

Landscape Appraisal - Methodology

1. Methodology for the assessment of landscape effects

- 1.1.1. The landscape impact assessment describes the likely nature and magnitude of changes to individual landscape elements and characteristics (the landscape receptors). An assessment is made on the consequential effect on the landscape character in relation to the site itself and on the wider landscape. In order to carry out the assessment, evaluations initially need to be made about the quality and value of the receiving landscape, the nature of the landscape receptor and the nature of the effect of the Proposed Development (its sensitivity) to determine (the magnitude of change) that the receptor is likely to experience. These can then be used to inform the assessment and make a judgment about the effect of the change on the receptors.
- 1.1.2. Landscape characteristics are described in relation to the site and its surrounding area, and the impact of change on these must be considered in the context of the quality and value of the landscape.
- 1.1.3. It must also be considered that not all developments are automatically detrimental in a landscape but well designed, sited and successfully integrated, may not adversely affect the wider landscape; indeed, developments may enhance a landscape, especially that which has previously been degraded or those landscape which due to their characteristics can absorb a particular development. Alternatively, there may be detrimental effects on certain characteristics or elements, but not on all, and mitigation may reduce some of these effects.
- 1.1.4. There are potential effects on the landscape that will occur during the shorter construction phase (at Year 0), and there will be longer-term effects during the operational period.
- 1.1.5. Individual landscape features identified as landscape receptors include landscape character areas, designations, the landscape context (including the immediate setting of the site), and the landscape character within the site.
- 1.1.6. The landscape baseline and site assessment are used to determine the sensitivity of effects and magnitude of change on each of the landscape receptors. These assessments are then used to produce a judgment on how each landscape receptor may be affected by the Proposed Development.

1.1. Significance Criteria

- 1.1.1. The significance of a landscape effect (impact upon the receptor) is a professional judgement made, taking into consideration the following:
- 1.1.2. The nature of the affected landscape receptor (its sensitivity);
- The nature of the effect (the magnitude);
 - The type of the effect (positive, negative or neutral).
- 1.1.3. A significant landscape impact results when a landscape capacity threshold is exceeded, resulting in a change to the landscape character (which may be either beneficial or adverse). The landscape capacity is related to landscape sensitivity. While the methodology is designed to be robust and transparent, professional judgement is ultimately applied to determine the significance of each effect.
- 1.1.4. In some instances, the effect may be discernible or greater, but offset by other considerations; for example, through the mitigation or landscape proposals for the development, or the indirect effects arising from the change, or modification, of the land use, e.g., enhancements to biodiversity arising through less intensive agricultural practices, where the resulting overall effect may comprise a combination of both adverse and beneficial effects. In such cases, the significance of effect is assessed as neutral.

Table 1. Significance of Landscape Effects

Significance	Adverse Landscape Effects	Beneficial Landscape Effects	Significance
Major	• Substantial long-term or irreversible effects on medium sensitivity landscape • Some irreversible effects on highly sensitive landscape • Landscape character is affected to a significant degree	• Landscape character is significantly improved via removal of incongruous landscape elements and introduction/ restoration of valued characteristics landscape elements in low and medium sensitivity landscapes.	Major
Moderate	• Substantial long-term or irreversible effects on low sensitivity landscape • Some long-term or irreversible effects on medium sensitivity landscape	• Landscape character is improved via the introduction of many characteristics landscape elements and the removal of incongruous landscape elements in medium sensitivity landscape	Moderate

	Limited or temporary effects on high sensitivity landscape		
Minor	- Numerous medium-term or reversible effect on low sensitivity landscape - Limited of reversible effect on medium sensitivity landscape - Minimal effect on highly sensitive landscape	- Landscape character is slightly improved via strengthening of some valued characteristic landscape elements for a long-term duration in highly sensitive landscape - Some shorter duration improvements to lower sensitivity landscapes	Minor
Negligible	Some small-scale, short-term effects to low-medium sensitivity landscape No discernible effects to highly sensitive landscape There may be some small-scale, short-term beneficial effects but virtually no lasting effect on existing landscape character		Negligible

1.2. Landscape Quality Criteria

1.2.1. Landscape Quality is not the same as scenic beauty; quality is primarily a matter of how clearly the distinctive character of a landscape is expressed in an area, the state of repair/condition of landscape elements and the integrity/intactness of the landscape.

