

Land west of Old Manor Farm, South of Lower Road, Bedhampton Landscape and Visual Evidence and Appraisal

Volume 2 Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal

September 2021



Ref: 2255-TFC-00-ZZ-RE-L-8002

The **terra firma** Consultancy Ltd.
www.terrafirmaconsultancy.com

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.3. Report structure	1
1.4. Project brief	1
2. Design evolution	2
3. Proposed development.....	2
4. Appraisal of landscape effects	2
4.2. Geology, topography, soils.....	2
4.3. Hydrology	2
4.4. Vegetation and biodiversity.....	3
4.5. Settlement and road pattern	3
4.6. Access and recreation	3
4.7. History	3
4.8. Perceptual qualities	3
4.9. Condition and coherence.....	3
5. Additional mitigation and residual landscape effects	4
6. Appraisal of visual effects.....	4
6.2. Effect on representative viewpoints 3 and 4 – Views from Lower Road.....	5
6.3. Effect on representative viewpoints 18-21 – Views from A27.....	5
6.4. Effect on representative viewpoints 22 and 24 - Views from Bedhampton Hill.....	5
6.5. Effect on representative viewpoint 27 – Views from railway.....	5
6.6. Effect on representative viewpoint 28 – Views from Portsdown Hill Road (bridge over A3).....	5
6.7. Effect on views from private houses	6
6.8. Additional mitigation and residual visual effects	6
7. Conclusions	7
8. References	7

Appendices

Appendix 1: LVIA Methodology

Appendix 2: Figures

Figure 1 - Development proposals

Project reference: 2255

Date	Rev	By	Chk	Comments
02.09.21	P01	KB	AG	Initial issue
24.09.21	P02	EB	AG	Minor text revisions

1. Introduction

1.1. The terra firma Consultancy was appointed in February 2021 to provide landscape architectural services in support of the proposed development of land west of Old Manor Farm, South of Lower Road, Bedhampton. Our services involve the production of a Landscape and Visual Evidence and Impact Appraisal (LVE&IA) which, all in light of the client brief, comprises:

- Developing an understanding of the site and its setting;
- Defining what matters most about the landscape and visual aspects;
- Incorporating these into the best possible development proposals which maximises opportunities and potentials; and
- Minimising and mitigating harm.

1.2. For the purposes of the planning process the above work is presented in two volumes:

- **Volume 1 Landscape and Visual Evidence (LVE)** comprises our understanding of the site and its setting and the identification of what is important. This is critical in developing context-appropriate proposals and minimising harm and is the starting point for our work. The design and assessment should not be viewed as a linear process but rather an iterative one, with the identification of potential harm and mitigation informing the design at every stage, along with the work of other disciplines.
- **Volume 2 Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal** comprises the appraisal section of the final landscape report which has been completed once the final design was confirmed and forms an impartial assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the final proposals

1.3. Report structure

1.3.1. Volume 2 is set out as below:

- Introduction; report structure; project brief;
- Design Evolution
- Proposed development
- Appraisal of landscape effects;
- Additional mitigation and residual landscape effects;
- Appraisal of visual effects;
- Additional mitigation and residual visual effects;
- Conclusions
- Appendix 3: LVIA methodology
- Appendix 4: Figures

1.4. Project brief

1.4.1. The brief for the design team is to produce an outline planning application for up to 43 dwellings on the 3.67 hectare site. The brief for landscape architectural input is to advise on a landscape-led approach to the location and arrangement of development on the site and to assess the impact of the proposed dwellings on landscape and views, particularly on the conservation area and to support the outline application discussions with the local authority.

