensitivity Criteria

Visual Receptor Sensitivity	Description
Very High Sensitivity	Where the receptor would be stationary or moving slowly, would be likely to be exposed for consistent and prolonged periods and/or whose attention or main interest would be likely to be the landscape and views; particularly, but not necessarily limited to, users of promoted Public Rights of Way within landscapes designated at a national level, users of national trails and promoted long distance routes or at heritage assets, in these landscapes or other valued landscapes, where awareness of changes to visual amenity is likely to be acute.
High Sensitivity	Where the receptor would be stationary, moving slowly or steadily, would be likely to be exposed for consistent and prolonged periods and/or whose attention or interest is likely to include the landscape and views; typically residents at home, users of Public Rights of Way and country lanes, where awareness of changes to visual amenity is likely to be elevated.

Moderate Sensitivity	Where the receptor would be moving steadily or swiftly, would be likely to be exposed to the change for infrequent and short periods, and/or whose attention and interest may include the landscape or views but not primarily; typically travellers on roads, rail or other transport routes where awareness of change to visual amenity is likely to be limited.
Low Sensitivity	Where the receptor would be moving swiftly, would be exposed to the change occasionally and for very short periods, and/or whose attention or interest is not on views or landscape; typically people engaged in higher speed travel, engaged in organised outdoor sport (which does not involve an appreciation of views) and outdoor workers where the setting may be of importance to the quality of working life.
Negligible Sensitivity	Where the receptor would be predominantly inside and at their place of work focused on their work activity and where setting is not important to the quality of working life and awareness of change to visual amenity is likely to be negligible.

APPENDIX D: Magnitude of Visual Effects Criteria

Magnitude of Change	Description
Very Substantial	Where the proposed development would be openly visible in its entirety or near entirety, the development would be in stark contrast to the landscape context and may be perceived to be close to the viewpoint, such that it would be the dominant adverse/beneficial feature in the scene.
Substantial	Where the proposed development would be visible in its entirety or partly screened, the development would contrast with the landscape context and may be perceived to be in the near or middle distance, such that it would stand out as a prominent adverse/beneficial feature in the scene.
Moderate	Where the proposed development would be visible in its entirety or partly screened, the development may contrast with the landscape context and may be perceived to be in the middle distance or at closer distances if more screened, such that it would be evident as a noticeable adverse/beneficial feature in the scene.
Slight	Where the proposed development would be visible in its entirety or partly screened, the development may contrast with the landscape context and may be perceived to be in the distance or far distance, or at closer distances and largely screened, such that it would be a visible adverse/beneficial feature in the scene.

Negligible	Where the proposed development would be almost entirely screened, the development may contrast with the landscape context and may be perceived to be in the far distance, or at closer distances and substantially screened such that it would be a barely discernible adverse/beneficial feature in the scene.
-------------------	---

APPENDIX E: Landscape Value Criteria

Landscape Value	Description
Very High or International Value	Where the landscape has been designated at an international level, e.g. a World Heritage Site, and the purposes of which include landscape and/or recreational opportunities.
High or National Value	Where the landscape has been designated at a national level, e.g. National Parks (England, Scotland and Wales), Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (England, Wales and NI), Heritage Coasts (England and Wales), LANDMAP VSAA Outstanding Overall Evaluation (Wales) or where a landscape feature has been designated at a national level, e.g. Scheduled Ancient Monument, and forms a highly distinctive landscape feature.
Moderate-high or County/District Value	Regional Parks, landscape designations in Structure, Unitary or Local Development Plans, LANDMAP VSAA High Overall Evaluation (Wales) or a landscape feature that has been designated at a County/Borough/District level and forms a distinctive landscape feature.
Moderate or Local Value	For undesignated landscapes and landscape features which are locally valued, LANDMAP VSAA Moderate Overall Evaluation (Wales) and display evidence of responsible use and value.
Low or Unvalued	Where the landscape and/or landscape features have been despoiled and there is evidence that society does not value the landscape and/or landscape features, e.g. fly tipping, abandoned cars, litter, vandalism, etc.

