



**CD #34**

# **YORKSHIRE DALES AND LAKE DISTRICT NATIONAL PARKS**

## **REVIEW OF AREAS PROPOSED FOR EXTENSION**

**A Report for Natural England**

**by**

**Professor Carys Swanwick  
University of Sheffield**

**jointly with**

**Land Use Consultants**

**December 2007**

# CONTENTS

## **Section 1 Introduction and methods**

Introduction  
Background and overview  
Previous work and evaluation areas  
Interpretation of the brief  
The evaluation framework  
Preparing the evidence database  
Identifying limitations and gaps in the evidence base  
Preparing the technical assessment statements  
Table 1 : Relationship between areas defined during various study phases  
Table 2 : The Evaluation Framework  
Table 3 : Sources of evidence – Reports  
Table 4 : Sources of evidence – GIS Data

## **Section 2 Assessments of evaluation areas against the technical criteria**

EA1 Birkbeck Fells to Whinfell  
EA2 Helsington Barrows to Levens  
– EA2a Helsington Barrows to Sizergh Fell  
– EA2b River Kent to Levens  
EA3 the Orton Fells  
EA4 the Northern Howgill Fells  
EA5: Mallerstang and Wild Boar Fell  
EA6: Middleton, Barbon and Leck Fells  
EA7: Firbank Fell  
EA8: Killington to Kirkby Lonsdale  
– EA8a: Lower Lune Valley and EA8b: Killington to Mansergh (the fells to the west)  
– EA8c: Kirkby Lonsdale Area  
EA9: Cold Cotes Area

## **Section 3 Maps of key GIS layers for evaluation areas**

EA1 Birkbeck Fells to Whinfell  
EA2 Helsington Barrows to Levens  
– EA2a Helsington Barrows to Sizergh Fell  
– EA2b River Kent to Levens  
EA3 the Orton Fells  
EA4 the Northern Howgill Fells  
EA5: Mallerstang and Wild Boar Fell  
EA6: Middleton, Barbon and Leck Fells EA7: Firbank Fell  
EA8: Killington to Kirkby Lonsdale  
– EA8a: Lower Lune Valley and EA8b: Killington to Mansergh (the fells to the west)  
– EA8c: Kirkby Lonsdale Area

## **Section 4      Reports from database of evidence**

EA1 Birkbeck Fells to Whinfell

EA2 Helsington Barrows to Levens

- EA2a Helsington Barrows to Sizergh Fell
- EA2b River Kent to Levens

EA3 the Orton Fells

EA4 the Northern Howgill Fells

EA5: Mallerstang and Wild Boar Fell

EA6: Middleton, Barbon and Leck Fells

EA7: Firbank Fell

EA8: Killington to Kirkby Lonsdale

- EA8a: Lower Lune Valley and EA8b: Killington to Mansergh (the fells to the west)
- EA8c: Kirkby Lonsdale Area

**SECTION 1**  
**INTRODUCTION**

## **Introduction**

1. The definition of areas proposed for extensions of the Yorkshire Dales and Lake District National Parks represents a significant step taking forward work originally started in 1947 with the Report of the National Parks Committee, which proposed the designation of the Howgill Fells as a conservation area. More recently a substantial body of work has been undertaken to identify those areas potentially qualifying for designation.
2. This report for Natural England has been prepared by Carys Swanwick of the Department of Landscape at the University of Sheffield, the contract holder, working jointly with a team from Land Use Consultants. It is the result of a study carried out between July and November 2007 to review the evidence from earlier work setting out how each of a number of Evaluation Areas meets the 'technical' criteria for designation as part of a National Park, that is natural beauty and open air recreation. As well as evidence from existing work the study has also been informed by additional sources of evidence.

## **Background and overview**

3. The basis on which landscapes are designated has been the focus of a great deal of attention recently. This has resulted from:
  - issues arising from the designation of new National Parks in England;
  - the High Court and related Appeal proceedings relating to the so-called "Meyrick Judgement" on land included in the New Forest National Park. This raised a number of issues of principle regarding the application of the statutory designation criteria;
  - the amendments of the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act enacted under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, which sought to address the effects of the High Court judgement;
  - work carried out in 2006 for the Countryside Council for Wales to assist them in advising the Welsh Assembly on definitions of Natural Beauty, which examined evolving approaches to this concept and the origins of some of criteria currently in use;
  - the considerable body of work done so far on possible extension of the National Park designations in North West England.
4. The brief for the current study advised that the overall effect of the High Court challenge and the amendment introduced under the NERC Act was to return the legal framework to the position as it was understood to be prior to the High Court challenge. Nevertheless, the close scrutiny, as a result of these legal processes, of the way that the statutory criteria are applied has emphasised the need to be absolutely clear about how the factors contributing to the criteria for designation are taken into account and also the need for a robust evidence based to support decisions relating to designation.

