

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This SoCG relates to the planning application (5/21/3194) submitted by the Appellants on 12 November 2021 and refused by SACDC on 25/10/2022.
- 1.2. References to “the Parties” in this SoCG shall mean the Appellant and SACDC.
- 1.3. “The Application” in this SoCG shall mean “Outline application (access sought) for demolition of existing buildings, and the building of up to 330 discounted affordable homes for Key Workers, including military personnel, the creation of open space and the construction of new accesses and highway works including new foot and cycle path and works to junctions.”
- 1.4. This SoCG supplements the wider SoCG agreed between the Appellants and SACDC.
- 1.5. The purpose of this SoCG is to identify for the Inspector of the Planning Appeal the areas where SACDC and the Appellants are in agreement in relation to landscape and visual matters.

2. MATTERS AGREED BETWEEN THE PARTIES

- 2.1. It is agreed that the Appeal Site it is not in, or in the setting of, a nationally or locally valued landscape for the purposes of paragraph 174 of the NPPF.
- 2.2. It is agreed that the Appeal Scheme does not breach any national or local planning policies protective of landscape character and appearance including ‘Policy 74: Landscaping and Tree Preservation’ of the SADC Local Plan.
- 2.3. SACDC and the Appellant agree that the relevant published landscape character context for the Site is NCA 111: Northern Thames Basin (CD7.5), and LCA 10: St Stephen’s Plateau (CD8.13).
- 2.4. The sensitivity of these landscape character areas is Medium as set out in the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) (Paragraphs 2.13-2.14 with regard to NCA 111: Northern Thames Basin; and Paragraphs 2.16 to 2.33 and also Medium with regard to LCA 10: St

Stephen's Plateau) and as set out in the Proof of Evidence of Mr Friend (CD5.33) in Section 4.

- 2.5. The Landscape value of the site is given as Medium-Low by UBU and Medium by Mr Friend
- 2.6. The landscape condition of the site is either Low by UBU or Medium by Mr Friend.
- 2.7. Susceptibility to change is agreed as Medium.
- 2.8. Mr Gray States that Paragraph 5.7 of the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) dealing with the impact on Site Features unintentionally omitted the word Adverse, even when the beneficial effects of the site are also considered, it is agreed that the nature of effects on the Site Features will be Major Adverse at the operational stage.
- 2.9. Mr Gray States that Likewise, the consideration of the Setting of the Site as described in para 5.11 of the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) also omitted the word Adverse and implies that the nature of effects could be beneficial at the operational stage. It is agreed that the likely significance of effects will be Slight Adverse.
- 2.10. It is agreed that the overall Major Adverse effects at the operational stage can be reduced through the successful implementation of landscape mitigation leading to Moderate residual effects of landscape features within the site boundary as reported in paragraphs 5.8 of the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) and as set out in the Proof of Evidence of Mr Friend (CD5.33) in paragraphs 5.1.5, 5.1.8 and 5.1.24. It is not agreed whether the nature of the residual effects are adverse, neutral or beneficial. All outcomes in both landscape and visual terms that are provided within Mr Friend's proof are considered adverse in nature.
- 2.11. The methodology adopted for the preparation of the UBU LVIA, as set out in full in Section 4 of the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) is also agreed.
- 2.12. It is agreed that the selection of viewpoints that are included in the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) and in the Proof of Evidence of Mr Friend (CD5.33) are representative of

the visual receptors that could be potentially influenced by the proposed development. These are identified and listed in paragraphs 3.3, 3.6 to 3.9 of the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) and in the Proof of Evidence of Mr Friend (CD5.33) in Table 3 on Page 19 and on Figure 2 on page 20.

- 2.13. It is agreed that the sensitivity of the public footpath St Michael PRoW 012 is High and is represented by Viewpoints 18 of the UBU LVIA (CD4.17) and Viewpoint 6 of the Proof of Evidence of Mr Friend (CD5.33).
- 2.14. It is agreed that the judgements on sensitivity, magnitude of change and significance of effects are summarised in Table 1 of this SoCG and illustrates the differences in judgements between the Appellant's landscape architect and Mr Friend.

P. G. Gray

St. Albans
St. Albans