Table 2. Categorisation Guidance for Landscape Quality

Landscape Quality	Criteria
Good	- Strong characteristics with very limited incongruous elements. - Very good functional and visual condition. - Best example of landscape type, with key elements retained and in good condition
Moderate	- Retaining some key characteristics of the character area. - Good condition with some minor incongruous elements. - Good example of landscape type but may have suffered some decline to key elements.
Poor	- Poorly defined characterisation of character area. - Fragmented condition of landscape with many incongruous elements. - Poor example of landscape type, where key elements have been substantially eroded or lost

Table 3. Categorisation Guidance for Landscape Quality

Landscape Quality	Criteria
Quality (condition)	A measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements.
Scenic	The term used to describe landscapes that appeal primarily to the senses (primarily but not wholly the visual senses).
Rarity	The presence of rare elements or features in the landscape or the presence of a rare Landscape Character type.
Representativeness	Whether the landscape contains a particular character and/or features or elements which are considered particularly important examples.
Conservation interests (Ecology)	The presence of features of wildlife and earth science interest can add to the value of the landscape as well as having value in their own right.
Conservation interests (Heritage)	The presence of features of archaeological or historical and cultural interest can add to the value of the landscape as well as having value in their own right.
Recreation value	Evidence that the landscape is valued for recreational activity where experience of the landscape is important.
Perceptual aspects	A landscape may be valued for its perceptual qualities, notably wildness and/or tranquillity.
Associative qualities	This includes cultural associations, historic identity, artistic links, folklore, literature, and any symbolic meaning attached to the landscape.

1.3. Value Criteria

- 1.3.1. The value or importance of the affected landscape can be determined using Landscape, ecological, heritage or recreational designations to provide an indication of areas where the landscape is considered to be of higher value to the community (locally, regionally or nationally). Additionally, the landscape character baseline studies can also give an indication of value, especially for those landscapes which are not designated.
- 1.3.2. GLVIA 3rd edition provides guidance concerning the assessment of landscape value, particularly for areas of the landscape where no such landscape designations exist. In paragraph 5.28 it states that; "In cases where there is no existing evidence to indicate landscape value, and where scoping discussions suggest that it is appropriate, value should be determined as part of the baseline study through new survey and analysis. This requires definition of the criteria and factors that are considered to confer value on a landscape or on its components." It then suggests a number of options on how this could be undertaken. The two key methods include:
- *"Draw on a list of those factors that are generally agreed to influence value (see Box 5.1). they need to be interpreted to reflect the particular legislative and policy context prevailing in particular places. The list is not comprehensive and other factors may be considered important in specific areas."*

- “Draw up a list of criteria and factors specific to the individual project and landscape context.”

- 1.3.3. It goes on to state that a combination of the two methods is likely to be the most effective method and that judgements are likely to be required about which components of the landscape contribute most to the overall value.

Table 4. Box 5.1 (GLVIA 3rd edition) Range of factors that can help in the identification of valued landscapes

Quality (condition)	A measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements.
Scenic	The term used to describe landscapes that appeal primarily to the senses (primarily but not wholly the visual senses).
Rarity	The presence of rare elements or features in the landscape or the presence of a rare Landscape Character type.
Representativeness	Whether the landscape contains a particular character and/or features or elements which are considered particularly important examples.
Conservation interests (Ecology)	The presence of features of wildlife and earth science interest can add to the value of the landscape as well as having value in their own right.
Conservation interests (Heritage)	The presence of features of archaeological or historical and cultural interest can add to the value of the landscape as well as having value in their own right.
Recreation value	Evidence that the landscape is valued for recreational activity where experience of the landscape is important.
Perceptual aspects	A landscape may be valued for its perceptual qualities, notably wildness and/or tranquillity.
Associative qualities	This includes cultural associations, historic identity, artistic links, folklore, literature, and any symbolic meaning attached to the landscape.