## **Previous work and evaluation areas**

5. In October 2004 the then Countryside Agency commissioned Alison Farmer Associates (AFA), in association with others, to conduct an analysis of land between the Lake District and the Yorkshire Dales National Parks and report on an Area of Search for

possible future national landscape designations. The resulting Area of Search report produced in 2005 set out a characterisation of 11 Landscape Character Areas, refined from the framework of Joint Character Areas, with a description of both their landscape character and their character as a resource for recreation. Each Area (and some subdivisions of them) was evaluated against the statutory designation criteria of natural beauty and open air recreation in order to identify areas which do or do not meet the statutory criteria and also to identify areas requiring further scrutiny. The study identified four areas (the Orton Fells, the Northern Howgill Fells, Mallerstang and Middleton, Barbon and Leck Fells ) and parts of two further areas (the Lune Valley and the Kendal Low Fells) which were considered potentially worthy of designation as part of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Two areas were considered to be potentially worthy of designation as part of the Lake District National Park (Birkbeck Fell Common and Borrowdale and the area around Brigsteer and the River Kent.

6. In May 2005 the Countryside Agency Board, informed by a Board Paper prepared by its officers as well as by the Alison Farmer Associates Area of Search report, agreed that there were a number of areas between the Lake District and the Yorkshire Dales National Parks that meet the statutory criteria for designation as National Park. The Board agreed that draft boundaries should be identified for an extension to both of the Parks. Subsequent more detailed work by Alison Farmer Associates in 2006 reviewed the areas identified as potential extensions to the Lake District National Park in greater detail and recommended detailed boundaries. This work took into account the 2005 High Court challenge and subsequent amendments to the statutory criteria contained in the NERC Act but preceding the Court of Appeal Judgement in the Meyrick case.
7. As a result of these previous studies a variety of evaluation areas have been reviewed and the relationship between them can appear quite complex. **Table 1**, produced by Natural England officers at an early stage of the present study, sought to clarify the relationship between the various areas. The areas listed in the left hand column, under the heading Broad Areas Reviewed 2007, are the Evaluation Areas that have been the subject of this study. It is important to what follows to understand that the areas covered in the more detailed 2006 study (that is EA1, Birkbeck Fells to Whinfell and EA2, Helsington Barrow to Levens) have been subject to much more detailed examination, taking account of the legal challenges and debates in 2005, than the other evaluation areas. In particular the framework of criteria and factors used in the 2006 work was not used for the areas covered only in the 2005 study.
8. In order to make their final recommendations about the extent to which the Evaluation Areas meets the technical criteria for designation, that is natural beauty and recreation, Natural England decided to review the evidence compiled during the earlier work and produce statements on how each of the areas meets or does not meet them. The brief required that this should be done using an interpretation of the statutory criteria which remains consistent with earlier approaches but is clearer about the relationship between the words in the legislation and the specific factors to be taken into account.
9. At the start of the project it was clear that considerable progress has been made in interpreting the technical criteria but there appeared to be scope for further development of current thinking, especially about natural beauty. This is a complex and multifaceted concept that is concerned with landscape in its broadest sense, defined as the interaction between the physical, natural and cultural components of our environment and the way this is perceived and interpreted by people. There is now a reasonably good consensus about how the phrase should be interpreted and this is

reflected in the framework for evaluation adopted in the 2006 study of areas proposed for inclusion in extension of the Lake District National Park. This used a series of factors that are now generally recognised as underpinning this criterion and the criterion relating to recreation. When the current study began, however, there appeared to be scope for further thinking about the detailed translation of the broad criteria and these related factors into a series of sub-factors and 'indicators' which could then be linked directly and transparently to evidence.

## **Interpretation of the brief**

10. In summary the aims of the work, as we interpreted them in our proposal, were:

- to extend the detailed work done by Alison Farmer Associates and others in 2006 to assess the areas for possible extension of the Lake District National Park (but not the detailed boundary element of that work) to those areas under consideration for possible extension of the Yorkshire Dales National Park;
- to develop further the good work that had been done so far on the detailed interpretation and application of the technical criteria to, as the brief indicated, be "clearer about the relationship between the words in the legislation and the specific factors taken into account" and to develop a clear framework for evaluation;
- to provide a robust evidence base (database), with clear and transparent links to the statements on each evaluation area, to support arguments about whether and why each area does or does not qualify for National Park designation;
- to identify gaps in the available evidence;
- to use GIS within the study to help to provide a robust, objective and consistent mechanism for recording evidence where spatial data is available;
- to present conclusions and evidence in a form that is suitable for consultation on the principles of designating the different areas, in the form of technical statements assessing each area against the evaluation framework
- to prepare summary statements of the case for each area for Natural England to modify for use in its subsequent consultation.