2. Design evolution

- 2.1. Volume 1 identified a number of landscape and visual sensitivities, constraints and opportunities which were considered by the design team. These were balanced against other considerations and, where possible, incorporated into the final design proposals to eventually form the basis for the LVIA.
- 2.2. The key sensitivities, opportunities and constraints raised by the LVE and incorporated into the final plan include:
 - Protect the setting of the conservation area
 - Set built form away from noisy roads
 - Enhance existing green infrastructure and provide additional habitat and pedestrian linkages

3. Proposed development

- 3.1. The outline proposals comprise the development of up to 43 dwellings of 2 storeys accessed from Lower Road (via the consented Phase 1) and set within public open space which includes tree-planting, areas of habitat creation and allotments.
- 3.2. Figure 1 shows the proposals being submitted for consideration by the planning authority and against which likely landscape and visual effects have been assessed.

4. Appraisal of landscape effects

- 4.1. Landscape receptors and their sensitivities are set out in Volume 1. Landscape effects are considered through the appraisal of the sensitivity of the receptor (value and susceptibility to change – refer to Volume 1) and the magnitude of the landscape effect (size or scale, duration and reversibility) as described in the evaluation criteria (Appendix 3). The magnitude of effect is based on the mitigation measures included within the final proposals at the point of construction completion.

4.2. Geology, topography, soils

- 4.2.1. Topography is largely typical of the wider LCA and is somewhat susceptible to the type of change proposed and is felt to have a medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping would result in a low magnitude of effect as it is not considered that there will be extensive alterations of site levels required to facilitate development. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on topography would be moderate/minor adverse.
- 4.2.2. The soil is classified as Grade 1 (excellent quality agricultural land) and is susceptible to the type of change proposed and felt to have a high sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in the loss of some good quality agricultural soils. This would also have an impact on environmental services in terms of food production and carbon sequestration and is considered to be a medium magnitude of effect. Combined with a high sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on soils would be major/moderate adverse.

4.3. Hydrology

- 4.3.1. There are no water bodies on site and the south-west corner has potential to flood but the permeable soil will absorb rainfall and will replenish the aquifer. Hydrology is considered susceptible to the type of changes proposed through the introduction of impermeable surfaces and is felt to be of medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings and highways would increase the amount of impermeable surfacing within the site but this will be in part mitigated by use of permeable surfaces (where appropriate) and SUDs features and would result in low effect. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall effect on hydrology would be moderate/minor adverse.

4.4. Vegetation and biodiversity

- 4.4.1. The site's vegetation, which comprises arable crops and boundary vegetation, is considered to be of medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping would result in a loss of arable crops (and an ensuing loss to the environmental services of food production and carbon sequestration) but with some areas being replaced by species-rich native grassland of higher biodiversity level and additional tree and shrub planting (with an ensuing positive impact on environmental services). On balance this is considered a nil effect, resulting in a neutral effect. In contrast there would be a low beneficial effect on the boundary vegetation which would be supplemented, connected and managed for biodiversity resulting in a positive effect for environmental services and a minor beneficial effect.

4.5. Settlement and road pattern

- 4.5.1. Settlement and road patterns have changed much since the building of the major roads in the mid-late 20th Century and the continued extension of Bedhampton. When Phase 1 is built out further local change will result. The settlement pattern along Lower Road is linear with more modern cul-de-sacs branching off it and the proposals will result in further branches which are considered in keeping. Settlement and road patterns are considered to be of low sensitivity. The proposed introduction of additional buildings, highways and landscaping would result in additional areas of settlement, largely in keeping with the existing pattern, and are considered a low adverse effect. Combined with low sensitivity this results in a minor adverse effect on settlement and road pattern.

4.6. Access and recreation

- 4.6.1. Access and recreation opportunities including formal and informal play areas and allotments would be provided on the site where currently none exist and sensitivity was assessed as low. This low beneficial change, coupled with low sensitivity would result in a minor beneficial effect on access and recreation.

