

Appendix A - Outline assessment methodology



Appendix A - Landscape and visual appraisal methodology

1.0 Introduction

The methodology to support a Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) has been based on the following industry best-practice standard guidance:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition. (2013) by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, referred to as GLVIA3 within this methodology;
- Technical Information Note 08 / 2015 - Landscape Character Assessment (2016) by the Landscape Institute;
- An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (Revised March 2018) by Natural England; and
- Technical Guidance Note 06 / 19 - Visual Representation of Development Proposals (September 2019) by the Landscape Institute.

Photography

The photography accompanying the report has been produced using the guidance contained within the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note - TNG 06 / 19 ‘*Visual Representation of Development Proposals*’ as a basis, to provide a realistic representation of visibility based on those experienced with the naked eye. In particular, reference has been made to ‘Type 1’ of Section 3.6 - Introducing Visualisation Types 1-4: Table 2, to inform the approach to photography. Viewpoint photography has been captured using a full frame digital single-lens reflex camera (Canon EOS 6D Mark II) together with a 50mm fixed lens (Canon EF 50mm prime lens). The camera height was based on the average viewer height at approximately 1.60m above ground level. Where viewpoints consisted of more than one image, PTGui Pro 13.1 was used to merge the images together.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility Mapping and Analysis (Where relevant and terrain data supports)
Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping based on ‘Bare Earth’ and ‘Reduced Buffers’ assessment will be produced using the combined use of Ordnance Survey Digital Terrain Mapping (DTM) and high resolution aerial photography, together with a series of target points placed across the existing landform at set heights. Target points will be used for the Proposed Development, calculated from a combination of the masterplan associated with the Proposed Development and the individual heights and any relevant structures proposed. The calculation uses GIS viewshed analysis software and calculates where a person would theoretically be able to see the target points, with an eye height of 1.60m above existing ground level.

The mapping process will include a bare earth and reduced buffers calculation, with the reduced buffers illustrating the screening effects of buildings and vegetation present within the Study Area based on the use of Ordnance Survey Digital Surface Mapping (DSM). The results will provide a basis for the understanding theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development and help in identifying potential viewpoints.

2.0 Appraisal process

Baseline Assessment

A baseline assessment illustrates the landscape context of the Site and is informed by an initial desktop review. This desktop review helps to identify an appropriate and proportionate extent of Study Area along with identifying potential viewpoint locations which are likely to support further assessment within the field. The baseline assessment is compiled from reviewing the following:

- Relevant landscape planning policy;
- Landscape designations;
- National and local landscape character assessments;
- Ordnance Survey mapping; and
- Aerial mapping.

Site Assessment

Following the completion of the desktop study, a site appraisal is carried out to assess potential landscape and visual receptors which may be affected by Proposed Development within the Site and provides an opportunity to verify the findings of the baseline assessment.

Landscape and Visual Appraisal

GLVIA3 (page 21: paragraph 2.21) defines two distinct components of an LVIA as follows:

- Assessment of landscape effects: assessing effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right; and**
- Assessment of visual effects: assessing effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people.**

Following a review of the baseline landscape and visual context of the Site and its Study Area along with the Site assessment, the appraisal section considers a combination of assessments in relation to the nature of a landscape or visual receptor along with defining the anticipated nature of landscape or visual effects. The following Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of this methodology illustrate the distinction between a landscape and a visual receptor and the associated assessment methodology used.

3.0 Landscape assessment methodology

The prediction of landscape effects arising from a Proposed Development within a Study Area is defined by GLVIA3. It states the following steps should be undertaken in order to identify and describe the landscape effects:

- Identify the landscape receptors that are likely to be affected by the scheme; and
- Identify the interactions between the landscape receptors and different components of the scheme at its different stages.

Landscape receptors are defined by GLVIA3 (Page 86: Paragraph 5.34) as “*components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the scheme*”. These can include overall landscape character and key landscape characteristics, individual landscape elements or landscape features and specific aesthetic or perceptual landscape characteristics.

The nature of landscape receptors (sensitivity)

The interaction between the different components of a Proposed Development and landscape receptors has potential to result in landscape effects (both adverse and beneficial). Landscape receptors are assessed in terms of their ‘nature of receptor’, previously referred to as a receptors ‘sensitivity’ based on combined judgements relating to their landscape value and their susceptibility to change. The definition relating to these complex judgements are detailed below.

Landscape Value

Landscape value can be applied to a landscape area, part of a landscape or to individual features within the landscape, which can help to establish the overall landscape character of the Site and the Study Area. It is also important to determine the nature of the landscape receptor likely to be affected (sensitivity) at both Site and Study Area scale.