11. We recognised that the previous work provided an extensive body of information and would be the main source of evidence to be collated. The current study needed to build on and add value to this work, underpinning judgements with information and spatial data that together could provide a strong evidence base and providing a clear and transparent link from the criteria to the related factors/sub-factors and indicators to the available supporting evidence.

## **The evaluation framework**

12. Both the 2005 Area of Search Study and the 2006 Lake District Report by Alison Farmer and Julie Martin showed good progress in moving to clearer interpretation of the technical criteria. However, the 2005 work suffered from a lack of an agreed evaluation framework so that the tables and text evaluating individual areas were somewhat discursive and lacked a standardised structure which links the points made to supporting

evidence. The 2006 report took a similar approach in its overall evaluation of the areas under consideration with respect to the Lake District National Park but adopted a more structured tabular framework of factors in evaluating sub-areas which had been subject to particular scrutiny.

13. The document supplied by Natural England with the brief for the current work, which set out first thoughts on more detailed interpretation of the technical criteria into a series of contributing factors and tabular representations of links to evidence was a very helpful first step in developing a structured evaluation framework. It provided the starting point for developing the framework that we have used.
14. The first stage of the work was to develop further an appropriate evaluation methodology. This was based on review of the previous work and took account of discussions at a preliminary inception meeting. The factors of landscape quality and scenic quality were particularly reviewed to try to ensure that they could be related to the individual character and quality of the areas under review. In our proposal we also suggested that consideration should be given to the introduction of one or more 'indicators' for each of the factors or sub factors, which could then in turn be clearly linked to specific evidence, either in written form or as map datasets. This idea was accepted and is reflected in the final framework. **Table 2** summarises the framework of criteria, factors, sub-factors, indicators that has been used.

### **Collating the evidence**

15. The initial brief for the study did not require that we gathered new evidence but rather that we use the existing evidence available to inform the evaluation of the areas against the technical criteria and organise this evidence on the basis of the agreed evaluation framework so that the links from the evidence to the final statements were clear and transparent. Existing 'evidence' has been of two main forms - written statements in existing documents and reports and mapped spatial data, in both hard copy and digital form, which could potentially be related to the interpretation of the criteria. **Table 3** lists the reports that have been used as sources of evidence and **Table 4** lists the mapped spatial data that we have used. Whatever the form of the information, we tried to have regard to its source, provenance and reliability.

### **Written evidence**

16. The main written evidence that we have used has come from the reports of the earlier evaluation studies by Alison Farmer Associates referred to above. These contain both information about the character of the landscape in the various areas and summary evaluation statements related to the technical criteria. In addition some of the evaluation areas (Evaluation Areas 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6) were also the subject of similar but independent reports prepared by the Friends of the Lake District (FLD) in association with the Yorkshire Dales Society (YDS), including both a summary document and an extensive supporting technical document consisting of a wide range of topic papers on different aspects of the criteria.
17. Together these four documents, that is the two AFA reports and the two reports by FLD/YDS have been a key source of evidence. In the majority of cases where we have used evidence from these documents we have not pursued the original material that they have drawn on since this would have been a major duplication of effort. So, for example, we have in several places used quotations from the writing of Alfred

Wainwright, drawing on summaries of the sources included in the FLD/YDS technical report which includes comprehensive extracts from these writings, where they were relevant to particular evaluation areas. We have, however, checked particular points where the information seemed to be ambiguous or uncertain to see if we could find additional information.

18. A major part of the task has been to organise the written material to fit with the evaluation framework. This has proved relatively easy in the case of the areas covered in the AFA 2006 work (EA1 and EA2) where considerable progress had already been made in interpreting the criteria and where much more detailed information was available. It has been much more difficult for those areas that were only covered in the AFA 2005 report where only modest amounts of information were available and where a comprehensive evaluation framework did not exist. To some degree we have therefore been attempting to fit statements into the framework retrospectively and this has not always been easy, especially where evaluation statements contain material relevant to several different factors, sub factors or indicators. We have adopted a policy of repeating evidence statements under any indicator to which they are relevant, even though we recognise that this has led to a degree of duplication.