4.7. History

- 4.7.1. Some evidence of parliamentary field pattern remains but disrupted by transport infrastructure which also disrupts the field pattern and severs the connection with the wider landscape. No listed buildings or scheduled monuments nearby. Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Character Area 5: Old Manor Farm which forms part of the wider conservation area lies to the north-east but is now in residential use and will be further influenced by the additional built form of Phase 1. The remaining historic character is somewhat susceptible to the type of change proposed (it is already adjacent to housing and disrupted by transport infrastructure) and is overall felt to have a medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of additional buildings, highways and landscaping and the loss of the existing fields leading to a general intensification of land use and would result in the a medium magnitude of effect. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on history would be moderate adverse.

4.8. Perceptual qualities

- 4.8.1. The site is heavily influenced by transport infrastructure which greatly diminishes its tranquillity and is felt to have a low sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping is considered, on balance to result in nil effect as the proposals would in part screen some of the noise from the existing roads, but there would also be a slight increase in slower-moving traffic due to the new development. Combined with a low sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on perceptual qualities would be neutral.

4.9. Condition and coherence

- 4.9.1. The site is in generally good condition but is removed from the wider landscape by transport infrastructure and existing built form. If Phase 1 were to be built out as consented this would further influence the site's coherence which is considered to be of low sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping would result in a low adverse effect. Combined with low sensitivity this results in a minor adverse effect on condition and coherence.

5. Additional mitigation and residual landscape effects

- 5.1. Measures to avoid / prevent, reduce or mitigate adverse effects were identified early in the iterative design process and have been designed into the proposals described within section 2.2.
- 5.2. Additional mitigation measures (generally covered by planning conditions) will include the following:
- Soil stripping and storage will be carefully managed to enable reuse on the site where possible; topsoil and subsoil will be stored separately to avoid contamination; and soil storage bunds will be carefully shaped to ensure soils are free draining and not compacted.
 - Protection of existing trees and hedges in accordance with arboricultural advice and method statements.
 - Management plan to include maintenance of existing and proposed green infrastructure.
 - Establishment of vegetation over time
- 5.3. The effect of additional mitigation measures on landscape receptors is assessed, and a summary of residual effects is given below (the mitigation does not always alter the overall effect):

Landscape receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of effect	Landscape effects	Mitigation	Residual effects
Topography	Medium	Low	Moderate/minor adverse	-	-
Soils	High	Medium	Major/moderate adverse	Careful soil-stripping and re-use	Moderate adverse
Hydrology	Medium	Low	Moderate/minor adverse	-	-
Vegetation and biodiversity (arable crops)	Medium	Nil	Neutral	-	-
Vegetation and biodiversity (boundary vegetation)	Medium	Low	Minor beneficial	Management plan	Minor beneficial
Settlement and road pattern	Low	Low	Minor adverse	-	-
Access and recreation	Low	Low	Minor beneficial	-	-
History	Medium	Medium	Moderate adverse	-	-
Perceptual qualities	Low	Nil	Neutral	-	-
Condition and coherence	Low	Low	Minor adverse	-	-

6. Appraisal of visual effects

- 6.1. View receptors and their sensitivities are set out in Volume 1. Visual effects are considered through the appraisal of the sensitivity of the receptor (value and susceptibility to change – refer to Volume 1) and the magnitude of the visual effect (size or scale, extent, duration and reversibility) as described in the evaluation criteria (Appendix 3). The magnitude of effect is based on the mitigation measures included within the final proposals – at the point of construction completion.

- 6.1.1. Views of a similar nature are grouped together and an overall assessment of effects is made on the group of views as a whole where possible and ensuring a balanced overview is maintained, taking into account varying levels of visibility.

6.2. Effect on representative viewpoints 3 and 4 – Views from Lower Road.

- 6.2.1. Visual receptors are walkers, motorists and cyclists within the setting of Character Area 5 of Old Bedhampton Conservation Area on the edge of the settlement. Pedestrians and cyclists would have a greater interest in their surroundings than motorists. Viewers are considered to be of high sensitivity. The proposed development would introduce partial views of built form into the foreground and middle-ground set behind existing boundary vegetation and the built form of the builders' merchants and replace views across the open fieldscape towards the railway and A27. On balance the magnitude of change would be high adverse.
- 6.2.2. A high sensitivity combined with a high adverse magnitude of change would result in a major adverse effect, which would be expected where viewpoints are adjacent to the new development.