The value of a landscape receptor is linked to its’ importance in terms of any designations that may apply, or its’ importance as a landscape or landscape resource, which may be due to a number of factors defining such criteria. GLVIA3 states that people within a community will value the landscape differently and for very different reasons dependant on their relationship with the landscape. Where landscapes have no formal landscape designations such as National Parks, National Landscapes (previously known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)), Conservation Area etc., they may still be valued locally.

The following criteria have been identified (GLVIA3 Page 84: Paragraph 5.28) in determining the factors influencing landscape value:

LANDSCAPE VALUE
Landscape quality (condition)
Scenic quality
Rarity
Representativeness
Conservation interests
Recreation value
Perceptual aspects
Associations

Table 1: Landscape Value

An assessment will be made on the landscape value for each landscape receptor and will be informed by the following defining criteria as illustrated in Table 2.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
High	Landscape receptors of international or national importance either by designation or demonstrates a high level of positive attributes as defined in the landscape factors used to assess the value of a landscape. May contain elements / features which could be described as unique, nationally scarce or mature vegetation such as ancient woodlands. Lacks detracting / degrading features and has limited opportunity for enhancing existing landscape value.
Medium	Landscape receptors of regional or local importance either by designated or undesignated landscape which illustrates locally important landscape features with some evidence of detracting / degrading features. Demonstrates opportunities for enhancing existing landscape value.
Low	Landscape receptors which lack designations and does not demonstrate significant locally important landscape features or demonstrates a low level of positive attributes as defined in the landscape factors used to assess the value of a landscape. High level of detracting / degrading features with areas of alteration or erosion of features.

Table 2: Landscape Value Defining Criteria

Appendix A - Landscape and visual appraisal methodology

Landscape susceptibility to change

Landscape susceptibility to change is the ability of the landscape (overall landscape character area / type or individual landscape element or landscape feature) to “*accommodate the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and / or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies*” (GLVIA3 Page 89: Paragraph 5.40). The criteria level in relation to landscape susceptibility to change is illustrated in Table 3.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
High	The landscape receptor is a highly distinctive and cohesive landscape and / or with high value characteristics or features and is essentially intact and in a very good condition with very few detracting or visually intrusive elements. Is likely to have a strong landscape pattern / texture. The landscape receptor has a limited capacity to accommodate the type of change or Proposed Development without effecting its overall integrity. Is likely to be a greenfield site.
Medium	The landscape receptor is distinctive, represents common landscape characteristics and in a very reasonable condition with some detracting or visually intrusive elements. Is likely to have a landscape pattern which is mostly intact. The landscape receptor has some capacity to accommodate the type of change or Proposed Development without effecting its overall integrity. Possible greenfield site.
Low	The landscape receptor is likely to be simple, possibly with a mixed character and or monotonous with indistinct features. Landscape lacking coherence and includes detracting or visually intrusive elements, with landscape features which may be in poor or improving condition and few which could not be replaced. Is likely to have a minimal variation in landscape pattern. The landscape receptor is robust and has a greater capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development without effecting its overall integrity. Possible brownfield site.
Very Low	Landscape which is generally limited in value, which illustrates area or areas of significant alteration, degradation or the erosion of landscape features. The landscape receptor is extremely robust and illustrates a high capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development without effecting its overall integrity. Is likely to be a brownfield site.

Table 3: Landscape Susceptibility to Change Defining Criteria

Overall nature of landscape receptors (sensitivity)

By combining Landscape Susceptibility to Change together with Landscape Value, an overall nature of the landscape receptor (sensitivity) can be demonstrated. However, a combination of 'high' landscape susceptibility and 'high' landscape value is likely to demonstrate the highest landscape sensitivity, whereas a 'low' landscape susceptibility and a 'low' landscape value is likely to demonstrate the lowest level of landscape sensitivity. Table 4 identifies how susceptibility and value of view can be combined to demonstrate the sensitivity of a landscape receptor.