### **Map evidence**

19. We assembled a wide range of spatial data in both hard copy and digital form. Hard copy data came from the earlier AFA projects and from various landscape character assessments carried out for different administrative areas. Digital data was mainly provided by Natural England but in a few cases we were able to use map data that we already held, provided that copyright arrangements allowed this, and we also obtained some data from other sources, notably the digital data on rights of way in Lancashire and Cumbria which were obtained directly from the County Councils concerned.
20. To facilitate the use of this data we compiled an ESRI ArcReader project, incorporating all of the GIS data into an easily accessible format. ArcReader is a freely available read-only GIS package. The full version of ArcGIS was used to interrogate the datasets quantitatively and qualitatively but the use of ArcReader allowed the datasets to be used in an easily accessible way to inform judgements about the evaluation areas against the indicators in the evaluation framework. For example, as well as calculating statistics for topographic attributes such as maximum elevation and slope, the data was also interpreted visually to assess whether dramatic topography was present within each area. This proved an enormously valuable tool throughout the project and will be made available as part of the supporting evidence base. The maps included in **Section 3** of this report are compilations, for each Evaluation Area, of the datasets that we have found particularly useful in understanding the nature of each area.

### **Preparing the evidence database**

21. At an early stage of the project we decided that the most effective way to organise the evidence statements would be to create a Microsoft Access database to contain the information collected throughout the project. The database was designed to reflect the evaluation framework so that evidence statements could be entered for each evaluation area for all relevant indicators linked to the technical criteria. We used the written evidence from the various reports referred to above, together with our own summary statements based on the most relevant map data, to populate the database. Reports were then produced listing all the evidence statements according to the evaluation

framework. These reports provided the basis for our written statements summarising the case for each evaluation area against the technical criteria. All the reports from the database, listing out the evidence statements under each of the criteria and the related factors, sub factors and indicators, and covering all the evaluation areas except EA9 (Coldcotes) <sup>1</sup>, are included in **Section 4** of this report, in numerical order by evaluation area. Each piece of evidence is accompanied by a short reference showing the source of the information, linked to a full reference at the end of the relevant report.

## **Identifying limitations and gaps in the evidence base**

22. The brief for the study required that we identify any apparent gaps in the available evidence. This was done in August once the assembly of available digital and hard copy data and relevant reports was largely complete. Most of the data that we had compiled at that time was satisfactory in terms of its quality and value but we were aware of the limitations of the Land Cover Map 2000 data from the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology which is based on automated computerised interpretation of remote sensing imagery. This can give only a rough guide to land cover types in the Evaluation Areas and is prone to errors in interpretation of land cover classes. We have used it in the map series in Section 3 while being aware of these limitations, because it was the only comprehensive data source that we could reasonably use. We also received Phase 1 habitat data which could have been a more reliable guide to land cover and vegetation types, but this data proved to be incomplete and impossible to incorporate in our GIS layers in the time available because of its format and the fact that it is detailed field survey information originally mapped at 1: 10,000 scale.

## **Differences between 2006 and 2005 studies**

23. We held a meeting with Alison Farmer on 23rd July 2007 to help to identify the information that was collected for the 2006 boundary study for areas EA1 and EA2, but which was not available for the areas covered only in the 2005 study. It was clear from this discussion, and from our review of the existing information that we had gathered, that there were several types of information collected for the 2006 study areas that were not available for the areas only covered in 2005. Our conclusions on the main gaps in the evidence base, including those identified from discussions with Alison Farmer, are summarised below.

### *More detailed landscape character assessment information*

24. In the 2006 study a brief summary of landscape character types in the evaluation areas was based on the content of the existing assessment of the Lake District Environmentally Sensitive Area and on some additional field survey. The 2005 areas were covered by the Cumbria Landscape Character Assessment which contains useful map information on landscape types, but does not include detailed descriptions of the individual areas identified, concentrating instead on broad and brief descriptions of the types occurring throughout Cumbria. We advised Natural England that there was a need for more detailed field survey of the areas not included in the 2006 study and for the 2006 landscape character assessment information to be brought into the same framework. As a result the contract was extended to allow a brief supplementary detailed landscape character assessment to be carried out to cover Evaluation Areas 3 to

---

<sup>1</sup> After review it was agreed that the issues relating to EA9 Coldcotes were about detailed boundary drawing rather than the principle of whether the area meets the technical criteria. A summary statement for this area is included in Section 2 of this report but we have not collated evidence statements in the database .

8 and to expand the brief descriptions of the landscape of Evaluation Areas 1 and 2, based on existing information, to fit within the same framework. A separate report of this work was prepared <sup>2</sup> and is referred to as a source of evidence in **Table 3**.