6.3. Effect on representative viewpoints 18-21 – Views from A27.

- 6.3.1. Visual receptors are motorists travelling at moderate to high speed or pedestrians and cyclists who would have a potentially greater interest in their surroundings. Viewers are considered to be of low sensitivity. The proposed development would result in a variety of effects, depending on the exact location and orientation of the viewer including partial, filtered views of the proposed built form seen in the context of existing built form (including consented Phase 1). On balance the magnitude of change would be medium adverse.
- 6.3.2. A low sensitivity combined with a medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate/minor adverse effect, which would be expected where viewpoints are close to the new development.

6.4. Effect on representative viewpoints 22 and 24 - Views from Bedhampton Hill

- 6.4.1. Visual receptors would be motorists travelling at moderate speed focussing on the road or pedestrians and cyclists who would have a potentially greater interest in their surroundings, although be walking on a busy residential road. Viewers are considered to be of low sensitivity. The proposed development would result in a variety of effects, depending on the exact location and orientation of the viewer. In some cases (such as in representative viewpoint 22) partial views of rooftops of built form may be visible over and behind existing vegetation in the context of a busy road junction on the edge of the settlement. In others (represented by viewpoint 24) these views are more distant and seen in the context of existing built form. On balance the magnitude of change would be medium adverse at viewpoint 22 and nil at viewpoint 24.
- 6.4.2. A low sensitivity combined with a medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate/minor adverse effect for viewpoint 22 and combined with a nil magnitude of change resulting in a neutral effect for viewpoint 24.

6.5. Effect on representative viewpoint 27 – Views from railway.

- 6.5.1. Visual receptors are passengers travelling by train at a moderate speed through a built-up area with some interest in their surroundings. Viewers are considered to be of low sensitivity. The proposed development would introduce additional built form and planting on the outskirts of a settlement, seen in relation to Phase 1. On balance the magnitude of change would be medium adverse. A low sensitivity combined with a medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate/minor adverse effect.

6.6. Effect on representative viewpoint 28 – Views from Portsdown Hill Road (bridge over A3).

- 6.6.1. Visual receptors are motorists travelling at moderate speed, focussing on the road or pedestrians/cyclists on the

Wayfarer's Walk who would have a greater interest in their surroundings, although influenced by being on a road bridge crossing a major road. Viewers are considered to be of medium sensitivity. The proposed development would introduce partial, distant views of additional built form and landscaping seen beyond and in the context of the existing settlement and transport infrastructure. On balance the magnitude of change would be nil. A medium sensitivity combined with a nil magnitude of change would result in a neutral effect.

6.7. Effect on views from private houses

- 6.7.1. Visual receptors are residents at home and in their gardens with a high susceptibility to change and are considered to be of high sensitivity. The proposed development would result in a variety of effects, depending on the exact location and orientation of the viewer. In some cases such as from a small number of properties at the western end of Lower Road there will be partial views of additional built form from south-facing windows seen through intervening vegetation and in the context of the existing builders' merchants. On balance the magnitude of change would be medium adverse. For properties further east along Lower Road or further north views will be at least partly obscured by existing built form, including Phase 1 and the magnitude of change would be low adverse. In other cases, such as from a small number of properties in the south-west corner of Manor Farm there will be oblique views from south or west-facing windows seen above boundary fences, filtered by vegetation and seen in the context of Phase 1. On balance the magnitude of change would be low adverse. There would also be views from west-facing windows of Phase 1 but as the order of building and occupation of the two phases is not known this is not considered.
- 6.7.2. A high sensitivity combined with a medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a major/moderate adverse effect for those at the western end of Lower Road. A high sensitivity combined with a low adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate adverse effect for those further east on Lower Road or to its north and in the south-west of Manor Farm.