Landscape Susceptibility to Change

- 1.3.4. The landscape receptor may be the overall character, quality, condition of a particular landscape area, or it may be a landscape element or feature, or a perceptual or aesthetic aspect.
- 1.3.5. Landscape susceptibility relates to the ability of the landscape receptor to accommodate the Proposed Development without unduly undermining the baseline situation. The susceptibility of the landscape is specific to the location of the Proposed Development, (not the wider general landscape), similarly the degree of susceptibility is measured in terms of the specific Proposed Development, (not to any type of development in general).
- 1.3.6. Therefore, individual assessment of the Proposed Development and its proposed location and setting is essential to determining landscape susceptibility, as there may be localised differences in condition, quality or the range of landscape elements or features or the intactness or representativeness of the landscape character, which might not be apparent from the broader baseline landscape character analysis.

1.3.7. Landscape susceptibility is assessed as High, Medium or Low and can broadly be defined by the following criteria, which would be affected by the development to differing degrees, although this list is not exhaustive.

Table 5. Categorisation Guidance for Landscape Value

Landscape Susceptibility	Criteria
High	• The landscape has a strong, distinctive, or fragile character that would be fundamentally altered by the Proposed Development. • The proposals are extensive in nature relative to the receiving landscape and would affect key elements or patterns that define its character. • The landscape is open and visually connected with the wider setting, with little opportunity for containment. • The landscape is of small-scale or complex form, or displays high scenic, perceptual, ecological, or heritage value that would be directly affected. • The site or its immediate surroundings are designated for landscape, heritage, or ecological reasons that would be directly affected by the proposals. • The overall landscape condition and intactness contribute strongly to its value and would be disrupted by the proposals.
Medium	• The landscape has some capacity to accommodate change of the type proposed without a fundamental loss of its defining character. • The proposals are of moderate extent, contained within part of the site, or align partially with existing landform or pattern. • The landscape is more enclosed or less visually connected to the wider setting, with some ability to integrate new elements. • Some valued features (landscape, ecological, or heritage) may be affected, but their contribution to overall character would remain discernible. • The overriding landscape quality, scenic or perceptual characteristics would be partially changed but not lost.
Low	• The landscape has a simple, large-scale, or robust character with capacity to absorb the type and scale of development proposed. • The proposals are limited in extent relative to the receiving landscape or occur within an already modified or enclosed context. • The site is not designated for landscape, heritage, or ecological reasons, or existing designations would remain unaffected. • Few, if any, valued landscape, heritage, or ecological features would be directly affected. • The overall landscape quality, scenic and perceptual qualities would remain largely unchanged.

1.3.8. The Site based assessment involves the recording of both objective description and subjective impressions of the landscape, as well as details of the existing landscape condition. It includes an assessment of the extent and nature of views to and from the Site and the type of receptors that experience these views.

1.4. Magnitude Criteria

1.4.1. The nature of the effect (magnitude) is judged on the following aspects and is collectively defined as the Magnitude of Landscape Effects:

- the size and scale of changes to landscape character and features,
- the overall time duration, i.e., how long would the development be in place and if it is wholly or partially reversible or likely to be permanent,
- the extent of the geographical area over which landscape effects would be felt.

1.4.2. Any change to landscape characteristics can be of the following type:

- Positive (Beneficial)
- Negative (Adverse)
- Neutral.

1.4.3. The type of effect on landscape receptors is related to the Baseline Situation and whether it is a desirable or an undesirable change. A neutral effect may occur, for example, if a characteristic element is replaced with a different but equally characteristic element. Therefore, it is possible for there to be a large scale of change but with a neutral effect overall.

