

ORGANISATION	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECIEVED	RESPONSE
BGS	<p>With one or two honourable exceptions, the influence of Superficial Deposits (i.e. 'Drift') on the landscape has not been considered. With a few exceptions, the significance of glaciation and periglaciation for the evolution and character of the landscape has not been considered.</p> <p>The characteristic use of building materials in relation to the geology has been inconsistently dealt with - sometimes not mentioned at all, if mentioned then only stone, not other local materials such as clay and brick although these are just as important and equally characteristic.</p> <p>Minerals have not always been considered in Landscape Change and Management, or their link to geodiversity and biodiversity. Industrial heritage receives poor attention in most landscape areas apart from the coalfield</p> <p>Section 3: Foundations of the EM Landscape, p32, para 5 BGS suggest a large block of additional text relating to geo-diversity. This is to be added as a separate sub section in addition to the 3 pages on geology.</p> <p>Section 4: Group 11B Moorland Valleys. Page 269 Suggested amalgamation of LCT with 10C wooded slopes and vales (p247) as little difference</p> <p>Section 4: Group 5B Wooded Village Farmlands. Page 149 This type covers milstone grit, coal measures and Sherwood sandstone as well as area of mercia mudstones. This makes the physical landform different and also affects the building material. Suggest split into 2 types.</p> <p>Sandstone Forests and Heaths 10B Mention when Sherwood Forest came into existence. Mention Robin Hood as the 'legend' clearly has a significant impact on the tourist industry of this area and on Nottingham as well. Need to clarify the visitor numbers.</p>	<p>This study draws out what is unique to the EM. It is not intended as a full description of the geology, therefore no additional information is needed.</p> <p>The consistency has been checked, although the study draws out those features which contribute significantly to character and not further detail was thought to be necessary.</p> <p>Minerals is already raised where it is an issue, this study does not aim to fully describe the mineral activity in the region. Likewise, the Partnership considered the report draws out the key areas where industrial heritage is significant and no change is necessary.</p> <p>A shorter version of this suggested text about 'geo-diversity' was added.</p> <p>Although there are clearly similarities, the moorland element gives a key character difference so the LCTs have not been changed.</p> <p>The geology in this LCT is varied but the land use and land cover on the surface have evolved to form a more consistent character and field study suggested there areas should be contained in a single LCT</p> <p>The necessary amendments have been made to takes these comments on board.</p>
<p>In light of the detailed and extensive comments received from BGS The Landscape Partnership consider there is scope for a separate study focused entirely on the geological assets of the Region and raising the profile of geodiversity. This suggestion has been passed to the Geodiversity Partnership for further action.</p>		

<p>CPRE</p>	<p>This is a coherent, useful and interesting report. There is potential to use it as a valuable education resource. The published report needs promoting.</p> <p>There is potential to have clickable website to allow a more interactive way to access the information.</p> <p>Soils Section 3.2 p 32 The soils section seems short and there is potential to draw out the key finding from the ADAS report to provide more comprehensive information</p> <p>Biodiversity P37 Could the regional and local wildlife sites be referred to as well as the national ones</p> <p>Housing P47/48 Suggests the housing pressure correctly identified here is not picked up on in the individual RLCT in the forces for change section and it should be.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure (pp50) CPRE do not agree that infrastructure routes can provide an opportunity for landscape enhancement. This section needs to mention EM airport which impacts tranquillity and has potential for expansion.</p> <p>Minerals and waste (p51 – 56) This section is longer than others in the same section, potential to consolidate it, or move some of the text to a more appropriate location.</p> <p>Strongly support the need for an advocacy document to spread the messages of the EMRLCA and recommend the EMRLCA is used for education purposes where possible.</p> <p>There are many other small and specific recommended changes which highlight the importance of landscape protection or emphasise the significance of the forces for change, especially the housing targets.</p>	<p>Useful general comments which will be considered for future actions.</p> <p>There is limited space for this detailed information in this report; however reference is made to the regional soil study.</p> <p>Text has been added to cover this point.</p> <p>Housing is considered specifically in the ‘forces for change’ section of the relevant LCTs so no change was thought to be necessary.</p> <p>This point has been taken on board and the text changed to ‘the impacts from new infrastructure routes can be mitigated’. A section has been added about EM Airport.</p> <p>This is a long section but the information is considered relevant so it has not been consolidated.</p> <p>An Advocacy document has now been produced and is available in hard copy and electronically</p> <p>Minor factual amendments have been made.</p>
-------------	---	--