DEFINING CRITERIA (IDENTIFYING LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY)				
	High Susceptibility	Medium Susceptibility	Low Susceptibility	Very Low Susceptibility
High Value	High Sensitivity	High Sensitivity	Medium Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity
Medium Value	High Sensitivity	Medium Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity
Low Value	Medium Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Negligible Sensitivity
Negligible Value	Low Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Negligible Sensitivity	Negligible Sensitivity

Table 4: Overall nature of landscape receptor / Sensitivity Defining Criteria

A summary of the defining criteria relating to the different levels of sensitivity is illustrated in Table 5.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
High	Areas of landscape character that are highly valued for their scenic quality (including most statutorily designated landscapes); and / or Elements / features that could be described as unique; or are nationally scarce; or mature vegetation with provenance such as ancient woodland or mature parkland trees. Mature landscape features which are characteristic of and contribute to a sense of place and illustrates time-depth in a landscape and if replaceable, could not be replaced other than in the long term.
Medium	Areas that have a positive landscape character but include some areas of alteration / degradation / or erosion of features; and / or Perceptual / aesthetic aspects has some vulnerability to unsympathetic development; and / or Features / elements that are locally commonplace; unusual locally but in moderate / poor condition; or mature vegetation that is in moderate / poor condition or readily replicated.

Low	Areas that are relatively bland or neutral in character with few / no notable features; and / or A landscape that includes areas of alteration / degradation or erosion of features; and / or Landscape elements / features that are commonplace or make little contribution to local distinctiveness.
Negligible	Damaged or substantially modified landscapes with few characteristic features of value, capable of absorbing major change; and / or Landscape elements / features that might be considered to detract from landscape character such as obtrusive man-made artefacts (e.g. power lines, large scale developments, etc.).

Table 5: Nature of Landscape Receptors Summary Defining Criteria

Overall nature of landscape effects (magnitude)

The Magnitude of Landscape Effects illustrates the degree of change to a landscape receptor in terms of its size or scale of the change, the geographical extent of the area which is impacted by the change and its duration and the ability to reverse the change. Table 6 sets out the categories and criteria adopted in respect of the separate considerations of Scale or Size of the Degree of Change.

Scale or size of the degree of landscape change

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
High	Total or substantial loss or large-scale damage to landscape characteristics / features and the introduction of new uncharacteristic elements resulting in the integrity of the landscape being compromised. Overall landscape receptor will be fundamentally changed.
Medium	Partial loss or medium scale damage to landscape characteristics / features and the introduction of new elements but not necessarily uncharacteristic resulting in a partial change to the element / feature which may in some cases diminish its overall integrity. Overall landscape receptor will demonstrate obvious change.
Small	Limited or a slight loss or small-scale damage to landscape characteristics / features and the introduction of new elements which are characteristic of the surrounding landscape, with its integrity remaining unchanged. Overall landscape receptor will demonstrate some change.
Negligible	Very minor loss or alteration to one or more key landscape characteristics / features and the introduction of new elements which are characteristic of the surrounding landscape. Overall landscape receptor illustrates minimal change.
None	No loss or alteration to any key landscape characteristics / features within the Site. Overall landscape receptor remains unchanged.

Table 6: Landscape Size / Scale Defining Criteria

Geographical extent

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
Large	Landscape effects which could influence a number of landscape types or character areas.
Medium	Landscape effects which could influence landscape type or character area in which the Site is located.
Small	Landscape effects which could influence the immediate landscape setting to the Site only.
Negligible	Landscape effects which could be limited to influencing the Site only.

Table 7: Geographical Extent Defining Criteria

Duration

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
Long-term	10 Years +
Medium-term	5 to 10 Years
Short-term	1 to 5 Years
Temporary	12 months or less

Table 8: Duration of Landscape Effect Defining Criteria

Appendix A - Landscape and visual appraisal methodology

Overall landscape nature of effect

The assessment of a landscape receptors ability to respond to scale or size of the degree of change provides us with an opportunity to summarise the overall nature of effect for each receptor. The overall nature of effect for receptors can be interpreted as per Table 9.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
High	Introduction of incongruous development which would result in noticeable change, total loss or large scale damage over an extensive area, affecting many key characteristics and the experience of the landscape. Changes would be permanent and long-term demonstrating substantial changes to the perceived / aesthetic qualities of a landscape. Total loss or substantial loss and or damage to landscape features or components which cannot be mitigated.
Medium	Introduction of uncharacteristic development which would result in noticeable change over a large area, or more intensive change over a limited area, affecting some key characteristics and the experience of the landscape. Changes would be medium to long-term and be permanent to partially reversible demonstrating noticeable changes to the perceived / aesthetic qualities of a landscape. Demonstrate loss or damage to landscape features or components which may be partially mitigated.
Low	Introduction of development that is not uncharacteristic which would result in a small change over a limited area affecting few landscape characteristics. Changes would be short to medium-term and be permanent to partially reversible with partial changes to the perceived / aesthetic qualities of a landscape. Demonstrate partial loss or damage to landscape features or components which can be mitigated.
Negligible	Little perceptible change to the landscape characteristics. Changes would be short-term and reversible and demonstrate limited changes to the perceived / aesthetic qualities of a landscape resulting in the existing character remaining largely intact. Changes would be small scale to a small proportion of landscape features.