Table 6. Nature of Landscape Effect (Magnitude)

Magnitude of Effect	Criteria
Large	Substantial change to landscape characteristics Addition of elements that would be prominent and may conflict with key landscape characteristics
Medium	Moderate changes to landscape characteristics Addition of elements that may be noticeable but do not conflict with key landscape characteristics
Small	Limited changes to landscape characteristics Addition of elements that are not uncharacteristic with existing landscape
Negligible	No perceptible change to the landscape characteristics
None	No effect on landscape character

1.5. Judgement of Sensitivity

- 1.5.1. Judgements about sensitivity in this assessment take into account considerations of landscape quality / value and the susceptibility of the landscape to accommodate the Proposed Development. The nature of the receptor is the sensitivity of that receptor to change. To determine the nature of the receptor, an assessment is made regarding the quality and value of the landscape elements, together with the strength/importance of contribution they make towards the landscape character present and how susceptible the landscape would be to the proposed changes or can recover from change.

Table 7. Nature of Landscape Receptors (Sensitivity)

Sensitivity	Criteria
High	A substantial number of key elements are susceptible to change and sensitivity to disturbance A national or internationally recognised landscape with features difficult to replace, without affecting the existing character Cohesive landscape A highly valued landscape or with highly valued elements or associations
Medium	A number of elements are susceptible to change Of regional, district or county recognition with some scope to replace without adversely affecting the character Some features worthy of conservation A moderately valued landscape or with some valued elements or associations
Low	A small number of elements are potentially susceptible to change Of local recognition or non-designated landscape with some scope to replace and enhance without adversely affecting the character Weak landscape structure A little valued landscape with few (if any) valued elements or associations

2. Methodology for the assessment of visual effects

- 2.1.1. The assessment of visual effects focuses on publicly accessible viewpoints which represent a range of sensitive locations with the potential to be affected to a significant degree by the proposals.
- 2.1.2. During the site visit, a series of photographs were taken of the views across the site (see Appendix 6, Figures 16-23). In addition to the ZTV, this helps to establish the key surrounding areas from which there may be visibility and informs where potential viewpoints for assessment may best be located, considering the surface features which may provide barriers or filters to visibility.
- 2.1.3. Visual receptors are treated the same way as the landscape receptors considered in Chapter 6. The aims of both are transparent, objective assessment, and the principles of methodology are the same; the human receptors are, however, more differentiated. The LI and IEMA recommend in GLVIA3 that the significance of visual effects be assessed by relating the sensitivity and importance of the receptors with the nature, scale and duration of the changes predicted.
- 2.1.4. Visual effects are defined as the relationship between the visual sensitivity of the receptor, the scale of visual effect and the nature of visual effect.

2.2. Field work

Photography

- 2.2.1. The photographs have been taken using a Canon EOS 6D Mark I camera using a circa 50mm focal length lens. The camera was set at a typical eye height of 1.6m above ground level.
- 2.2.2. The photographs used to illustrate the assessment have been 'stitched' together using Photoshop digital imaging software to provide a 'panoramic image', thus providing a visual context to the focus of the centre photograph.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility

- 2.2.3. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility ('ZTV') determines the potential area within which the site is visible, however, not all of the site would be visible from each vantage point. The extent of the study area is defined in As shown in Figure 6, Appendix 4. The first step in establishing the visual envelope is to exclude those places hidden from view; this is mapped by computer calculation and shown on the ZTV Plan

- 2.2.4. It is important to note that the computer model calculates both bare topography and physical screening, including the buildings and vegetation. The process of the theoretical visibility is further explained on Figure 6, Appendix 4. Such an analysis would inevitably cover a much greater area, many parts of which would not actually be visible on the ground because of other vertical landscape features, e.g., hedgerows, woodland, etc. which are not routinely considered in a computer model.
- 2.2.5. Because of the averaging factor of the computer-generated model, there is a +/- 3m tolerance, which slightly distorts and exaggerates the results, e.g., a hedge barrier of 3m height could indicate on the ZTV that there is still theoretical visibility across an area, whereas in reality the extent of visibility would be less and in some cases non-existent, similarly this averaging effect may also indicate intervisibility with the site extending slightly further beyond the brow of a hill or ridgeline, which would in reality not be visible due to the topography. Therefore, although there may be landscape impacts there may be reduced or no visual impacts.