<p>Derby City Council</p>	<p>The opening paragraphs are too vague; real thought needs to go into expressing up front the assessment's added value and relationship to other assessments.</p> <p>For the whole document an executive summary is vital. This must explain how it relates to other existing LCAs.</p> <p>A general comment about all the figures. It would be immensely helpful if at the right time they were available electronically for authorities, agencies and others to cookie cut to their boundaries to use in other documents, particularly local ones. This would also help bring the value of the report to the attention of others.</p> <p>P1193A Floodplain valleys. Landscape Change and Management Gravel extraction in the valleys: there is not enough inert fill for full restoration to dry uses so wet uses are inevitable. How can these be positively planned for, taking into account need for careful design for such matters as minimising the risk to planes of bird strike and maximising benefits for biodiversity gain? These are strategic issues the assessment could comment on.</p>	<p>The opening paragraphs were amended and strengthened accordingly.</p> <p>An executive summary was written and Christopher Pennell was asked to write a foreword for the report.</p> <p>The newly created regional Landscape Character Types can be available as a GIS layer for use by stakeholders upon request to Natural England.</p> <p>Reference to this comment has been made in the report.</p>
---------------------------	--	---

<p>Derbyshire County Council</p>	<p>The document needs an executive summary (see more detailed comments)</p> <p>The opening passages need to explain how this documents relates to other local assessments and explain what will happen next i.e. it will inform the SPD, LDFs.</p> <p>P27 Section 3 Physical Influences Is there any limestone pavement in Derbyshire?</p> <p>Section 3 is too long. The geology section talks at length and using specialist terms about geological details which do not impact landscape character and there is scope to consolidate it significantly. The same applies to biodiversity.</p> <p>Section 3.3 Cultural Influences Too long in a document which is about the present day landscape. Accept the historical depth of the landscape but some of the time periods discussed do not have an impact on today's landscape, for example, there is little of the impact of human activity in the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods that is at all evident today.</p> <p>Section 4 LCT Descriptions For ease of use it would be helpful if the main landscape groups (eg. Group, 2, etc) were colour referenced on the page edge so that it is much easier to find individual descriptions – perhaps the LCT reference number (1a, 1b, etc) might also be included on the tab.</p> <p>Figure 18 – National Character Areas with Regional LCTS Not sure of the overall benefit of this Figure other than showing where the discrepancies are between the national and regional landscape areas – NCAs have already been presented at Figure 2</p> <p>Figures general comments It would be more helpful to see how the baseline datasets relate to the regional LCTs. Perhaps consider overlaying the base maps with the outlines of the regional LCTs – without this information the figures are of limited value because it is difficult to relate them to the boundaries of LCTs</p>	<p>This comment, which was made by several stakeholders, has been taken on board. An Executive Summary has been written, as has a foreword. The section explaining the relationship between this document and other existing character assessments has been strengthened.</p> <p>There is no limestone pavement in Derbyshire and this reference has been removed from the document.</p> <p>Section 3 was consolidated where possible, although it contained much valuable information which the Partnership did not want to lose from the document.</p> <p>The Partnership accepted this point but felt that the present landscape was a result of all the historical time periods, even if the evidence was not immediately obvious in the present landscape, and have opted to retain most of this section.</p> <p>Tabs have been added to section 4 to facilitate easy access to the landscape groups.</p> <p>It was considered useful to illustrate how the national and regional studies relate to each other and this figure was retained.</p> <p>This is a useful point but would make the document very large. It was suggested that this would be a useful feature to add to the online version, perhaps by creating an interactive map whereby different GIS layers could be added or removed to compare different data sets. This is being investigated.</p>
----------------------------------	--	--