Table 9: Overall Landscape Nature of Effect Defining Criteria

Beneficial, Neutral or Adverse Change

The overall assessment of the nature of effect should be assessed in terms of its change and if this change or changes can be considered as beneficial, neutral or adverse. Beneficial change would demonstrate that development, or part of it, would be in keeping with the existing landscape character surrounding the Site and would therefore make a positive visual or physical change to key landscape characteristics. Removal or the reduction of the impact of uncharacteristic or degrading landscape features would also demonstrate a benefit of the Proposed Development.

Neutral change would demonstrate that development would not materially effect the existing landscape character therefore demonstrates that Proposed Development would; maintain the character (including overall quality and value) of the landscape, blend seamlessly with the characteristic landscape features and elements, and or enable a sense of place to be retained.

Adverse changes would demonstrate that development, or part of it, would be experienced as uncharacteristic change within the landscape or introduce uncharacteristic elements which would be perceived as intrusive within the existing landscape character. These changes would be associated with having a negative visual and or physical effect.

Assessment of Landscape Effects and their Significance

Overall, the assessment of landscape effects and their significance seeks to combine the overall nature of a landscape receptor (sensitivity) and the overall nature of effect (magnitude). It is generally accepted that any major loss or irreversible negative effects based over a large area on a landscape receptor which illustrates characteristics or designations of a nationally important and valued landscape is likely to lead to the greatest level of significance. Conversely, reversible negative effects over a short duration or limited extent of area are likely to result in the lowest level of significance. The overall description identifying the defining criteria for Landscape Significance for landscape receptors can be interpreted as per Tables 10a and 10b.

It is important to clarify that any effects which are assessed to be ‘minor’ or ‘not significant’ are considered to be ‘non-important’. Effects assessed as ‘moderate’ may be considered to be ‘important’ but must be supported by reasoned justification. ‘Major’ or ‘Moderate / Major’ effects are considered to be ‘important’ and require weighing in the planning balance against other benefits of the Proposed Development. The following is extracted from The State Of Environmental Impact Assessment Practice In The UK 2011 which aims to establish the need for introducing a classification in relation to the significance of effects:

This approach is considered good practice; whilst recognising the inherent subjectivity of the assessment, it attempts to aid communication of the scale of the impact by introducing a classification. This approach also allows the practitioner to identify and discuss effects that some groups may consider significant, whilst others would not. For example, a negative landscape effect described as being of ‘minor significance’ might be considered to indicate that a majority of people would not consider the effect to be significant; however, a smaller group, perhaps within the local community, may disagree and consider the effect to be significant.

The following tables - Table 10a and 10b are based on an interpretation of The State Of Environmental Impact Assessment Practice In The UK 2011 - Figure 6.3: EIA significance evaluation matrix. Table 10a illustrates how by defining the nature of a receptor (Sensitivity) and nature of effect (Magnitude) can provide on overall significance of effect. Table 10b illustrates the defining criteria for the significance rating. This summary of assessment can be considered as part of an overall assessment of importance in establishing the level of harm to existing landscape receptors.

DEFINING CRITERIA (IDENTIFYING MAGNITUDE OF EFFECT)				
NATURE OF RECEPTOR (SENSITIVITY)	NATURE OF EFFECT (MAGNITUDE)			
	High Magnitude	Medium Magnitude	Low Magnitude	Negligible Magnitude
High Sensitivity	Major	Moderate / Major	Moderate	Minor / Moderate
Medium Sensitivity	Moderate / Major	Moderate	Minor / Moderate	Minor
Low Sensitivity	Moderate	Minor / Moderate	Minor	Not Significant / Minor
Negligible Sensitivity	Minor / Moderate	Minor	Not Significant / Minor	Not Significant

Table 10a: Overall assessment significance evaluation matrix

-  Not Important
-  Unlikely to be Important
-  May be Important (where supported by justification)
-  Materially important effects