Representative Viewpoints

- 2.2.6. These are the assessed viewpoints that represent views from which the greatest degree of intervisibility would be experienced from a range of publicly accessible locations and where it would be expected that visual receptors would be most susceptible to change in the view.
- 2.2.7. For the visual receptor types recorded in the visual assessment, the susceptibility has been described, sensitivity assessed, and the nature of the view and the potential changes are described. The effects of proposed mitigation potential changes have also been described.

2.3. Value Criteria of the view

- 2.3.1. The criteria for assessing the value of views have been based on the value in Section 4.2 of the Landscape Methodology. The criteria is shown in Table 9 below.

Table 8. The criteria for assessing the value of views

High	Views with high scenic value within designated landscapes including but not limited to World Heritage sites, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, etc. Likely to include key viewpoints on OS maps or reference within guidebooks, provision of facilities, presence of interpretation boards, etc.
Medium	Views with moderate scenic value within undesignated landscape including urban fringe and rural countryside.
Low	Views with unremarkable scenic value within undesignated landscape with partly degraded visual quality and detractors.

2.4. Visual Receptor Susceptibility to Changes in Visual Amenity

2.4.1. The susceptibility of visual receptors relates to the individuals or groups of people likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint by the change in the visual amenity introduced by the Proposed Development. Different visual receptors would react in various ways due to:

- The occupation or activity of the people experiencing the views at particular locations or along specific routes and
- The extent to which their attention or interest may be focused on the views and the visual amenity experience at a viewpoint or along a route.

2.4.2. Visual receptor susceptibility is thus accorded a grading of Low, Medium or High.

Table 9. Nature of Visual Receptors (Susceptibility)

Susceptibility	Criteria
High	Typically includes occupiers of residential properties and people engaged in outdoor recreation where enjoyment of the landscape and its visual qualities form a key part of the experience (e.g. walkers using PRoW, visitors to scenic viewpoints). However, the level of susceptibility will vary according to how compatible the Proposed Development is with the visual character of the area. In some cases, receptors of this type may display moderate or low susceptibility where the development is of a type or scale that can be readily accommodated within the existing visual context.
Medium	Includes people engaged in outdoor activities or travelling through the landscape where appreciation of views contributes to, but is not a primary focus of, their experience (e.g. users of minor roads, cyclists, or passengers on local trains). Susceptibility depends on the visual relationship between the receptor and the Proposed Development, and may increase where the landscape context is tranquil, undeveloped, or distinctive.
Low	Includes people at places of work (e.g. industrial or commercial areas) and those travelling on major roads or motorways, where attention is generally focused on tasks or movement rather than on views. Susceptibility may be reduced where the existing environment already includes similar forms of built or utilitarian development. .

2.5. Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

2.5.1. Visual Sensitivity is affected by the following factors (not an exhaustive list):

- Location and context of the viewpoint and the significance of the view in relation to valued landscapes or features;
- The duration of the view, and any 'screening effect' by the interlying landscape elements;

- The reason for their association with the view e.g. a working environment or a recreation, leisure or holiday situation;
- Characteristics of the view, e.g. whether it is continuous or intermittent and static or transient;
- The importance of the view and the activity or expectations of the receptor at the viewpoint;
- Numbers of people affected and whether the viewpoint is publicly accessible (viewpoints at public locations are normally considered more sensitive than those at private locations although private residential locations can be used to represent their community;
- The 'popularity' or value of the view (e.g. as noted in guidebooks, described in novels and depicted in paintings, etc.).

2.5.2. Furthermore, the speed at which the receptor may be passing through the landscape, (duration); e.g., a low or slow speed allows for a more acute and detailed observation of the passing landscape and a greater awareness of elements which conflict with the wider view of the landscape. For instance, an individual driving to work would be less sensitive and their duration of view decreased due to the speed of travel, their awareness of the surrounding landscape would be less extensive, as their concentration is focused on the road ahead.