6.8. Additional mitigation and residual visual effects

- 6.8.1. Measures to avoid / prevent, reduce or mitigate adverse effects were identified early in the iterative design process and have been designed into the proposals described within section 2.2, however the passage of time will increase the screening provided by new vegetation.
- 6.8.2. Additional mitigation measures will include the following:
- 6.8.3. Establishment of vegetation over time on the basis of protection of existing and new vegetation and good management practice
- 6.8.4. The effect of additional mitigation measures on representative viewpoints is assessed, and a summary of residual effects is given below, in winter to give the worst-case scenario (the mitigation does not always alter the overall effect):

Representative viewpoint	Sensitivity of view receptor	Magnitude of effect	Visual effects in winter, years 0-5	Mitigation	Residual effects in winter after year 5
3 & 4	High	High adverse	Major adverse	Establishment of vegetation over time	Major/moderate adverse
18-21	Low	Medium adverse	Moderate/minor adverse	Establishment of vegetation over time	Minor adverse
22	Low	Medium adverse	Moderate/minor adverse	Establishment of vegetation over time	Minor adverse

Representative viewpoint	Sensitivity of view receptor	Magnitude of effect	Visual effects in winter, years 0-5	Mitigation	Residual effects in winter after year 5
27	Low	Medium adverse	Moderate/minor adverse	Establishment of vegetation over time	Minor adverse
28	Medium	Nil	Neutral	n/a	
Views from private houses at western end of Lower Road	High	Medium adverse	Major/moderate adverse	Establishment of vegetation over time	Moderate adverse
Views from private houses further east on Lower Road, north of Lower Road, and in the south-west of Manor Farm	High	Low adverse	Moderate adverse	Establishment of vegetation over time	Moderate/minor adverse

7. Conclusions

- 7.8.1. As a result of this Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal it is considered that the proposals are in accordance with HBC policies CS1, CS8, CS11, CS13, CS16 and DM8 as set out in the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and that they are supported by the findings of The Study into the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity and the Value of the Undeveloped Open Land in HBC (2015). In addition, proposals are informed by a review of the landscape character assessments and conservation area appraisal.
- 7.8.2. Of the ten landscape receptors carried forward for appraisal (vegetation and biodiversity being split) six would experience negative effects (history, topography, soils, hydrology, settlement and road pattern, condition and coherence) which would be expected in a site developed for housing, but none of these would experience significant residual effects. Of the remaining receptors, two would experience neutral effects (vegetation and biodiversity (arable), perceptual qualities) and two would experience beneficial effects (vegetation and biodiversity (boundary) and access and recreation).
- 7.8.3. Of the visual receptors carried forward for appraisal only two would experience significant residual effects (viewpoints 3 and 4- western end of Lower Road) which is to be expected with the construction of a new housing development in close proximity to them. The remaining seven publicly accessible viewpoints which represent views from the A27, Bedhampton Hill, Portsdown Hill Road and the railway, six would experience only minor adverse residual effects, which is not considered significant and one would experience only neutral effects.
- 7.8.4. A small number of private houses at the western end of Lower Road would experience moderate adverse residual visual effects, with properties further east on Lower Road, to the north of Lower Road and in the south-west of Manor Farm experiencing moderate/minor residual visual effects. None of these effects are considered of significance.

8. References

- National Character Assessment (NCA, 2014)
- National Design Guide, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2021)
- National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

- Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011)
- The Study into the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity and the Value of the Undeveloped Open LAND IN HBC (2015)
- Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
- Havant Borough Council Old Bedhampton Conservation Area Appraisal (2019)
- Havant Borough Townscape, Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (2007)
- Hampshire County Integrated Character Assessment (2012))
- The Landscape Institute and IEMA 'Guidelines for landscape and visual impact assessment' 3rd Edition (2013)
- The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage: 'Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland' (2002)
- Natural England: 'Agricultural Land Classification mapping' (2010)
- MAGIC website

Appendix 1: LVIA Methodology

1. Evaluation criteria for Landscape Effects Assessment

Refer to Volume 1, Appendix 1 LVE Methodology for assessment of landscape sensitivity.