<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>P119 3A Floodplain valleys: Forces for Change Forces for Change should include climate change, which will lead to increased flooding, and summer desiccation of wetlands.</p> <p>Overall, this is a very wide-ranging and comprehensive report, which we welcome.</p>	<p>Climate change has been considered throughout the report and there is specific mention of it in some RLCTs e.g. those in Group 1 which discuss Environmental Processes and Climate Change. It is also mention specifically in section 3.4.9.</p>
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>Page 49 Section 3: Employment provision Employment provision is not likely to have a lesser impact on landscape character than new housing as is stated here. (The M1 remains a focus for distribution sheds and industrial development as at J29a (Markham Vale), a possible site near Derby, proposed employment areas on the edge of Leicester, major expansion of DIRFT and proposed commercial activity associated with the Silverstone motor racing circuit).</p> <p>Page 235. 10A Forest Hills and Ridges: Infrastructure The tranquillity, remoteness and sense of being back in time of parts of the Rockingham Forest could be threatened by wind farm proposals</p>	<p>This comment has been incorporated into the text.</p> <p>The ‘forces for change’ section has been extended to include renewable energy in this LCT.</p>
<p>Gedling Borough Council</p>	<p>Do not have any specific comments as the EMRLCA is a background document at the Regional scale and it doesn't have a direct impact on planning applications or how we draft our policy.</p>	<p>The EMRLCA does have a use at the Local level particularly when working across administrative boundaries. A a section has been added to the report to explain how this regional level LCA relates to Local policy and decision making.</p>
<p>Hinckley and Bosworth BC</p>	<p>Submitted a number of minor factual, useful comments and changes based on local knowledge.</p>	<p>The relevant changes have been made.</p>

<p>South Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Section 1 p15 report Structure “value-laden terminology” – subjective perceptions There is no reason why objectivity and subjectivity cannot sit side by side complementing each other. How will objective description without an element of value judgment/subjective evaluation/emotive response define those landscapes which are in need of enhancement/improvement?</p> <p>Section 3.5 Perception of Landscape Tranquillity ranking is too crude a tool to identify neglected/declining landscapes particularly at the more micro scale. What is the measure for this?</p> <p>Figure 17 Regional Landscape Character Types It would be helpful to have this Figure as either an A3 fold-out or featuring at the beginning of each Landscape Character Group for ease of reference</p>	<p>The remit and methodology used in this assessment is to remain objective and describe the character of the landscape. It is an evidence base which will inform other decision makers.</p> <p>Tranquillity is one element which contributes to the perception of landscape and has been used to inform the regional level character assessment. The Partnership did not consider any alteration to the document was necessary.</p> <p>This Figure shows the key output of the study – the identification of 31 LCTs. It has been added as an A3 fold out map & key to the beginning of section 4 for ease of reference, and remains with the other figures at the end of the document.</p>
<p>West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit.</p>	<p>There is a clear need for a consistent approach to Landscape Character Assessments across the Region. This is therefore a fully supported process.</p> <p>It is extremely essential that the importance of existing local and county assessments, such as The Northamptonshire Environmental Character Suite is recognised in the document.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that Green Infrastructure has not been considered in the wider context of this document.</p>	<p>A key role of the EMRLCA is to signpost the way to other local, more detailed assessments. A section has been added to the document to clarify the relationship between this assessment and existing Character Assessments.</p> <p>As mentioned in the introduction, one of the key aims of the document is to provide a sound evidence base upon which to create robust GI strategies. Text has been added in section 3 to explain the role and benefits of sound GI, based on a good LCA, in relation to development pressure.</p>

Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>Figure 11: Biodiversity Action Plan habitat map</p> <p>It is appreciated that the national habitat inventories provided by Natural England have been used, but there are a number of problems with these, such as the extent of heathland in Sherwood is greatly exaggerated (as several large conifer plantations, e.g. Clipstone Forest, Longdale Lane, Sampsons Wood, Thieves Wood etc. are mapped erroneously as heathland), and it also appears that lots of Lowland Calcareous Grassland sites have been mapped (e.g. in Rushcliffe) which don't exist.</p>	NE are aware of the limitations of the national inventories however they are the most upto date version we have and do provide us with the only regionally consistent data set for the region. NE are continually working to improve the inventories.
Rutland County Council	<p>Generally express a lot of support for the document.</p> <p>It would be helpful and aid interpretation if county boundaries could be shown on Figure 17.</p>	It was felt this would add extra lines to the map which may reduce the clarity of the figure. This is something which could be explored further for the internet version of the figure.