2.5.3. Distance would further affect the sensitivity of the visual receptor, as the impact of the development, if visible, would decrease with distance, due to the effects of atmosphere in certain weather conditions, which may make the far distance hazy, and less prominent. The development may appear more fragmented as intervening landscape features break up the view of the site. Therefore, views of the site may be unobstructed, glimpsed, filtered or obscured. Foreground features may also provide greater visual distraction and appear more visually dominant than the development in the distance, or there may be more features which distract the viewer's attention as the included angle encompasses a greater panorama, with increased distance. As the viewer recedes from the development the apparent scale and extent of the development would also naturally decrease, to a point where it no longer forms a major part of the view and its significance is reduced.

2.5.4. The location of a visual receptor is also important, i.e., a receptor located within a home dwelling, workplace or place for holidaying, leisure or past time would further influence the Visual Sensitivity. For instance, at a place of dwelling, rooms used in daylight hours are normally considered more sensitive than locations used during the night.

- 2.5.5. The angle of view of visual receptor in relation to the development site can affect the extent of visibility for some developments, particularly those that may cover a large surface area but have limited vertical emphasis, as a lower viewing position can foreshorten the view of the site, whereas a more elevated position could result in the application site being visually more extensive, as it is looked down upon. A low viewing position though could also result in the development being viewed against the skyline, whereas the elevated viewing position might remove this effect.
- 2.5.6. The scale of visual impact is based on the change to the visual amenity, which the Proposed Development creates, and the sensitivity of the visual receptor. The assessment provides an analysis of the types of visual receptors expected for each viewpoint and assumes that visibility is on a clear, bright day in winter when a potential view of the Proposed Development is most prominent. However, a number of factors would potentially have a reducing effect on the scale of visibility, not least changing weather and atmospheric conditions, increasing over distance and increased leaf cover from hedges and trees in the intervening landscape through spring to autumn; when it might also be expected that footpaths and other recreational routes might be most frequently used.

Table 10. Sensitivity of visual receptors criteria

Sensitivity	Criteria
High	Those receptors which have high susceptibility to change, due to their location and/or reasons for being at that location, which would make the change to the view by the Proposed Development not readily accommodated. Visual receptors who are at a location of high value.
Medium	Those receptors which have medium susceptibility to change, due to their location and/or reasons for being at that location, which would make the change to the view by the Proposed Development able to be accommodated. Visual receptors who are at a location of moderate value even though they may be highly susceptible.
Low	Those receptors which have low susceptibility to change, due to their location and/or reasons for being at that location, which would make the change to the view by the Proposed Development able to be accommodated. Visual receptors who are at a location of low value even though they may have high or medium susceptibility.

Definition of Visibility

- 2.5.7. Visibility of the development would vary according to the location of the visual receptor and the interaction of physical features such as trees, hedges, topography, these may exist in combination, e.g., a view may be partial and filtered. Therefore, views can be described as:

- Not Visible.
- Glimpsed: a brief or distant view in the context of the wider landscape, e.g., a view through a field gateway which would otherwise be screened by the adjacent hedgerows.
- Partial: a direct view of part of the development.
- Filtered: the site is visible but partially screened, e.g., by trees and sparse hedges which act to obscure a direct and unimpeded view.
- Open: a direct and unobstructed view of the whole development.

Viewpoint Proximity

2.5.8. Viewpoint proximity to the site is classed as follows:

- Close-range: Within 0.5km
- Medium-range: Between 0.5km and 1.5km
- Long-range: Over 1.5km

2.6. Magnitude criteria

2.6.1. The nature of the effect is judged on the size and scale of changes to landscape character, which the visual receptor may experience as well as the overall time duration of that experience, the extent of the area over which it occurs along with whether the change is reversible or irreversible. This is collectively defined as the Magnitude of Visual Effects.