#### *Assembly of detailed information on Cumbria County Wildlife Sites*

25. We were advised that these sites have particular importance in Cumbria because some of them are of equivalent value to SSSIs. In the end we were provided with map information on the extent of these sites but not with details about their value.

#### *Historic Landscape Character Assessment (HLCA) information*

26. This was supplied in map form by the HLCA project officer for Cumbria for the 2006 study. Discussions between Natural England and Cumbria officers suggested that it would be difficult to get hold of the equivalent information for the other areas in the timescale of the study. Ultimately Cumbria were able to supply information for EA3, the Orton Fells, but not for the other areas

#### *Information on recreation and tourism sites*

27. In 2006 all recreation and tourism sites in the evaluation areas were visited and information collected on their nature, use and future plans. A representative of the operators was contacted in each case, either in person or by telephone, to provide further information or insights. No steps were taken to provide similar information for the other areas and evaluation against the recreation criterion therefore relied on existing evidence from previous reports and on map data, for example on access land.

### **The role of fieldwork**

28. The original contract required fieldwork only for the purpose of familiarisation so that the construction of the evaluation statements would be informed by at least some knowledge of the areas in question. The extension of the contract to cover additional landscape character assessment work for the areas not covered in the AFA 2006 report allowed us to carry out additional fieldwork. In total the original familiarisation visit and the additional landscape character assessment fieldwork meant that approximately eight person days of time were spent in the field in the evaluation areas. The additional fieldwork for the landscape character assessment in particular allowed us to gain greater familiarity with the areas and this in turn meant that we were able to some degree to exercise our own judgements in preparing the technical assessments against the evaluation criteria. The supplementary landscape character assessment report therefore became an additional source of evidence for us to draw on. We were also able to make informed judgements based on our own knowledge, as well as weighing up the balance of the evidence.

### **Preparing the technical assessment statements**

29. The main time commitment in the study has been devoted to review and interpretation of the database and preparation of a written statement for each area, based on the available evidence, and setting out the extent to which each meets the agreed

---

<sup>2</sup> University of Sheffield/Land Use Consultants, September (2007), North West Designations Broad Areas Review, Supplementary Detailed Landscape Character Assessment

interpretation of the factors underlying the technical criteria of natural beauty and opportunities for open air recreation. The statements, referred to as 'assessments against the technical criteria', are included as **Section 2** of this report. Each was required to be approximately 1,000 words in length. They follow a standard structure closely related to the structure of the evaluation framework, addressing each of the main factors relevant to the designation criteria. Each begins with a description of the landscape context for the evaluation area and then summarises the extent to which the evaluation area meets the designation criteria, based on judgements for each of the main factors underpinning the particular criterion. The statements are based on our own judgement based on review of the evidence and on our own observations. Where judgements in the text are supported by specific pieces of evidence in the database they are referenced by means of numbered references in the text linked to endnotes at the end of each statement. These are in the format EA1- NB14-87, NB16-96, 99 where (in this hypothetical example):

- EA1 is the number of the evaluation area and the evidence report in Section 4
- NB14 is the number of the relevant indicator in the evaluation framework
- 87 is the individual number of the first relevant piece of evidence, located under NB14
- NB16 is the number of the second relevant indicator in the evaluation framework
- 96, 99 are the numbers of the second and third relevant pieces of evidence, both located under NB16

30. To locate and read the relevant evidence it is therefore necessary to find the report in **Section 3** for the appropriate evaluation area, locate the numbered indicator and find the particular numbered piece of evidence. The individual pieces of evidence are numbered in order from the first piece in EA1 to the last piece in EA8c. There are 963 pieces of evidence in the database at the point of completion of the current project.
31. It should be noted that two of the evaluation areas are divided into sub areas. Area 2 is divided into EA2a and EA2b and a separate assessment report has been prepared for each of these. Area 8 has been divided into EA8a, EA8b and EA8c but for reporting purposes EA8a and EA8b have been linked together because, from a landscape perspective, it is hard to separate the Lower Lune Valley (EA8a) from the fells to the west between Killington and Mansergh (EA8b) which include the valley slopes. As a result there are eleven assessment reports in total, including EA9.