LEVEL	SIGNIFICANCE OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS - DEFINING CRITERIA
Major Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would; greatly enhance the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or create an iconic high quality feature and / or series of elements; and / or enable a sense of place to be created or greatly enhanced.
Moderate / Major Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would; enhance the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or enable the restoration of characteristic features and elements lost as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development; and / or enable a sense of place to be enhanced.
Moderate Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would; improve the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or enable the restoration of characteristic features and elements partially lost or diminished as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development; and / or enable a sense of place to be restored.
Minor Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would; complement the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or maintain or enhance characteristic features and elements; and / or enable some sense of place to be restored.
Not Significant Neutral Effects	Proposed Development would; maintain the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or blend in with characteristic features and elements; and / or enable a sense of place to be retained.
Minor Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would; not quite fit the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or be at variance with characteristic features and elements; and / or detract from a sense of place.
Moderate Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would; conflict with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or have an adverse impact on characteristic features or elements; and / or diminish a sense of place.
Moderate / Major Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would; and / or be at considerable variance with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or degrade or diminish the integrity of a range of characteristic features and elements; and / or damage a sense of place.
Major Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would; be at complete variance with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape; and / or cause the integrity of characteristic features and elements to be lost; and / or cause a sense of place to be lost

Table 10b: Description of Landscape Significance Defining Criteria

Appendix A - Landscape and visual appraisal methodology

4.0 Visual assessment methodology

Visual effects are described by GLVIA3 (page 98: paragraph 6.1) as “*An assessment of visual effects deals with the effects of change and development on the views available to people and their visual amenity.*”

The assessment of visual effects seeks to predict effects on viewpoints being assessed as a result of the Proposed Development. GLVIA3 (Page 98: Paragraph 6.3) requires the assessment of the following:

- The area in which Proposed Development may be visible;
- The different groups of people who may experience views of the Proposed Development;
- The viewpoints and if they will be effected by the Proposed Development; and
- The nature of the views at each viewpoint.

Nature of visual receptors (sensitivity)

The nature of a visual receptor is based on a number of complex issues which should be evaluated as part of an LVIA and can be defined as their Visual Susceptibility to Change.

Visual Susceptibility to Change

The susceptibility of a visual receptor is dependant on the following:

- Their susceptibility to changes in the view and visual amenity;
- Their perceived value attached to the view;
- Its’ relationship to an activity they are engaged in; and
- The extent to which their attention is focused on the views and visual amenity at that location.

As such those visual receptors most sensitive to change are likely to include people engaged in outdoor activities where an appreciation of the landscape is the focus or residents in areas where the landscape setting contributes to the setting of the properties. Conversely, those considered least sensitive to change include (but are not restricted to) people engaged in outdoor sports or recreation where there is no focus on the surrounding landscape / views and people at their place of work where their focus is on their work activity.

The overall susceptibility to change for visual receptors can be interpreted as per Table 11.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA (VISUAL SUSCEPTIBILITY)
High	Residents at home with primary views from ground floor, garden and upper floors; Public rights of way and footpaths (either strategic or popular routes) where people are engaged in outdoor recreation, whose attention / interest is likely to be focused on the landscape or particular views; Visitors to heritage assets or other attractions, where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience; Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents; Travellers on recognised scenic routes.
Medium	Residents with secondary views, primarily from first floor level; Travellers on road, rail, or other transport routes where landscape is a focus of the view; Users of local, and less used Public Rights of Way or where the attention is not focused on the landscape; Schools and other institutional buildings and their outdoor areas, play areas.
Low	Users of outdoor sport / recreation facilities which does not involve / depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape; Travellers on road, rail or other transport routes not focused on the landscape / particular views e.g. on motorways and “A” road or commuter routes;
Very Low	People at their place of work whose attention may be focused on their work / activity and not their surroundings.

Table 11: Visual Susceptibility to Change Defining Criteria

Value of Views

The value of a view should consider the following:

- Recognition attached to the value of a particular view, e.g. in relation to heritage assets or planning designations; and
- Indicators of the value attached to views by others, e.g., in guide books, defined viewpoints tourist maps, literary references, art work etc.

An assessment will be made on the value of a view and will be informed by the following defining criteria as illustrated in Table 12.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA (VALUE)
High	A unique or recognised high-quality view, well-frequented and / or promoted as a beauty spot / visitor destination as often illustrated on Ordnance Survey maps. A view with cultural associations (recognised in art, literature or other media). A view which relates to the experience of other features, for example heritage assets.
Medium	May be valued locally however it is not widely recognised for its quality or has low visitor numbers. The view has no strong cultural associations.
Low	A view with no recognised quality, is unremarkable and / or is unlikely to be visited specifically to experience the views available.
Very Low	A poor quality view which is likely to be unvalued or regarded as degraded.

Table 12: Value of View Criteria

Overall nature of visual receptor (sensitivity)

By combining overall susceptibility to change together with the value of a view, an overall nature of a visual receptor (sensitivity) can be demonstrated. It is generally the case that a combination of high susceptibility and high value is most likely to give rise to the highest sensitivity. Conversely, a very low susceptibility and negligible value is most likely to give rise in the lowest level of visual sensitivity.