APPENDIX F: Landscape Susceptibility Criteria

Landscape Susceptibility	Description
Very High susceptibility	Where the clarity of the key characteristics are very strongly expressed and/or their robustness to change is fragile and/or views are an essential characteristic, and/or policies and strategies aim to achieve “no change” to landscape character, and the changes to landscape character that could be brought about by a development of the type, scale and location proposed would be incompatible with these factors.
High Susceptibility	Where the clarity of the key characteristics are strongly expressed and/or their robustness to change is weak and/or views are an important characteristic and/or policies and strategies aim to conserve the key characteristics, and the changes to landscape character that could be brought about by a

	development of the type, scale and location proposed would have a poor compatibility with these factors.
Moderate susceptibility	Where the clarity of the key characteristics are clearly expressed and/or their robustness to change is moderately strong and/or views contribute to landscape character and/or policies and strategies promote or accept limited changes to key characteristics, and the changes to landscape character that could be brought about by a development of the type, scale and location proposed would have a moderate compatibility with these factors.
Slight susceptibility	Where the clarity of the key characteristics are vaguely expressed and/or their robustness to change is strong and/or views are incidental to landscape character and/or policies and strategies promote or accept that the landscape could evolve, and the changes to landscape character that could be brought about by a development of the type, scale and location proposed would have a good compatibility with these factors.
Negligible susceptibility	Where the key characteristics are muddled and/or their robustness to change is very strong and/or views are irrelevant to landscape character and/or policies and strategies promote or accept major changes to key characteristics and the changes to landscape character that could be brought about by a development of the type, scale and location proposed would have excellent compatibility with these factors.

APPENDIX G: Landscape Sensitivity Criteria

Landscape Sensitivity	Description
Very High sensitivity	A landscape likely to be of international or national value and/or with features, elements, areas or special qualities of international or national value, that could be very susceptible to the type, scale and location of development proposed.
High sensitivity	A landscape likely to be of national or County/Borough/District value and/or with features, elements, areas or special attributes of value, that could be very susceptible or susceptible to the type, scale and location of development proposed.
Moderate sensitivity	A landscape likely to be of national, County/Borough/District or local value and/or with features, elements, areas or special attributes of value or local value, that could have a moderate or slight susceptibility to the type, scale and location of development proposed.
Low sensitivity	A landscape likely to be of local value and/or with features, elements, areas or special attributes of value, that could have a slight susceptibility to the type, scale and location of development proposed.
Negligible sensitivity	A landscape that is likely to be unvalued and/or with features, elements, areas or special qualities that are unvalued, and that could have a slight or a negligible susceptibility to the type, scale and location of development proposed.

APPENDIX H: Magnitude of Landscape Effects Criteria

Magnitude of Change	Description
Very Substantial adverse (or beneficial)	Where the proposals would become a defining characteristic of the landscape, would override and be in stark contrast with (or would substantially enhance) the existing landscape context, would be in the context of no similar developments (or would reinstate particularly valued features that had been previously lost or degraded) and would be a dominant additional feature(s).
Substantial adverse (or beneficial)	Where the proposals would become a key characteristic of the landscape, would compete with and detract from (or enhance) the existing landscape context, would be in the context of few similar developments (or would reinstate particularly valued features that had been previously lost or degraded) and would be a prominent additional feature(s).
Moderate adverse (or beneficial)	Where the proposals would become an equal characteristic of the landscape and would contrast with (or complement) the existing landscape context, may be in the context of a few similar developments (and/or would reinstate valued features that had been previously lost or degraded) and would be a noticeable additional feature(s).
Slight adverse (or beneficial)	Where the proposals would become a minor characteristic of the landscape and would contrast with (or complement) the existing landscape context, may be in the context of some similar developments (and/or would reinstate features that had been previously lost or degraded) and would be a visible additional feature(s).
Negligible adverse (or beneficial)	Where the proposals may contrast with (or would complement) the existing landscape context, may be in the context of several similar developments (and/or would reinstate minor features that had been previously lost or degraded) and would be a barely discernible additional feature(s).

APPENDIX I: Overall Assessment of Landscape and Visual Effects Criteria (Significance)

	Magnitude of Change				
Sensitivity	<i>Very Substantial</i>	<i>Substantial</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Slight</i>	<i>Negligible</i>
<i>Very High</i>	Major ++	Major +	Major	Major - Moderate	Moderate
<i>High</i>	Major +	Major	Major- Moderate	Moderate	Moderate - Minor
<i>Moderate</i>	Major	Major - Moderate	Moderate	Moderate - Minor	Minor
<i>Low</i>	Major - Moderate	Moderate	Moderate - Minor	Minor	Minor - Negligible
<i>Negligible</i>	Moderate	Moderate - Minor	Minor	Minor - Negligible	Negligible

enplan