**Table 1 : Relationship between areas identified defined during various study phases (prepared by Natural England)**

Broad Areas Review (this study)		AFA Lake District Boundary Study		CA Adopted Area of Search	Area of Search AFA recommendations	AFA Area of Search Landscape Character Areas	Joint Character Areas
2007		2006		2005	2005	2005	1998
EA1 Birkbeck Fells to Whinfell		Shap to Garnet Bridge Area	Sub-Area 12a: Upland area associated with Birkbeck Fells Common and Northside.	10: Birkbeck Fells Common, Whinash, Borrowdale, Whinfell	12: Birkbeck Fell Common	LCA6: Birkbeck Fell Common and Borrowdale	Cumbria High Fells
			Sub-Area 12b: Eastern Fringes of Birkbeck Fells Common.		13: Borrowdale Eastern Fringes		
			Sub-Area 13a: Eastern Flank of Lune Gorge.				
			Sub-Area 13b: Southern slopes of Dillicar Common and Grayrigg Common.				South Cumbria Low Fells
			Sub-Area 14: Core area of Borrowdale (inc Northside, Whinfell Ridge and Bretherdale Common)		14: Core area of Borrowdale (inc Northside, Whinfell Ridge and Bretherdale Common)		Cumbria High Fells
			Sub-Area 15: Ashstead and Bannisdale Valleys.		15: Whinfell Ridge western fringes		South Cumbria Low Fells
EA2 Helsington Barrows to Levens	EA2a Helsington Barrows to Sizergh Fell  (includes all of 23 and parts of 22a, 24a and 24b)	Helsington Barrows to Levens	Sub-Area 22a: Eastern fringes of Lyth Valley associated with limestone escarpment.	11: Brigsteer and River Kent	22: Levens to Brigsteer  (also slightly touches on 23 Lyth Valley) <sup>3</sup>	LCA 8: Morecambe Bay Limestones and Mosses	Morecambe Bay Limestones
			Sub-Area 23: Upland area associated with Helsington Barrows and Brigsteer Park		24: River Kent Environs		
			Sub-Area 24a: Eastern fringes of upland area (Helsington Barrows and Brigsteer Park).				
			Sub-Area 24b: Continuation of limestone ridge to Sizergh Fell.				
	EA2b River Kent to Levens		Sub-Area 22a: Eastern fringes of Lyth Valley associated with		23 Lyth Valley		

<sup>3</sup> Note confusing numbering of 23 / 22: in AoS number 23 is Lyth Valley, in LD Boundary study number 23 is the main ridge.

Broad Areas Review (this study)		AFA Lake District Boundary Study		CA Adopted Area of Search	Area of Search AFA recommendations	AFA Area of Search Landscape Character Areas	Joint Character Areas
2007		2006		2005	2005	2005	1998
	(includes parts of 22a, 24a and 24b)		limestone escarpment. Sub-Area 24a: Eastern fringes of upland area (Helsington Barrows and Brigsteer Park). Sub-Area 24b: Continuation of limestone ridge to Sizergh Fell.		24: River Kent Environs		
EA3 the Orton Fells		n/a		4: Orton Fells	6: Orton Fells core area 7: Orton Fells western fringe 8: Orton Fells north eastern fringes	LCA 3: Orton Fells and Farmland	Orton Fells
EA4 the northern Howgill Fells				6: the northern Howgills	9: Howgill Fells core area 10: Howgill Fells western fringe	LCA 4: Howgill Fells	Howgill Fells
EA5: Mallerstang and Wild Boar Fell				5: Mallerstang	11: Whole of Mallerstang	LCA 5: Mallerstang	Yorkshire Dales
EA6: Middleton, Barbon and Leck Fells				7: Middleton, Barbon & Leck Fell	31: Western Fells	LCA 10: Middleton, Barbon and Leck Fells	
EA7: Firbank Fell				8: Parts of the Lune Valley	17: Firbank Fell northern fringe 18: Firbank Fell	LCA 7: Kendal Low Fells	
EA8: Killington to Kirkby Lonsdale	EA8a: Lower Lune Valley				28: North of Kirkby Lonsdale	LCA 9: Lune Valley	
	EA8b: Killington to Mansergh (the fells to the west)				29: Kirkby Lonsdale environs		
	EA8c: Kirkby Lonsdale Area	19: A684 to Mansergh	LCA 7: Kendal Low Fells				
EA9: Cold Cotes Area		9: Cold Cotes area	32: East of Ingleton	LCA 10: Middleton, Barbon and Leck Fells	Yorkshire Dales		