<p>Peak District National Park Authority</p>	<p>Overall it is an excellent piece of work</p> <p>General - Section 4: Landscape Change & Management sub headings Not consistently applied across all Landscape Character Types. It is unclear if these subsections were not deemed necessary in all cases, or have been overlooked, but in some cases their omission seems surprising.</p> <p>Preface- Paragraph 2 Refers to LCA being an objective process. Whilst that is true for the landscape character assessment, this paragraph ought to perhaps acknowledge that the inclusion of sections on “shaping the future landscape” does introduce a more subjective and value laden element in suggesting future management priorities for each area.</p> <p>Section 3 biodiversity (page 37) Refers to only 49% SSSIs being in favourable/recovering condition. We suspect this figure is now well out of date and it is likely to be over 80%- Natural England should be able to provide an update.</p> <p>The document should provide an important tool in regional landscape and land-use planning. Given the position of the National Park, straddling 4 Regions, it would be useful to have your views on how links with other Regions might be made in utilising the EMRLCA, ensuring that other Regions are aware of and engage with it.</p> <p>The Peak District Landscape Strategy identifies and generally welcomes the potential for appropriately scaled hydroelectric power generation within the Derwent Valley.</p>	<p>The sub-sections were only added if they applied to the LCT. Several more sub-sections have been added where it was felt their omission was inappropriate.</p> <p>This point is addressed in the newly introduced Executive Summary which states clearly that no judgement is made about the quality or value of the landscape and the document, following best practice, seeks to be objective at all times, even when describing future management guidelines.</p> <p>This figure was outdated and has now been corrected to 96.5% This figure will change each year and can be checked on the NE webpage.</p> <p>Yorks & Humber, NW and West Midlands are in the early stages of preparing regional LCAs. The East of England have progressed their regional assessment towards management objectives. Reference to these documents has been added to the text to make people aware of need to consider other cross boundary assessments too. NE & PDNP have an advocacy role to make others aware of the EMRLCA as an evidence base.</p> <p>A section on energy provision has been added to cover this useful point to LCT 10B.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Leicestershire CC</p>	<p>P148 5A Village Farmlands. Landscape Change and Management: Possibly add reference to energy crops – need to decide whether this topic should be covered under the sub-head Energy Provision, Agriculture or Forestry. (we note that in 9a energy crops are considered under Agriculture)</p> <p>5B Wooded Village Farmlands The landscape character description is very similar to 5A Village Farmlands, with repetition of large sections of the text. More differentiation is needed.</p> <p>5C Undulating mixed Farmlands: Energy provision Re wind farms. Is this a topic where the production of <i>regional</i> level guidance for use by counties/districts would be appropriate?</p> <p>We are concerned by the second sentence of this para which could be quoted in applications by wind farm developers to support their proposals. (<i>Wind farm development can create visual landmarks and reduce the sense of remoteness and isolation</i>)</p> <p>9a Settled coalfield farmlands Woodland is described here as forming a ‘significant component’ of the landscape, but Key Characteristics describes it as having ‘generally low woodland cover’.</p> <p>10d Forested Ancient Hills As Regional Park is not a statutory or protective designation is may be misleading to describe it as ‘offering more robust protection’ and we suggest this phrase is deleted</p> <p>Section 4 Recommendations on Shaping the Future Landscape tend to be very generic, rather than containing guidance specific to individual LCTs.</p> <p>More photos are needed in the LCT sections. The figures and their keys need sorting out</p> <p>It would be more helpful if keys for figures could be on page opposite rather than on reverse.</p>	<p>The Partnership agreed with this point. A reference to energy crops has been added under the ‘agriculture’ section.</p> <p>It was agreed they should not be amalgamated, there is sufficient difference in character to keep separate. Text was reworked to clarify the differences.</p> <p>The EMRLCA will form a useful evidence base in any future regional strategic assessments of renewable energy.</p> <p>The Partnership agreed to delete the text ‘create visual landmarks’. The role of the EMRLCA is to remain unbiased and objective as far as possible.</p> <p>This paragraph has been revisited and clarified to explain this is a well ‘treed’ landscape, although there are fewer blocks of large woodland. Landscape restoration and woodland planting has shaped this landscape.</p> <p>The Regional Spatial Plan policies provide support for regional parks. Instead of ‘offering more robust protection’ the document now refers readers to the appropriate regional plan policy.</p> <p>Although more site specificity would be useful it is not always possible at the regional level. More detail can be obtained from lower tier LCAs.</p> <p>Many more good quality images were added as a result of an internal NE landscape photography competition.</p> <p>The maps and figures have all been re-formatted so the maps and keys align correctly; they were previously only in draft format.</p>
--------------------------	--	---