Table 13 identifies how susceptibility and value of view can be combined to demonstrate the sensitivity of a visual receptor.

DEFINING CRITERIA (IDENTIFYING VISUAL SENSITIVITY)				
	High Susceptibility	Medium Susceptibility	Low Susceptibility	Very Low Susceptibility
High Value	High Sensitivity	High Sensitivity	Medium Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity
Medium Value	High Sensitivity	Medium Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity
Low Value	Medium Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Negligible Sensitivity
Negligible Value	Low Sensitivity	Low Sensitivity	Negligible Sensitivity	Negligible Sensitivity

Table 13: Overall Visual nature of receptor / Sensitivity Defining Criteria

A summary of the defining criteria illustrating the overall visual sensitivities is illustrated below within Table 14.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA (OVERALL NATURE OF RECEPTOR / SENSITIVITY)
High	A view that is well balanced, containing attractive features and notable for its scenic quality; and / or A view which is an important part of their reason for being there; and / or A view which is experienced by large numbers of people and / or is recognised for its qualities.
Medium	An otherwise attractive view that includes some unattractive or discordant features, or visual detractors; and / or A view which plays a small part in receptors being there; and / or A view that is recognised locally.
Low	A view that is unattractive, discordant and / or contains many visual detractors; and / or A view which is unlikely to be part of the receptor experience.
Negligible	A view that is at the lowest end of susceptibility and the value of view is not relevant.

Table 14: Overall Visual nature of receptor / Sensitivity Defining Criteria

Appendix A - Landscape and visual appraisal methodology

Magnitude of Visual Effects

The guidance provided in GLVIA3 (Page 115: Paragraph 6.38) requires that each of the following variables need to be evaluated for each of the visual effects identified:

- Size or scale of the change of view, including loss of or additional views, degree of contrast in terms of form, mass, scale, colour and texture etc;
- Geographic extent in terms of angle of view, distance etc; and
- Duration and reversibility in term of longevity of effects and whether reversible.

Visual Size / Scale Criteria

The visual size and scale of an effect is determined by considering the amount of change experienced by a receptor, based upon the criteria set out in Table 15.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
Large	Total or substantial loss or large-scale damage to an existing view as a result of the Proposed Development resulting in a change to an extensive proportion of a view. Total loss of visual characteristics / features and the introduction of new uncharacteristic elements. Overall the Proposed Development would become the dominant feature within the existing view, contrasting with its surroundings. Little or no scope for adequate mitigation.
Medium	An existing view which would experience partial loss or medium scale damage due to changes in the view resulting but not fundamentally changing the visual characteristics as a result of development. The introduction of new elements but not necessarily uncharacteristic resulting in a partial change to the existing view, which may in some cases diminish its overall integrity. Overall the existing view will demonstrate obvious change but not form the key features of the view. Partial mitigation exists or would be possible.
Small	Limited or a slight loss or small-scale damage to an existing view which demonstrates the retention of the majority of visual components which define existing landscape characteristics / features and the introduction of new elements which are characteristic of the surrounding landscape. The integrity of the view remains unchanged as the view would not result in a change to the general composition of the view. Overall, the existing view will demonstrate some change with Proposed Development only affecting a relatively small portion of the view or introduce new features that are not considered incongruous. Partial or full mitigation is present or possible.
Negligible	Very minor loss or alteration to the existing view with one or more key landscape characteristics / features and the introduction of new elements which are characteristic of the surrounding landscape. Overall the view is exposed to minimal change which is not dependant on mitigation proposals.
None	No loss or alteration to an existing view with key landscape characteristics / features retained within the Site. Overall the existing view remains unchanged.

Table 15: Visual Size / Scale of View Criteria

Geographical Extent

The geographical extent of a visual effect is determined by the amount of change experienced within a view, based upon the criteria set out in Table 16.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
Large	Visual effects which could result in the proposed development forming the main focus of the view, and / or at Close-range, and / or over a large area.
Medium	Visual effects which could result in the proposed development being located at medium distance, and / or over a narrow field of view, and / or oblique to the main focus of view.
Small	Visual effects which could result in the proposed development being located on the periphery of the main focus of view, and / or at a long distance, and / or would form a small area of the view.
Negligible	Visual effects as a result of the proposed development which would not be considered important.