**Table 2 : The Evaluation Framework**

<b>CRITERION : NATURAL BEAUTY</b>		
<b>Factor</b>	<b>Sub-factor</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<b>Landscape quality</b>	NB1 Intactness	Characteristic landscape elements well represented throughout
	NB2 Condition	Characteristic landscape elements in good condition
	NB3 Incongruous elements or features	Incongruous elements not present to a significant degree or not visually intrusive
<b>Scenic quality</b>	NB4 Distinctive sense of place	Coherent landscape character conferring a recognisable sense of place
	NB5/6 Striking land form/topography	High degree of relative relief and scale and height of landform
		Striking landform types
	NB7 Visual interest in patterns of land cover	Varied land cover and vegetation types forming recognisable patterns in relation to each other and to land form
	NB8/9 Appeal to the senses	Striking aesthetic qualities in the landscape
Memorable views and eye catching features		
<b>Relative wildness</b>	NB10/11 Sense of remoteness	Extent of land containing no roads
		Relatively distant from significant habitation
	NB12/13 Relative lack of human influence	Uninterrupted tracts of open land with no/few signs of buildings, tracks, enclosure or other clearly man made structures
		Predominantly semi- natural vegetation with little or no apparent evidence of cultivation or forestry plantations
	NB14 A sense of openness or exposure	Large extent of open land at relatively high altitude
	NB15 A sense of the passing of time or return to nature	Evidence of re-wilding or succession through lack of management (reversion of farmland to moorland or moorland to scrub and woodland)
<b>Tranquillity</b>	NB16/17 Contributors	Evidence of apparent openness and perceived naturalness in the landscape
Continued.....		

		Presence of water and or woodland
	NB18/19/20 Detractors	Presence of or proximity to large numbers of people
		Presence of human influence in terms of transport systems, extensive or non traditional development.
		Detracting levels of noise and/or light pollution
<b>Natural heritage features</b>	NB21/22 Geological and geomorphological features	Visible expression of geology in distinctive character/sense of place and other aspects of scenic quality
		Presence of striking or memorable geomorphological features
	NB23/24 Wildlife and habitats	Presence of wildlife habitats that make a particular contribution to character/sense of place and other aspects of scenic quality
		Presence of individual species that contribute to tranquillity and sense of place
<b>Cultural heritage features</b>	NB25/26 Man made elements or structures	Presence of buildings and settlements that make a particular contribution to character/sense of place and other aspects of scenic quality
		Presence of visible archaeological remains that provide striking features in the landscape
	NB27 Human influence in altering the landscape	Visible presence of historic landscape types or specific landscape elements that provide evidence of time depth of human influence in the landscape
<b>Associations</b>	NB28 Associations with written descriptions	Availability of descriptions of the landscape in literature, topographical writings and guide books
	NB29 Associations with artistic representations, in art, music and other art forms, through language and folklore, and through modern media (photography and film)	Depiction of the landscape in art, other art forms such as photography or film, through language and folklore, and in inspiring related music.
	NB30 Associations of the landscape with people, places or events	Evidence that the landscape has associations with important people or events
Continued.....		

<b>CRITERION: RECREATION</b>		
<b>Access to high quality landscapes</b>	R1 Opportunities to enjoy outstanding natural beauty	Good access to areas that pass the tests for natural beauty (see Natural Beauty)
	R2 Opportunities to enjoy tranquillity and relative wildness	Good access to areas that offer an experience of tranquillity and wildness
<b>Natural or cultural heritage or other features to enjoy</b>	R3/4 Access to a range of natural or cultural heritage features	Presence of, and access to, natural features of interest which enrich the experience of the landscape and contribute to understanding of special qualities and sense of place
		Presence of, and access to, cultural features of interest which enrich the experience of the landscape and contribute to understanding of special qualities and sense of place
	R5 Landmarks and other features	Presence of, and access to or view of, recognised and valued landmarks or other features of interest in the context of quiet outdoor recreation
<b>Good recreation provision</b>	R6 High quantity of appropriate recreation provision	Presence of extensive network of rights of way and/or extent of open access land over much of the area
	R7/8 Diversity of good quality provision for quiet enjoyment	Opportunities to enjoy a range of high quality landscape experiences
		Opportunities to enjoy a range of different provision for quiet recreation activity
<b>Accessibility</b>	R9/10 Good accessibility to centres of population	Good transport links to centres of population
		Availability of sustainable transport options providing links to centres of population
<b>Potential for enhancement</b>	R11 Potential for appropriate enhancement of enjoyment and understanding	Realistic plans to improve provision for access to or quiet enjoyment of the natural beauty of the landscape by new provision or improved management of existing