The National Forest	<p>There should be a direct read across between the EMRLCA and the National Forest Strategy for the LCTs within the National Forest. This is especially important for the landscape change and management sections. There are some inconsistencies. The National Forest Strategy should be the lead document as it has been through rigorous nation consultation.</p> <p>The relevant character types which will need revisiting are Village Farmlands, Wooded Village Farmlands, Forested Ancient Hills, River Valley Floodplains.</p>	The Partnership agreed the EMRLCA needed to be revised to reflect the NF Strategy aims where appropriate. This was done through liaison with the Nation Forest.
Natural England	<p>There is a need for more images. Action has been taken to organise a landscape photography competition and the images should be used to illustrate the document.</p> <p>Section 4 should be expanded within the index to help ease of access for people who want to go straight to their LCT.</p> <p>Introduction to Section 4 - P67 Make the paragraph about further information sources bold and in a box so it stands out. Then remove it from the end of each LCT to streamline the document.</p> <p>The sub sections in section 4 <i>Agriculture, land management and fishing</i> should only include fishing in the title where it is relevant.</p> <p>The ecosystem services provided in each LCT needs to be addressed. How should we do this?</p>	<p>These images have been used in the final document.</p> <p>Section 4, which provides details on the LCTS, has been made more prominent in the contents page and a tab in the margin system has been used to facilitate easy access to the relevant LCT in the text.</p> <p>This comment has been taken on board.</p> <p>A separate section has been added to discuss eco-system services in section 3, although there was not capacity to go into this in detail and further studies may be needed.</p>
Comments from members of the public	<p>The Rutland scarplands are not included in the assessment in Section 6. Corby, Kettering, East and South Northants all contain this landscape district.</p> <p>Woodland, which has recreational use and well as timber grows extensively on the Quaternary Boulder Clays which cover the Jurassic rocks. The visual and economic significance of this needs to be noted.</p>	Factual changes based on local knowledge from members of the public and from stakeholders have been made throughout the document where they have been suggested.

<p>FPCR Consultants</p>	<p>Question why the document was commissioned in the first place, suggesting there is no needed for an additional layer in the LCA hierarchy.</p> <p>In the Unwooded Vales LCT, it states "extensive new woodland planting would be generally inappropriate". There is no justification for this sweeping value judgement, which is completely at odds with Government strategy promoting the delivery of woodland.</p> <p>The mapping techniques used are confusing and very difficult to follow.</p> <p>There are many other flaws.</p>	<p>This question is answered fully in section. The Partnership did not consider it necessary to make any changes.</p> <p>This comment does not refer to a value judgement; more a description of the situation. If the character of the Unwooded Vales is 'unwooded' then delivery of large areas of new woodland would be out of character with the landscape and would not be appropriate. The Partnership supports the Government strategy promoting the delivery of woodland and recently worked closely with the Forestry Commission to produce a Woodland Opportunity Mapping report based on the findings of the EMRLCA. This document can be viewed on the NE regional landscape webpage.</p> <p>The definitive 2002 LCA Guidance for England and Wales was used to inform the methodology.</p> <p>The Partnership cannot address them if they are not made aware of what these flaws may be. The results of the public consultation (as detailed above) revealed much support for the document.</p>
-------------------------	---	--