1.1. Magnitude of landscape effect

The magnitude of the landscape effect of the proposals is dependent on:

- **Size or scale:** this should take into consideration the extent of the loss of the existing landscape, the proportion of the total extent this represents and the contribution of the element to the character of the landscape; the degree to which the aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape are altered; and whether the effect changes the key distinctive characteristics of the landscape.
- **Extent:** consideration of the geographical area over which landscape effects are felt
- **Duration:** long, medium or short term.
- **Reversibility:** this is a judgement on the reversibility of a proposal in, say, a generation.

The magnitude of the landscape effect can be **high, medium, low or nil** and can be either **adverse or beneficial**. This is defined more fully below:

Adverse	High	• Major loss of or alteration to an existing landscape element that may be key to landscape character. • Major loss of or alteration to perceived landscape character as a whole. • Major loss or alteration to key characteristics of the landscape that are critical to its distinctive character. • Extensive geographical area affected. • Long-term / irreversible effect.
	Medium	• Moderate loss of or alteration to an existing landscape element that may be key to landscape character. • Moderate loss of or alteration to perceived landscape character as a whole. • Moderate loss or alteration to key characteristics of the landscape that are critical to its distinctive character. • Medium sized geographical area affected. • Medium-term and effect that may be partially reversible.
	Low	• Minor loss of or alteration to an existing landscape element that may be key to landscape character. • Minor loss of or alteration to perceived landscape character as a whole. • Minor loss or alteration to key characteristics of the landscape that are critical to its distinctive character. • Small sized geographical area affected. • Short-term and effect that may be reversible.
Neutral	Nil	• No perceptible loss or alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape. • Adverse effects balanced by beneficial effects.

Beneficial	Low	• Minor beneficial alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape.
	Medium	• Moderate beneficial alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape.
	High	• Major beneficial alteration to existing landscape elements, landscape character as a whole or key characteristics of the landscape.

1.2. Landscape effects and significance

The landscape effect is a combination of the level of sensitivity of the landscape receptor and the magnitude of the landscape effect, which can be adverse, beneficial or neutral.

		Sensitivity of Landscape		
		High	Medium	Low
Magnitude of landscape effect	High adverse	Major adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
	Medium adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse
	Low adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse	Minor adverse
	Nil	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
	Low beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
	Medium beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial
	High beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial

1.3. Definition of significance

Significance may vary with location and context and with the type of proposal, but typically effects are assessed to be significant where they typically are major or major/moderate adverse (indicated by shading illustrated in the table above).

A scale of significance can be reasonably described as follows:

- *Major loss or irreversible adverse landscape effects over an extensive area, and / or on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects key to the character of highly valued landscape receptors* are defined to be effects of key importance for consideration in the decision making process and / or of national importance and therefore significant.
- *Major/Moderate loss or irreversible adverse landscape effects over a large area, and / or on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects typical of the character of highly valued landscape receptors* are defined to be effects of key consideration in the decision making process and / or of regional or district importance therefore significant.
- *Moderate loss or adverse landscape effects over an area, on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects typical of the character of valued landscape receptors* can be defined to be effects likely to be a lesser consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance but not generally significant. Where seen in combination in cumulative assessments, moderate effects could become significant.
- *Moderate/minor loss or adverse landscape effects over an area, on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key to the character of valued landscape receptors* can be defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance and therefore not significant.
- *Minor loss or reversible adverse landscape effects over limited area, on elements and or aesthetic / perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key to the character of landscape receptors* are defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of very local importance and therefore not significant.