Table 16: Geographical Extent Defining Criteria

Duration

The overall duration of a visual effect is based upon the criteria set out in Table 17.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
Long-term	10 Years +
Medium-term	5 to 10 Years
Short-term	1 to 5 Years
Temporary	12 months or less

Table 17: Duration of View Criteria

Reversibility

The visual size and scale of an effect is determined by considering the amount of change experienced by a receptor, based upon the criteria set out in Table 18.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
Reversible	Change that can be largely reversed without significantly effecting the visual receptor. (Accommodation on wheels with limited infrastructure, Solar PV Array, wind farms etc.)
Partially Reversible	Change that can partially be reversible and restore the landscape to a similar nature as per the existing baseline. (Mineral extraction, temporary events)
Irreversible	Change that cannot be reversed and forms a permanent change such as roads, buildings etc.

Table 18: Reversibility of View Criteria

Overall Visual Nature of Effect

The visual size and scale of an effect is determined by considering the amount of change experienced by a receptor, based upon the criteria set out in Table 19.

LEVEL	DEFINING CRITERIA
High	Proposed Development, or a part of it would give rise to an effect that would fundamentally change, establish a total loss or substantial alteration to key visual characteristics or would become the dominant and contrasting feature or the focal point in the view. Little or no scope for adequate mitigation.
Medium	Proposed Development, or a part of it would give rise to an effect that would markedly change or would form a prominent feature or element of the view which is readily apparent to the receptor. Partial mitigation is possible.
Low	Proposed Development, or a part of it would give rise to an effect that would create limited or localised changes to the existing view and would be noticeable but not alter the overall balance of features and elements that compromise the existing view Partial or full mitigation is possible.
Negligible	Only a very small part of Proposed Development would be discernible with very little change, or it is at such a distance that it would form a barely noticeable feature or element of the view and / or occupy a negligible proportion of the view. Full mitigation is possible.

Table 19: Visual Magnitude Defining Criteria

Beneficial, Neutral or Adverse Change

The overall assessment of the nature of effect should be assessed in terms of its change and if this change or changes can be considered as beneficial, neutral or adverse. Beneficial change would demonstrate that development, or part of it, would introduce new features that would enhance the view; and or would demonstrate an improvement generally within a view; and or create perceivable improvements to a view from removal or screening of detracting features.

Neutral change would demonstrate that development would not materially effect the existing visual amenity therefore demonstrates that Proposed Development would demonstrate no perceptual change in the view.

Adverse changes would demonstrate that development, or part of it, would cause a level of deterioration to an existing view through the removal of landscape features which characterise the view; and or introduce new features within the view which are uncharacteristic.



Appendix A - Landscape and visual appraisal methodology

Assessment of Visual Effects and their Significance

Overall, the assessment of visual effects and their significance seeks to combine the nature of the visual receptor / overall sensitivity and the nature of effect (magnitude of effect). It is generally accepted that any major loss or irreversible negative effects based over a large area experienced by larger number of highly sensitive visual receptors located within areas of nationally or internally important and valued landscape are most likely to lead to the greatest level of significance. Conversely, reversible negative effects over a short duration or limited extent of area are likely to result in the lowest level of significance. The overall description identifying the defining criteria for Visual Effects and their Significance for visual receptors can be interpreted as per Tables 20 and 21.

It is important to clarify that any effects which are assessed to be ‘minor’ or ‘not significant’ are considered to be ‘non-important’. Effects assessed as ‘moderate’ may be considered to be ‘important’ but must be supported by reasoned justification. ‘Major’ or ‘Moderate / Major’ effects are considered to be ‘important’ and require weighing in the planning balance against other benefits of the Proposed Development. The following is extracted from The State Of Environmental Impact Assessment Practice In The UK 2011 which aims to establish the need for introducing a classification in relation to the significance of effects:

This approach is considered good practice; whilst recognising the inherent subjectivity of the assessment, it attempts to aid communication of the scale of the impact by introducing a classification. This approach also allows the practitioner to identify and discuss effects that some groups may consider significant, whilst others would not. For example, a negative landscape effect described as being of ‘minor significance’ might be considered to indicate that a majority of people would not consider the effect to be significant; however, a smaller group, perhaps within the local community, may disagree and consider the effect to be significant.

The following tables - Table 20 and 21 are based on an interpretation of The State Of Environmental Impact Assessment Practice In The UK 2011 - Figure 6.3: EIA significance evaluation matrix. Table 10a illustrates how by defining the nature of a receptor (Sensitivity) and nature of effect (Magnitude) can provide on overall significance of effect. Table 10b illustrates the defining criteria for the significance rating. This summary of assessment can be considered as part of an overall assessment of importance in establishing the level of harm to existing visual amenity.

DEFINING CRITERIA (IDENTIFYING MAGNITUDE OF EFFECT)				
NATURE OF RECEPTOR (SENSITIVITY)	NATURE OF EFFECT (MAGNITUDE)			
	High Magnitude	Medium Magnitude	Low Magnitude	Negligible Magnitude
High Sensitivity	Major	Moderate / Major	Moderate	Minor / Moderate
Medium Sensitivity	Moderate / Major	Moderate	Minor / Moderate	Minor
Low Sensitivity	Moderate	Minor / Moderate	Minor	Not Significant / Minor
Negligible Sensitivity	Minor / Moderate	Minor	Not Significant / Minor	Not Significant

Table 20: Overall assessment significance evaluation matrix

- Not Important
- Unlikely to be Important
- May be Important (where supported by justification)
- Materially important effects

LEVEL	SIGNIFICANCE OF VISUAL EFFECTS - DEFINING CRITERIA
Major Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would create an iconic new feature that would greatly enhance the view.
Moderate / Major Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would lead to a major improvement in a view from a highly sensitive receptor.
Moderate Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would cause obvious improvement to a view from a moderately sensitive receptor, or perceptible improvement to a view from a more sensitive receptor.

Minor Beneficial Effects	Proposed Development would cause limited improvement to a view from a receptor of medium sensitivity, or would cause greater improvement to a view from a receptor of low sensitivity.
Not Significant Neutral Effects	No perceptible change in the view.
Minor Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would cause limited deterioration to a view from a receptor of medium sensitivity, or cause greater deterioration to a view from a receptor of low sensitivity.
Moderate Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would cause obvious deterioration to a view from a moderately sensitive receptor, or perceptible damage to a view from a more sensitive receptor.
Moderate / Major Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would cause major deterioration to a view from a highly sensitive receptor, and would constitute a major discordant element in the view.
Major Adverse Effects	Proposed Development would cause the loss of views from a highly sensitive receptor, and would constitute a dominant discordant feature in the view.

Table 21: Description of Visual Significance Defining Criteria

Appendix B - Viewpoints



Key views of the Site - VP1



Receptor type

Recreation (Footpath BOX54 - reference ST 83718 68084).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP2



Receptor type

Recreation (Bridleway BOX55 - reference ST 83546 67946).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP3



Receptor type

Recreation (Bridleway BOX94 - reference ST 83422 68168).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP5



Receptor type

Recreation (Bridleway BOX55 - reference ST 83158 68197).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP6



Receptor type

Recreation (Footpath BOX44 / BOX47A - reference ST 83545 68589).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP7



Receptor type

Recreation (Bridleway / Footpath BOX51 / BOX48 - reference ST 83901 68369).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP8



Receptor type

Recreation (Footpath BOX51 - reference ST 83918 68226).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP9



Receptor type

Recreation (Bridleway BOX59 - reference ST 83786 67743).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP10



Receptor type

Transport (Bradford Road B3109 - reference ST 83942 67758).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP11



Receptor type

Transport (White Ennox Lane (Unnumbered) - reference ST 83924 68913).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP13



Receptor type

Recreation (Footpath BOX64 - reference ST 82820 67730).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP14



Receptor type

Recreation (Footpath BOX43 - reference ST 82751 67917).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP15



Receptor type

Transport (Henley Lane (Unclassified) - reference ST 82647 67857).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP17



Receptor type

Recreation (Bridleway BOX44 - reference ST 83126 68540).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP18



Receptor type

Recreation (Footpath BOX41 - reference ST 83244 68886).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP19



Receptor type

Transport (Unnamed B-road - reference ST 84070 66714).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP21



Receptor type

Transport (Unnamed, unclassified road - reference ST 82537 67410).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP23



Receptor type

Transport (Henley Lane (Unclassified) - reference ST 82349 67765).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP24



Receptor type

Transport (Wadswick Lane (Unnumbered B-Road) - reference ST 85266 67770).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP25



Receptor type

Transport (Henley Lane (Unclassified) - reference ST 81717 67117).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP27



Receptor type

Transport (Prospect (Unclassified) - reference ST 81694 67807).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP29



Receptor type

Transport (Unnumbered Road - reference ST 81975 69141).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP30



Receptor type

Transport (Unnumbered B-Road) reference ST 82892 70224).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.

Key views of the Site - VP31



Receptor type

Recreation (Footpath BOX76 - reference ST 81341 67699).

Brief description of view

This receptor has no intervisibility with the Site or the Receptor. As such, it has not been assessed.



We are rural