PLANTING SCHEDULE

Native Woodland Tree & Shrub Mix		1.5m centres	
Species	%	Height (cm)	Root
Quercus robur*	10	250-300cm	BR
Betula pendula	20	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Cornus sanquinea	5	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Crateagus monogyna	20	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Malus sylvestris	10	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Prunus spinosa	10	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Rosa canina	5	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Sorbus aucuparia	20	40-60cm	BR (1+1)

** Standard tree sizes to be planted at 2.5m centres*

Native Hedgerow Mix		6.66 plants per m	
Species	%	Height (cm)	Root
Crataegus monogyna	50	250-300cm	BR
Prunus spinosa	20	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Corylus avellana	10	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Cornus sanguinea	5	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Rosa canina	5	40-60cm	BR (1+1)
Viburnum opulus	10	40-60cm	BR (1+1)

Emorsgate EM2F - Basic General Purpose Meadow Mixture		
%	Species	Common Name
3.4	Achillea millefolium	Yarrow
11.4	Centaurea nigra	Common Knapweed - yaless
10.0	Cruciata laevipes	Crosswort
3.4	Daucus carota	Wild carrot
3.4	Knautia arvensis	Field scabious
10.0	Leucanthemum vulgare	Oxeye Daisy (Moon Daisy)
13.4	Malva moschata	Musk Mallow
1.14	Medicago lupulina	Black Medick
20	Plantago lanceolata	Ribwort Plantain
10	Potentum sanguisorba ssp sanguisorba	Salad Burnet
0.7	Primula veris	Cowslip
2.0	Ranunculus acris	Meadow Buttercup
6.7	Rhinanthus minor	Yellow Rattle
3.33	Silene dioica	Red Campion
1.3	Silene vulgaris	Bladder Campion

Semi-improved and improved grassland to be converted to species-rich neutral grassland by scarifying the surface to create areas of bare ground, into which is sown 100% native wildflower seed mix in early spring or autumn in accordance with suppliers' instructions. A suitable mix would be Emorsgate EM2F 'Standard General Purpose Wildflowers' mix. Once established, the grassland should be cut twice annually in early spring and late autumn and arisings removed from site.

Legend:

- Development subject to a Planning Application (4100m2)
- Additional Land within Severn Trent Water's Ownership
- Site Infrastructure
- Proposed Native Hedgerow (0.0709km)
- Proposed Native Woodland Tree and Shrub Mix (0.0153ha)
- Proposed Wildflower Meadow (0.06ha)

Rev	Date	Description	Drn	Chk	App
00	05/10/2022	First draft	MP	DL	

Church Stoke

RSK

TITLE: Appendix A
Landscape Strategy Proposals

Church Stoke_Conceptual Landscape Strategy.qgz_Landscape Strategy Proposals

0 10 20 m

Scale: 1:500 @ A3

REV 00

Severn Trent Water Limited

EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS, CHURCH STOKE

Landscape & Visual Appraisal

Appendix B Assessment Methodology

RSK/LTP/32673/05/01 Rev00

MARCH 2022

CONTENTS

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology 2
Introduction 2
Guidance and Best Practice 2
Spatial Scope of Study Area 3
Temporal Scope 3
Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology Overview 4
Landscape Assessment Methodology 4
Landscape Sensitivity 4
Landscape Value 4
Landscape Susceptibility 6
Magnitude of Change 7
Visual Assessment Methodology 9
Visual Sensitivity 9
Visual Receptor Value 9
Visual Receptor Susceptibility 10
Magnitude of Change 11
Overall Level of Effects and Determining Significance 13
Residual Effects 14
Viewpoints and Photography 14
Cumulative Impact Assessment 15
Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
References ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

APPENDIX A DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

APPENDIX B ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology

Introduction

1.1 The following outlines the guidance, methodology and approach used in the assessment of landscape and visual effects. The methodology sets out the criteria and definitions for the assessment of sensitivity, magnitude of change and significance of effects.