1.4. Mitigation and residual effects

Where adverse landscape effects are judged to be significant, mitigation proposals are described where possible. Any significant residual landscape effects remaining after mitigation are then summarised.

2. Evaluation criteria for Visual Effects Assessment

Refer to Volume 1, Appendix 1 LVE Methodology for assessment of visual sensitivity.

2.1. Magnitude of visual effect

The magnitude of the visual effect of the proposals needs to be established. This is dependent on:

- Size or scale: this should take into consideration the scale of change in the view with respect to loss or addition of features in the view and changes to its composition (including the proportion of the view occupied by the proposed development and the degree of contrast or integration of the proposed development with the existing landscape elements and characteristics) and the nature of the view in terms of duration and degree of visibility.
- Extent: this will vary with different viewpoints and is likely to reflect the angle of view in relation to the main activity of the receptor and the distance of the viewpoint from the proposed development.
- Duration: long, medium or short term.
- Reversibility: this is a judgement on the reversibility of a proposal in, say, a generation.

The magnitude of the visual effect can be **high, medium, low or nil** and can be either **adverse or beneficial**. This is defined more fully below:

Adverse	High	• Major change in view composition resulting from a loss of or alteration to features. • Direct angle of viewing in relation to main activity of the receptor. • Close-range view. • Prolonged exposure to view. • Long-term and irreversible effect.
	Medium	• Moderate change in view composition resulting from a loss of or alteration to features. • Indirect angle of viewing in relation to main activity of the receptor. • Mid-range view. • Moderate exposure to view. • Medium-term and irreversible effect.
	Low	• Minor change in view composition resulting from a loss of or alteration to features. • Peripheral view in relation to main activity of the receptor. • Distant view. • Brief exposure to view. • Short-term and irreversible effect.
Neutral	Nil	• No perceptible change to the composition of the view.
Beneficial	Low	• Minor beneficial change to the composition of the view.
	Medium	• Moderate beneficial change to the composition of the view.
	High	• Major beneficial change to the composition of the view.

2.2. Significance of visual effect

The significance of the visual effect is a combination of the level of sensitivity of the visual receptor and the magnitude of the visual effect, which can be adverse, beneficial or neutral.

		Sensitivity of Receptor		
		High	Medium	Low
Magnitude of visual effect	High adverse	Major adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
	Medium adverse	Major / Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse
	Low adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate / Minor adverse	Minor adverse
	Nil	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
	Low beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
	Medium beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Moderate beneficial
	High beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial	Major beneficial

2.3. Definition of significance

Significance may vary with location and context and with the type of proposal, but typically effects are assessed to be significant where they typically are major or major/moderate adverse (indicated by shading illustrated in the table above).

A scale of significance can be reasonably described as follows:

- *Major changes on a extensive scale introducing new, non-characteristic, intrusive or discordant effects into the view of highest sensitivity receptors* are defined to be effects of key importance for consideration in the decision making process and / or of national importance and therefore significant.
- *Major/Moderate changes on a large scale introducing new, non-characteristic, intrusive or discordant effects into the view of higher sensitivity receptors* are defined to be effects of key consideration in the decision making process and / or of regional or district importance and therefore significant.
- *Moderate changes introducing effects into the view of moderately sensitivity receptors* can be defined to be effects likely to be a lesser consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance but not generally significant. Where seen in combination in cumulative assessments, moderate effects could become significant.
- *Moderate/minor changes introducing small effects into the view of moderately sensitivity receptors* can be defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of local importance and therefore not significant.
- *Minor changes introducing small effects into the view of low sensitivity receptors* can be defined to be effects unlikely to be a consideration in the decision making process and / or of very local importance and therefore not significant.

2.4. Mitigation and residual effects

Where adverse visual effects are judged to be significant, mitigation proposals are described where possible. Any significant residual visual effects remaining after mitigation are then summarised.

Appendix 2: Figures

Figure 1 - Development proposals

Figure 1 - Development proposals