**Table 3 : Sources of evidence – Reports and other sources**

<b>Source- Short Name</b>	<b>Source - Full Reference</b>	<b>Source Type</b>
Alison Farmer Associates and Julie Martin Associates (2006)	Alison Farmer Associates and Julie Martin Associates (2006), Recommended Draft Boundary for an Extension to the Lake District National Park, Final Report and Appendices	Report
Alison Farmer Associates (2005)	Alison Farmer Associates (2005), Recommended Area of Search for Land Worthy of Designation in the North West of England, Final Report	Report
FLD/YDS, Full Report (2005)	Friends of the Lake District/Yorkshire Dales Society (2005), The Land Between Two Parks, A report on proposals for further statutory protection of the landscape of Cumbria	Report
FLD/YDS, Cumbria's Forgotten Landscapes (2005)	Friends of the Lake District/Yorkshire Dales Society (2005), Cumbria's Forgotten Landscapes 2005, A summary of the National Park Boundary Review Project investigating possibilities for increasing the area of designated landscape between the Lake District and the Yorkshire Dales National Parks	Report
Cumbria Landscape Classification (1995)	Cumbria County Council (1995) Cumbria Landscape Classification	Report
Lake District ESA Landscape Assessment	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (1995) Lake District Environmentally Sensitive Area Landscape Assessment	Report
Pennine Dales ESA Landscape Assessment	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (unknown date), Pennine Dales Environmentally Sensitive Area	Report
Yorkshire Dales National Park LCA (2001)	Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority (2001), Landscape Character Assessment and Quality of Life Capital Assessment of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Estell Warren Landscape Architects	Report
Lake District National Park LCA (2007) (Draft)	Chris Blandford Associates (2007) Lake District National Park Landscape Character Assessment and Guidelines. Interim Report No. 2. Draft Character Assessment	Report
North West Designations, Supplementary LCA, September 2007	University of Sheffield/Land Use Consultants, September (2007), North West Designations Broad Areas Review, Supplementary Detailed Landscape Character Assessment	Report
Cumbria tourism web site	<a href="http://www.visitcumbria.com">www.visitcumbria.com</a>	Other
Comments by the Ramblers Association (18/11/04)	Comments in letter from RJ Hawkins (18/11/04), Ramblers Association in response to consultation on Alison Farmer 2005 Report	Other
Sheepfolds web site	<a href="http://www.sheepfolds.org">www.sheepfolds.org</a>	Other

**Table 4 : Sources of evidence – GIS Data**

<b>Source - Short name</b>	<b>Source - Full reference and details</b>
Battlefields	English Heritage (2007), Register of Historic Battlefields
Scheduled Monuments	English Heritage (2007), Scheduled Monuments
Tranquillity (NE and CPRE, 2006)	Natural England and CPRE (2006), National Tranquillity Map
Night Skies (light pollution) 1993 and 2000	CPRE/LUC night-time satellite imagery (2003). Data obtained from NOAA-NESDIS National Geophysical Data Center, and manipulated/analysed by and on behalf of CPRE by Land Use Consultants and Nigel Press Associates.
Land Cover Map 2000	Natural Environment Research Council, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology Monks Wood (2002), Land Cover Map 2000
Moorland Line	DEFRA (2007), Moorland Line
SSSI Site Unit Condition	Natural England (2007) Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Site Unit Condition
Nature Conservation Designations (Local)	Cumbria County Council (2007), County Wildlife Sites Lancashire County Council (2007), County Wildlife Sites
Dry Stone Wall Condition Survey	DEFRA/RDS (2004) Dry Stone Wall Condition Survey
National Inventory of Woodland and Trees	Forestry Commission (2007), National Inventory of Woodland - Interpreted Forest Type (IFT)
Rural and Urban definitions	DEFRA, ODPM, NAW, ONS and Countryside Agency (2005), Rural and urban definitions
Main Rivers	DEFRA (2007) Watercourses designated as "main" under section 194(5) of the Water resources Act 1991
National Grid Infrastructure	National Grid (2007) National Grid Infrastructure (Towers, Power Lines and Cables)
Roads and Railways	Ordnance Survey Meridian 2, Roads and Railways
Nature Conservation Designations (National and International)	Natural England (2007), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
1:25,000 OS map	Ordnance Survey 1:25,000 scale base map
Geology map	British Geological Survey DiGMap (1:625,000, 1:250,000, and 1:50,000 scale) geology data
Forestry Commission Land	Forestry Commission (2007), Land owned or leased by the Forestry Commission
HLC	Cumbria Historic Landscape Characterisation (interim data), Cumbria County Council, 2007
Countryside Stewardship Scheme Agreements	DEFRA (2004) Countryside Stewardship Scheme Agreements
Less Favoured Areas	DEFRA (2004), Less Favoured Areas
Woodland Trust Sites	Woodland Trust (2007), Woodland Trust owned or managed sites
ESA Tiers and Agreements	Natural England (2007), Environmentally Sensitive Areas Tiers and Agreements