1.2 The potential landscape and visual effects of the proposed development have been assessed separately.

1.3 Landscape effects include direct effects upon the fabric of the landscape, such as the addition, removal or alteration of structures, woodlands, trees or hedgerows, which may alter the character and perceived quality of the area, or more general effects on character and designated areas arising from the introduction of new man-made features.

1.4 Visual effects relate to specific changes in the composition of views and the effects of those changes on visual receptors (e.g. residents, business users, users of recreational open space, views to and from valued landscapes).

Guidance and Best Practice

1.5 The methods of assessment used are based on the broad principles established, and approaches recommended in, the following best practice guidance:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3)[1]:
- An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment[2];
- An Approach to Landscape Sensitivity Assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management[3];
- LANDMAP – the all-Wales GIS (Geographical Information System)[4];
- LANDMAP Guidance Note 46: Using LANDMAP in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (NRW, 2020)[5];
- The State of Environmental Impact Assessment Practice in the UK[6];

[1] The Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition

[2] Natural England (2014) An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment

[3] Natural England (2019) An Approach to Landscape Sensitivity Assessment – to inform spatial planning and land management

[4] Natural Resources Wales (NRW) GIS based landscape resource where landscape characteristics, qualities and influences on the landscape are recorded and evaluated into a nationally consistent data set

[5] NRW (2020) LANDMAP Guidance Note 46: Using LANDMAP in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments; updated 31 December 2021

[6] Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (2011) The State of Environmental Impact Assessment Practice in the UK

- Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21 Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations[7]; and
- Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals[8].

Spatial Scope of Study Area

1.6 The landscape assessment has focused on those areas which are likely to experience significant effects. The visual assessment has focused on those groups of receptors which are likely to experience significant effects.

1.7 The study area for the landscape and visual assessments extends to 2 km from the Proposed Development. This is a wider study area than would be usual for developments of this size but has been extended to include the western outliers of the Shropshire Hills which extend to 1.5 km east of the site at Todleth Hill and Roundton Hill.

1.8 The relatively low-level development and experience on similar projects indicates that noticeable landscape and visual effects are likely to be limited beyond this distance due to the scale and low-level nature of the proposed development and screening provided from the surrounding mature vegetation.

Temporal Scope

1.9 The assessment has taken account of the effects of the proposed development at the following points in time:

- Construction – the point at which the construction works would be visible;
- Operation Year 1 – the point at which the proposed development would first be visible in its entirety; and
- Operation Year 15 – once proposed mitigation planting has had the opportunity to mature.

1.10 Short-term effects are typically those which would arise during the construction phase of the proposed development.

1.11 Medium and long-term effects are typically those which would arise between years one and 15 of operation.

1.12 Long-term residual effects of the proposed development are typically those which would remain after a minimum 15 years, once any mitigation planting has had an opportunity to establish and mature, along with any proportionate incremental growth in existing vegetation.

[7] Landscape Institute (2021) Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21 Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations

[8] Landscape Institute (2019) Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals

Landscape and Visual Assessment Methodology Overview

1.13 The key aspects of the proposed development have been considered against the baseline conditions to allow the potential landscape and visual effects to be predicted. Consideration has been given to effects on:

- Landscape receptors, including the constituent elements of the landscape, its aesthetic or perceptual qualities and the character around the development; and
- Visual receptors or the people who could be affected by changes in views and visual amenity at different locations.

1.14 The effects have been identified by establishing and describing the changes resulting from the different components of the development and the predicted effects on individual landscape or visual receptors. This takes account of both the nature and sensitivity of the receptor and the nature and magnitude of the change likely to occur.

1.15 Each judgement has been determined by a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment using professional judgement accompanied by a clearly explained rationale.

Landscape Assessment Methodology

Landscape Sensitivity

1.16 The first step in assessing landscape effects is to determine the sensitivity of the landscape to the proposed development. Paragraph 3.24 of GLVIA3 defines the nature of a landscape receptor's sensitivity by *"combining judgements about its susceptibility to change arising from the specific proposal with judgements about the value attached to the receptor"*. Judgements on the value attached to the landscape are unrelated to the nature of a development proposal, whilst judgements on susceptibility may vary in response to the type of development proposed and the attributes of the area in which it is to be located.

Landscape Value

1.17 Value relates to the relative importance of the landscape to different stakeholders and can apply to areas of landscape as a whole, or to individual elements, features and aesthetic or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of the place. Paragraph 5.20 and box 5.1 of GLVIA3 lists a range of factors which can be used to identify valued landscapes. The criteria listed are: landscape quality; scenic quality; rarity; representativeness; conservation interests; recreation value; perceptual characteristics; and associations. The criteria within box 5.1 has been developed since it was first published to take account of appeal decisions, high court judgements and practitioners' experience. Table 1 within the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21 '*Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations'* sets out an updated range of factors which are broadly the same as the original box 5.1 except for the following changes: 'conservation interests' is separated into heritage and cultural factors; the term 'landscape condition' is used in place of 'landscape quality'; the terms 'rarity' and 'representativeness' are combined into 'distinctiveness'; and a new factor 'function' is included which addresses the value attached to landscapes which perform a clearly identifiable and valuable function.

1.18 If a local planning authority has undertaken a landscape character and/or sensitivity study these can often be a useful resource, in conjunction with field survey work, to establish landscape value based on the listed criteria. Similarly, within Wales the LANDMAP datasets created by Natural Resources Wales (NRW) have been used as a key indicator to establish landscape value based upon the overall evaluation recorded for the different datasets. When considering effects on specific LANDMAP datasets the overall NRW evaluation has been used directly.

1.19 The value of a landscape may reflect communal perception at a local, regional, national or international scale and may be informed by a number of factors including scenic beauty, tranquillity, wildness, cultural associations or other conservation or recreation interests. Although landscape value or importance is usually determined by reference to statutory or local planning policy designations, an absence of such designation does not automatically imply a lack of value as other factors, such as scarcity, may be considered relevant. The value or importance of landscape elements has also been considered. The European Landscape Convention recognises that ordinary (undesignated) landscapes also have their value to the communities for whom they provide a resource in which to live, work and spend their leisure.

1.20 The degree of landscape value or importance is therefore a matter for reasoned professional judgement and the value of the general landscape was categorised as very high, high, medium or low, as shown in **Table A1** below.

Value	Criteria	Examples
Very High	Very attractive and rare landscape of outstanding scenic quality and very distinctive characteristics, features and elements. Existence of national or international landscape designations. Very good condition/very well-managed and intact. High cultural heritage interest which contributes significantly to landscape character with sites of designated national or international importance. Very high recreational value and accessibility which contributes significantly to recreational/visitor experience. Rich and valued cultural associations. Unique sense of place with very positive perceptual responses. No detracting features.	Internationally or nationally recognised including: National Parks, World Heritage Sites, Heritage Coasts
High	Attractive landscape with some distinctive characteristics, features and elements. Presence of national landscape designations. Good condition/well-managed and largely intact. Cultural heritage interest which contributes to landscape character. Recreational value and accessibility which contributes to recreational/visitor experience. Valued cultural associations. Strong sense of place with positive perceptual responses. Occasional detracting features.	Nationally, regionally or district recognised including: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Registered Parks and Gardens, Country Parks

Medium	Typical, commonplace and unremarkable landscape, which although scenically pleasing has limited variety or distinctiveness. Average condition with some intactness but scope to improve management for land use. Limited historic interest. Limited recreational value, poor accessibility and few visitors. No or very few recorded cultural associations. Some features worthy of conservation. Unremarkable sense of place with neither particularly positive nor negative perceptual responses. Some dominant detracting features.	District or Locally recognised. Generally undesignated but value expressed through for example cultural associations, local plan designations, conservation areas and demonstrable use. May contain listed buildings, tree preservation orders and sites of county or local importance.
Low	Landscape degraded or in obvious decline, visually unattractive and with poor sense of place. Lack of management has resulted in degradation and poor condition. Limited to no cultural heritage interest. Limited to no recreational value or public accessibility. No recorded cultural associations. Frequent dominant detracting features. Poor sense of place with negative perceptual responses. Disturbed or derelict land requires treatment.	Locally recognised: Some individual landscape elements or features may be worthy of conservation, landscape either identified for or would benefit from regeneration or restoration, site or area may be valued at a community level.

Table A1 – Landscape Value

Landscape Susceptibility

1.21 Susceptibility to change is defined as the, *"…ability of the landscape receptor (whether it be the overall character or quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area, or an individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic or perceptual aspect) 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."* (GLVIA 3 para. 5.40).

1.22 The landscape's key characteristics have been identified and an assessment made of their susceptibility to change brought about specifically by the proposed development. The assessment of the value and susceptibility of the landscape to the proposed development may subsequently be modified by consideration of any special value or importance attributed to the landscape. The assessment identified the ability of the existing landscape to accommodate change and the ease with which the proposed development might fit.

1.23 The relationship between the value attached to landscape receptors and their susceptibility to change as a result of the proposed development can be complex. An internationally valued landscape does not automatically have a high susceptibility to change as the specific development type proposed may not compromise the particular components of the landscape that it is valued for. In contrast a locally valued landscape may be highly susceptible to a particular development type that detrimentally affects a key element or elements of the landscape resource.

1.24 The susceptibility of landscape character to the specific changes likely to be associated with the introduction of the proposed development was categorised as high, medium or low, as detailed below in **Table A2**.

Susceptibility	Description
High	The overall character or quality/condition of the landscape receptor has a low ability to accommodate the proposed development and effective mitigation would be difficult to achieve. An individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect may be significantly affected.
Medium	The overall character or quality/condition of the landscape receptor has a medium ability to accommodate the proposed development and effective mitigation would be achievable. Individual elements and/or features, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect may be affected. There will be some consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (landscape receptor value) and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies.
Low	The overall character or quality/condition of the landscape receptor has a high ability to accommodate the proposed development and effective mitigation would be readily achievable. Only individual elements and/or features, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect may be affected.

Table A2 – Landscape Susceptibility

1.25 The sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors have been based on the judgements regarding the susceptibility of the landscape or visual receptor to change and the value placed on the landscape character, as explained above, or the visual amenity as explained below. The sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors have been assessed as very high, high, medium or low. **Table A3** indicates general categories of sensitivity based on combining these judgements and serves as a useful guide when making these judgements.

	Susceptibility		
Value	High	Medium	Low
Very High	Very High	High	Medium - High
High	High	Medium - High	Medium - Low
Medium	Medium - High	Medium	Medium - Low
Low	Medium - Low	Low	Low

Table A3 – Categories of Receptor Sensitivity

1.26 Depending on the individual circumstance of each receptor, the assessment of sensitivity in **Table A3** has been adjusted up or down to fully reflect the nature of the development proposed in that location.

Magnitude of Change

1.27 Assessment of the magnitude of landscape change brought about by the potential effects of the proposed development has taken account of the following criteria, as relevant.

Professional judgement has been used to determine the relevance and appropriate weighting to be attributed to each:

- The size and scale of the development taking into consideration:
- the extent of landscape elements that would be lost and the contribution of that element/those elements to landscape character;
- the degree to which aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape would be altered either by the removal of existing components of the landscape, or, the addition of new features; and
- whether any change or changes in key characteristics are critical to a distinctive landscape character.
- The geographical extent of the landscape area that would be changed considering the geographical area over which landscape effects would be felt. For example, there may be a moderate loss of landscape elements over a wide area, or a major addition affecting a very localised area;
- The likely duration of the change to the landscape; and
- Whether the change to the landscape would be potentially reversible.

1.28 For each effect professional judgement has been used to determine the relevance and appropriate weighting to be attributed. The magnitude of landscape change has been assessed as high, medium, low or negligible dependent upon these judgements, with examples provided in **Table A4**.

Magnitude of Change	Description
High	The proposed development occupies most of the landscape and/or its setting. The proposed development is a new component in the landscape ranging from a notable change in landscape characteristics over a wide area to intensive change over a more limited area. The proposed development would be very noticeable. There would be loss or major alteration to key elements, features, and/or characteristics of the baseline which would fundamentally alter the character of the landscape. The duration of this effect may be permanent and irreversible.
Medium	The proposed development would occupy a large proportion of the landscape and/or its setting. The proposed development is quite different in appearance to the main component of the landscape but similar to other more minor components. The proposed development would be readily noticeable. There would be partial loss of, or alteration to, key elements, features and/or characteristics of the baseline but the character of the landscape would not fundamentally change. The duration of this effect may be semi-permanent and irreversible.
Low	The proposed development would occupy a small proportion of the landscape and/or its setting. The proposed development is similar in appearance to the main component of the landscape. The proposed development would not be readily noticeable.

	There would be minor loss of, or alteration to, key elements, features and/or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.
Negligible	There would be little discernible change to the landscape and/or its setting.
No Change	There would be no change to the landscape and/or its setting.

Table A4 – Indicative Criteria for Assessing Likely Magnitude of Landscape Change

Visual Assessment Methodology

1.29 The assessment of visual effects addresses potential changes in people's views or visual amenity caused by the appearance and prominence of the proposed development in those views. In accordance with GLVIA3, the assessment focused on publicly accessible rather than private viewpoints, and on those receptor groups who are likely to be most sensitive to the effects of the proposed development. Receptor groups assessed included communities, where views contribute to the wider landscape setting enjoyed by residents in an area, road users, and residents or visitors using recreational routes, features and attractions. It includes an assessment of the effects on views from the edges of defined settlements and from aggregated groups of dispersed properties.

Visual Sensitivity

1.30 The first step in assessing visual effects is to determine the sensitivity of the visual receptors to the proposed development. Paragraph 3.24 of GLVIA3 states that professionals should assess the nature of a visual receptor's sensitivity by *"combining judgements about its susceptibility to change arising from the specific proposal with judgements about the value attached to the receptor"*.

Visual Receptor Value

1.31 Paragraph 6.37 of GLVIA3 explains judgement needs to be made about the value attached to the view experienced, taking account of the existing recognition attached to particular views (e.g. through planning designations) and other indicators such as appearance in guidebooks, tourist maps or cultural references. The value of a view was assessed as very high, high, medium or low by applying professional judgement and the indicative criteria listed in Table A5.

Value	Criteria	Examples
Very High	Iconic views of national or international importance, which are important in relation to the special qualities of a designated landscape, the cultural associations of which are widely recognised in art, literature or other media. The view is widely known and well-frequented and often includes interpretation and other facilities.	Identified and recorded view to or from a World Heritage Site.
High	View of national or international importance; or is associated with nationally designated landscapes or important heritage assets; or is promoted as a visitor	Public open spaces where focus is on views, public rights of way through valued landscapes, views from important tourist routes or promoted viewpoints, popular

	destination for its scenic beauty. The view is widely known and well-frequented.	visitor attractions where the view forms a recognised part of the visitor experience, or which have important cultural associations.
Medium	A view identified in a supplementary planning document, conservation area appraisal and/or views of local importance. The view is in an area of ordinary landscape value, or reasonably good landscape value but with detracting elements or features. People are unlikely to visit the viewpoint to experience the view.	Public rights of way through landscapes of moderate value, setting for elements of local and/or regional cultural heritage value or national value whose settings are already compromised.
Low	Viewpoint is within an area of low landscape quality, is extremely common or has little aesthetic appeal. People are unlikely to visit the viewpoint to experience the view.	Standard town centre or suburban location, with little rarity value or aesthetic quality. Industrial estate or busy main road that has very few positive characteristics. A poor-quality rural view with detracting elements in the view.

Table A5 – Visual Receptor Value

Visual Receptor Susceptibility

1.32 Susceptibility to visual change is determined by the occupation and activity of people experiencing a particular view and the extent to which their attention or interest may be focused on that view in a particular location.

1.33 The susceptibility to change of visual receptors was assessed as high, medium or low by applying professional judgement and the indicative criteria contained in **Table A6** below.

Susceptibility	Description
High	Visual receptors with a low ability to accommodate the proposed change. There will be undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (visual receptor value) and/or the landscape within the view. The viewpoint location may have been specifically created for its view and/ or is experienced by people, whether residents or visitors, whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the view. People with a particular interest in their available view or with prolonged viewing opportunities such as: residential locations; tourist destinations providing a specific important and highly valued view; recreational hilltops; ornamental parks/designed landscapes; and national trails.
Medium	Visual receptors with a moderate ability to accommodate the proposed change. There will be some consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (visual receptor value) and/or the landscape value within the view. The view may be experienced by people who are drawn to the view yet do not feel compelled to stop and take it in. People with a general interest in their surroundings or with transient viewing opportunities such as users of road, rail or transport routes; and users of general public open spaces.
Low	Visual receptors with a high ability to accommodate the proposed change. There will be limited consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation (visual receptor value) and/or the landscape value within the view. The viewpoint location may be transient and/or experienced only in passing by

	people, whether residents or visitors, whose attention or focus is on other activities, not on their surroundings. People with a passing interest in their surroundings such as users of recreation grounds and play areas; places of employment; major highways; commercial buildings; and commuters.

Table A6 – Visual Receptor Susceptibility

1.34 The sensitivity of visual receptors was based on the judgements regarding the susceptibility of the visual receptor to change and the value placed on the landscape and view. The sensitivity of visual receptors was assessed as very high, high, medium or low. **Table A3** (above) indicates general categories of sensitivity and serves as a useful guide when making these judgements.

1.35 The assessment of the sensitivity of visual receptors to changes in the view may be subsequently modified (either up or down) by consideration of whether any particular value or importance is likely to be attributed by people to their available views. For example, travellers on a highway may be considered likely to be more sensitive should the road have a scenic context or residents of a particular property may be considered likely to be less sensitive than usual should the property have an existing degraded visual setting.

1.36 In formulating sensitivity categories, it is also important to acknowledge the special circumstances where peoples' expectations in relation to the view are particularly enhanced. This could include locations at widely known and promoted viewpoints, the cultural associations of which are typically recognised in art, literature or other media. Here the category of 'very high' sensitivity applies. If this were not the case then all receptors within a National Park would be defined as having 'very high' sensitivity, which would undervalue the primacy of iconic and highly valued viewpoints. Similarly, the rationale behind attributing a 'high' rather than 'very high' sensitivity for residents and people in local communities is because they do not have the highest level of sensitivity unless standing at a particularly valued viewpoint, in which case they are captured under the category of visitor.

Magnitude of Change

1.37 The magnitude of a visual effect is about understanding the scale, nature, extent and duration of visual change a new development will have on a view.

1.38 The magnitude of change arising from the proposed development at any particular location has been described as high, medium, low, negligible or no change based on the interpretation of a combination of largely quantifiable parameters, as discussed below.

1.39 Each of the visual effects identified was evaluated in terms of its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced, and its duration and reversibility, as detailed below:

- The size and scale of visual change that takes place, taking account of:
  - the loss or addition of features;
  - changes in composition including the proportion of the view occupied by the proposed development;

- the degree of contrast or integration of new features with existing landscape elements and characteristics in terms of form, scale, mass, line, height, colour, texture; and
- the nature of the view of the proposed development in terms of the relative amount of time over which it would be experienced, and, whether views would be full, partial or glimpsed;

- The geographical extent of the change taking account of:
  - the angle of view in relation to the main activity of the receptor;
  - the distance of the viewpoint from the proposed development; and
  - the extent of the area over which the changes would be visible;
- The likely duration of the visual change; and
- Whether the visual change is potentially reversible.

1.40 For each effect professional judgement has been used to determine the relevance and appropriate weighting to be attributed. The magnitude of visual change was assessed as high, medium, low or negligible dependent upon these judgements, with examples provided in **Table A7** below.

Magnitude of Change	Description
High	The proposed development will occupy most of the view and/or its setting. The proposed development will be a new component in the view which will cause a notable change in the characteristics of the view over an extensive area, or an intensive change over a more limited area. The proposed development will be very noticeable and will alter the overall perception of the view. Visual loss of, or major disruption to, key elements, features and/or characteristics of the baseline (value of the view). The duration of this effect may be permanent and non-reversible.
Medium	The proposed development will occupy a significant portion of the view and/or its setting. The proposed development is dissimilar to the main component of the view but similar to other components. The proposed development will be clearly noticeable but will not change the overall perception of the view. Partial visual loss of, or disruption to, one or more key elements, features and/or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.
Low	The proposed development will occupy a small portion of the view and/or its setting. The proposed development is similar to the main component of the view. The proposed development will not be readily noticeable and to the casual observer there will be no discernible change. Minor visual loss of, or alteration to, one or more key elements, features and/or characteristics of the baseline. The duration of this effect may be temporary and reversible.
Negligible	There will be little discernible change to the view.
No Change	There will be no change to the view.

Table A7 – Indicative Criteria for Assessing Likely Magnitude of Visual Change

Overall Level of Effects and Determining Significance

1.41 A final judgement has been made on the overall level of effect upon receptors (both landscape and visual) through a combination of sensitivity and magnitude of change. The level of effect was assessed by combining all of the considerations and criteria set out above. This is described by GLVIA3 as an 'overall profile' approach to combining judgements and requires that all the judgements, against each of the identified criteria, are used within an informed professional appraisal of the overall level of effect, with reasoning provided in the text as to how the conclusions have been reached. Table A8 provides a guide as to how sensitivity and magnitude of change are combined to give an overall level of effect, for both landscape and visual amenity, but these are not hard and fast rules.

1.42 The relative weight attributed to each of the considerations is a matter for experienced professional judgement and will vary depending on the specific receptor or effect being assessed.

1.43 Level of effects have been identified in the absence of further (i.e. not embedded) mitigation, with the residual effect confirmed once any further mitigation measures, if applicable, were considered.

1.44 Overall effects have been described as major, moderate, minor, negligible or neutral.

Overall Effect		Magnitude of Change			
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Sensitivity	Very High	Major	Major/ moderate	Moderate/ minor	Minor/ negligible
	High	Major/ moderate	Major/ moderate	Moderate/ minor	Negligible
	Medium	Major/ moderate	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Low	Moderate/ minor	Moderate/ minor	Minor/ negligible	Negligible

Table A8 – Level of Overall Effect

1.45 It is important to note that effects can be adverse (negative), beneficial (positive) or neutral. Adverse effects would result from development that caused an increase in degradation of the landscape resource or a negative effect on the attributes that contribute to the value of views; an example could be the introduction of a feature which appears discordant within the existing landscape or view. Beneficial effects would result from development that created an overall improvement of elements that contributed to the value of the landscape resource or views; this could include the addition of valued elements or high-quality built form; or the removal of existing detractors. A neutral effect could occur where changes were considered neither positive nor negative within the context of the landscape or view being assessed; this could include the addition of an element within the landscape or view that already exists; such as the accretion of additional units to an existing development that does not result in the degradation or

removal of valued aspects of the landscape resource or view. A neutral effect could also occur where minor/negligible adverse and beneficial effects are considered to be of equal weight on a receptor. **Table A9** below provides some guidance on what the identified level of effect can equate to.

Overall Effect	Description
Neutral/No Change	There would be no effect on the landscape character/value of the existing view.
Negligible	The proposed development would be barely perceptible and have very little or no effect on the landscape character/value of the existing view.
Minor Adverse	The proposed development would cause a perceptible deterioration in the value of the landscape character/value of the existing view.
Moderate Adverse	The proposed development would cause a noticeable deterioration in the landscape character/value of the existing view.
Major Adverse	The proposed development would be the dominant feature and cause a major deterioration in the landscape character/value of the existing view.
Minor Beneficial	The proposed development would be in keeping with and would provide a perceptible improvement in the landscape character/value of the existing view.
Moderate Beneficial	The proposed development would be in keeping with and would provide a noticeable improvement to the landscape character/value of the existing view.
Major Beneficial	The proposed development would be in keeping with and would provide a major improvement to the landscape character/value of the existing view.

Table A9 – Examples of Identified Level of Effect

Impact Assessment or Appraisal

1.46 GLVIA3 and the Statement of Clarification 1/13, makes clear that for non-Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) developments the landscape and visual impact assessment should consider all types of effects: adverse, beneficial and neutral, direct and indirect, and long and short term, as well as cumulative effects. However, none of these effects should be given a judgement involving the terms ‘significant’ or ‘significance’. GLVIA3 also stresses that the approach to the assessment needs to be proportionate to the scale of the project being assessed and the nature of the likely effects.

1.47 This LVA is not part of an EIA. As such, discussions on whether effects are significant or not, are not covered in this assessment.

Residual Effects

1.48 Residual effects are those effects which will persist after any further mitigation measures (i.e. not embedded) have taken effect. Long-term residual effects of the proposed development are typically those which would remain after a minimum of fifteen years. When assessing landscape and visual effects this includes consideration of the establishment of any planting within the design and mitigation proposals and further growth of existing vegetation.

Viewpoints and Photography

1.49 To illustrate the nature and extent of the potential landscape and visual effects arising from the proposed development, a series of viewpoint locations has been selected to

demonstrate the visual context of the site and study area from a range of publicly accessible receptors within # km of the proposed site boundary. Each viewpoint has been visited and a photographic record taken.

1.50 As explained in GLVIA3 (para 6.19), viewpoints are selected to be either representative of the view experienced by different groups of people, to be specific to a particular location, or to demonstrate a particular effect. The selection of viewpoints has taken account of a number of factors, including:

- The accessibility to the public;
- The potential type, relative number and sensitivity of the viewers who may be affected;
- The viewing direction and distance (short, medium and long distance);
- Whether the view is static or part of a sequential view along a route;
- The view types (glimpsed, framed or panoramic); and
- The potential for cumulative views of the proposed development in conjunction with other similar proposed developments.

1.51 It should be noted that the selected viewpoints are not intended to be a representative sample of all the visual receptors but are deliberately biased to be representative of the most sensitive visual receptor groups – namely residential areas and valued landscapes or sites. This enables consideration of 'worst case' scenarios.

1.52 No access to private land was sought and the assessment was therefore based on a best assumption from publicly accessible locations.

1.53 Wherever possible, viewpoints were selected in places where they represent several different receptor groups (e.g. on the edge of a settlement where a footpath leaves the village; at a car park or picnic site on a promoted footpath, or at a trig point in an area of Open Access Land).

1.54 All viewpoint photographs were taken in accordance with the Landscape Institute's (LI) Advice Note 06/19 'Visual Representation of Development Proposals'.

Cumulative Impact Assessment

1.55 Cumulative landscape and visual effects are the likely additional landscape and visual effects to arise from the proposed development when considered in conjunction with other relevant development proposals.

1.56 Paragraph 6.2 of GLVIA3 identifies cumulative landscape and visual effects as those that, *"…result from additional changes to the landscape or visual amenity caused by the proposed development in conjunction with other development (associated with or separate to it), or actions that occurred in the past, present or are likely to occur in the reasonable future"*.

1.57 Paragraph 6.5 of GLVIA3 acknowledges that cumulative landscape assessment is complex and approaches to it are evolving, noting also that the *"challenge is to keep the task reasonable and in proportion to the nature of the project under consideration……It is always important to remember that the emphasis in EIA is on likely significant effects*

rather than on comprehensive cataloguing of every conceivable effect that might occur…".

1.58 The assessment of cumulative landscape and visual effects would usually follow a similar methodology to that described above for the main assessment, in that the degree of effect is determined by combining an evaluation of the sensitivity of the landscape/visual receptor and the magnitude of change. The difference from the main landscape and visual assessment is that a cumulative assessment considers the magnitude of change which would potentially arise from multiple developments.

1.59 For the Proposed Development there are no other development proposals within the study area with the potential to create cumulative landscape or visual effects and as such potential cumulative effects are not considered within this report.