Table 11. Nature of Visual Effects (Magnitude)

Magnitude of Effect	Criteria
Large	If the proposal is likely to be dominant and immediately apparent within the scene affecting the overall impression of the view
Medium	If the proposal is likely to be a visible and recognisable new development in the overall view, but which is not intrusive.
Small	If only a minor component of the development is discernible, or the development may be at a distance so that the effects are scarcely appreciated within the wider view
Negligible	No perceptible change to the visual amenity
None	No visual effects

Type of visual effect.

2.6.2. Any change to views within the landscape can be of the following type:

- Positive (Beneficial)
- Negative (Adverse)
- Neutral.

2.6.3. The type of effect on visual receptors is related to the Baseline Situation, and whether it is a desirable or undesirable change is determined by the perception of landscape quality. For example, a neutral visual effect may occur if a characteristic element is replaced with a different but equally characteristic element. Therefore, it is possible for there to be a large scale of change but with a neutral effect overall.

2.7. Significance criteria

2.7.1. The significance of a visual effect (impact upon the receptor) is a professional judgement made, taking into consideration the following:

- The nature of the affected visual receptor (their susceptibility and sensitivity);
- The nature of the effect (the magnitude);
- The type of the effect (positive, negative or neutral).

2.7.2. In some instances, the effect may be discernible or greater, but offset by other considerations; for example, through the mitigation or landscape proposals for the development, where the resulting effect is neither beneficial nor adverse. In such cases, the significance of effect is assessed as neutral.

2.7.3. In general, the duration weighting applied to magnitude would influence the significance. Duration is classed as follows:

- Very Long term effect: 15+ years
- Long term effect: 8-15 years
- Medium term effect: 3-8 years
- Short term effects: 1-3 years
- Temporary effect: Less than 1 year

- 2.7.4. It is considered in this assessment that it is reasonable to conclude that permanent visual effects would be those that would be of long term or greater duration, i.e., those lasting 8+ years.

Table 12. Significance of Visual Effects

Significance	Adverse Visual Effects	Beneficial Visual Effects
Major	Long-term or irreversible effects on medium sensitivity receptor Some long-term or irreversible effects on a highly sensitive receptor The visual amenity is affected to a significant degree	The view is significantly improved via the removal of existing incongruous landscape elements and introduction/restoration of valued characteristic landscape elements.
Moderate	Substantial long-term or irreversible effect of low sensitivity receptor Some long-term or irreversible effects to medium sensitivity receptor Limited or reversible effect in a highly sensitive receptor The visual amenity is affected to some degree	The view is improved via the removal of some existing incongruous elements and introduction/restoration of some valued characteristic landscape elements.
Minor	Some medium-term or reversible effects on a low sensitivity receptor Limited or short-term or reversible effect in a medium sensitivity receptor Very small or temporary effect on a high sensitivity receptor Minimal effect on visual amenity	The view is slightly improved via removal of limited incongruous elements and strengthening of some valued, characteristic landscape elements.
Negligible	Some small scale, short-term effects on low sensitivity receptor Barely discernible effect of existing visual amenity	
None	No effect on visual amenity	

3. Criteria Matrix

3.1.1. In general terms, effects assessed as being of "Moderate" or "Major" significance are considered significant. Effects assessed as "Minor" or "Negligible" are typically not considered significant, although they may still warrant mitigation or monitoring. Where there is any uncertainty, a precautionary approach is applied, and the rationale for each conclusion is clearly explained within this report.

Sensitivity of visual receptors criteria

3.1.2. The following box is used to determine the sensitivity of the site:

Table 13. Overall sensitivity of visual receptors

	Value			
Susceptibility		High	Medium	Low
	High	High	High	Medium
	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
	Low	Medium	Medium	Low

Degree of Effects

3.1.3. The Degree of Effects is a professional judgement based upon all the factors in terms of landscape and visual sensitivity and the magnitude of change arising from the proposals. The cross-referencing of landscape and visual sensitivity, along with the magnitude of change, determines the overall degree of effect. Table 15 below is a criteria matrix to help determine the degree of effects.

Table 14. Significance of visual effects

		Sensitivity		
		High	Medium	Low
Mag of Change	Large	Major	Major	Moderate
	Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor
	Small	Moderate	Minor	Minor
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible