

Cabbagefield Row, Havant

Landscape and Visual Evidence and Appraisal

Volume 2 Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal

July 2021



Ref: 2270-TFC-00-ZZ-RE-L-8002

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

terrafirma
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.3. Report structure.....	1
1.4. Project brief	1
2. Design evolution	1
3. Appraisal of landscape effects	2
3.2. Topography and soils.....	2
3.3. Hydrology	3
3.4. Vegetation and biodiversity.....	3
3.5. Settlements and road pattern	3
3.6. Access and recreation	3
3.7. History	4
3.8. Tranquility (aural, visual, dark skies)	4
3.9. Condition and coherence.....	4
4. Additional mitigation and residual landscape effects	4
5. Appraisal of visual effects.....	5
5.2. Effect on representative viewpoints 1 to 4 – views from Swanmore and Calshot Roads.....	6
5.3. Effect on representative viewpoint 7 – views from PRoW to the east- bridleway 108/121/1.....	6
5.4. Effect on representative viewpoints 8, 9, 10 & 14 – Views from PRoW to the north- bridleways 108/120/1 and 108/120/2.....	6
5.5. Effect on representative viewpoint 12 – Views from PRoW within Staunton Country Park - bridleway 108/120/3.6	
5.6. Effect on views from private houses.....	7
6. Additional mitigation and residual visual effects.....	7
7. Conclusions	8
8. References.....	8

Appendices

Appendix 1: LVIA Methodology

Appendix 2: Figures

Figure 1 - Design evolution

Figure 2 - Design evolution

Figure 3 - Landscape strategy

Figure 4 - Design evolution

Figure 5 - Design evolution

Figure 6 - Development proposals

Project reference: 2270

Date	Rev	By	Chk	Comments
29.07.21	P01	KB	AG	Stage 3 issue
30.06.22	P02	KB	KB	Updated proposals included at Figure 6

1. Introduction

1.1. The terra firma Consultancy was appointed in March 2021 to provide landscape architectural services in support of the proposed development of land at Cabbagefield Row. 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 appraisal 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 appraisal 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 150 dwellings on the 7.4 hectare site (red line area) with a developable area of 3.7 hectares. 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 150 dwellings on landscape and views and to support the pre-application discussions with the local authority prior to planning submission.

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. Figure 1 shows an early layout which extended northwards into the grassland SINC which was considered unacceptable. Early findings of this LVE suggested that the layout could better respond to the landscape in a number of ways; by keeping boundary vegetation in the public realm and creating a series of east-west green links across the site to connect the boundary vegetation (figure 3). Further iterations which respond to these findings and feedback are shown at figures 4 and 5 with the final layout at figure 6.
- 2.3. The key sensitivities, constraints and opportunities which emerged from the LVE and influenced the final proposals are.
- Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and sites of biodiversity such Staunton Country Park, SINC and Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland
 - Creating new open spaces close to housing developments
 - Enhance existing green infrastructure and provide additional habitat and pedestrian linkages
 - Responding positively to the site's topography and minimising the need for cut and fill.
 - Protecting the nearby watercourses and boundary vegetation
 - Minimising impact on sensitive visual receptors on PRoW, within Staunton Country Park and private views from nearby houses.

2.4. Proposed development (ref to fig 6 Development proposals)

- 2.5. The outline proposals comprise the development of 150 units comprising a mixture of 2 and 3-storey houses and 4-storey apartment-blocks accessed via Swanmore Road through existing roadside vegetation. The vegetation which surrounds the site to south, east and west will be protected by a landscape buffer and kept out of private ownership to facilitate easy management and reduce the pressure to remove it. The properties are arranged in terraces to minimise cut and fill and public open space and tree-planting runs east-west between them connecting the offsite woodlands.
- 2.6. Figure 6 shows the proposals being submitted for consideration by the planning authority and against which likely landscape and visual effects have been assessed.

3. Appraisal of landscape effects

- 3.1. 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.

3.2. Topography and soils

- 3.2.1. The site's undulating topography is largely typical of the wider LCA and is considered to have medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping would result in a low adverse magnitude of effect as it is not considered that there will be extensive alterations of site levels required to facilitate development and any alterations would be localised. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on topography would be moderate/minor adverse.
- 3.2.2. The site's soil is classified as poor quality agricultural land (Grade 4) with limited scope for producing food and a low carbon content and are susceptible to compaction and contamination through construction works and therefore we assign them a low sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in the loss of some of this poor quality soil. This would also have a low impact on ecosystem services in terms of carbon sequestration and is considered to be a medium adverse magnitude of

effect. Combined with a low sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on soils would be moderate/minor adverse.

3.3. Hydrology

- 3.3.1. There are no water-bodies on site but a stream lies off-site to the west and the site lies in a nitrate vulnerable zone. Water will be absorbed by the permeable soil and may potentially run into the off-site stream. We assign hydrology a medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in a reduction of permeable area but use of permeable paving and SUDs features would ensure no increase in run-off from the site and is considered to be a nil magnitude of effect. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on hydrology would be neutral.

3.4. Vegetation and biodiversity

- 3.4.1. The designated SINCs and Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland which partly surround the site and the grassland SINC which forms the northern part of the site are assigned a high sensitivity. The proposed development is off-set from these areas and is separated by a vegetated buffer. The on-site SINC grassland to the north is outside the developed area and it intended to protect this from unauthorised motocross use and further degradation. On balance it is considered that there will be a nil magnitude of effect on these areas of vegetation. Combined with a high sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on designated vegetation would be neutral.
- 3.4.2. The interior of the southern part of the site which comprises patches of ruderal vegetation and scrub contributes to ecosystem services through carbon sequestration and providing food for pollinators and is therefore assigned a high sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in the loss of this ruderal vegetation but the planting of trees, species-rich grassland and ornamental shrubs would help to mitigate this and there is considered, on balance to be a medium adverse magnitude of effect. Combined with a high sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on this ruderal vegetation would be major/moderate adverse.
- 3.4.3. The boundary vegetation to Swanmore Road which includes some non-TPO mature trees and which contributes to ecology, amenity and carbon sequestration is assigned a medium sensitivity. The proposals will safeguard the majority of this vegetation but the creation of a new footpath/cycle route to the west and the formalisation of the eastern access point will result in some loss of vegetation and is, on balance, considered to be a low adverse magnitude of effect. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on designated vegetation would be moderate/minor adverse.

3.5. Settlements and road pattern

- 3.5.1. There are no settlements or roads on the site and the those that are adjacent to the site are generally well-contained by the boundary vegetation to the north of Swanmore Road which provides a strong edge and are assigned a medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in a slight loss of containment to part of the adjacent settlement but is considered, on balance to be a nil magnitude of effect. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on settlements and road pattern would be neutral.

3.6. Access and recreation

- 3.6.1. The site is not formally designated as access land but used for informal recreation and unauthorised motocross. The bridleways to the north and to the east retain a largely rural setting and are considered to be of medium sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in improved and formalised access to the PRoW to the north of the site, via the development, and would deter unauthorised motocross but there would be a slight reduction in the rural quality of the bridleways. Additional public open space would be provided with opportunities for play. On balance this would result in a medium beneficial magnitude of effect. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on access and recreation would be moderate beneficial.

3.7. History

- 3.7.1. The site historically formed part of the Forest of Bere but the extant field pattern dates from the 19th or 20th century and historic map regression shows little change in the field pattern since the mid Victorian times. The site lies adjacent to the Staunton Country Park but is not considered to form part of the setting of the Sir George Staunton Conservation Area which lies within it. The somewhat poor condition of the site, location of the radio mast, creation of the A3(M) and the nearby housing developments have somewhat eroded this sense of history and as such history is considered to have a medium sensitivity.
- 3.7.2. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in the loss of some of the historic 'openness' of the site but the field pattern would remain unchanged. On balance this would result in a low adverse magnitude of effect. Combined with a medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on history would be moderate/minor adverse.

3.8. Tranquility (aural, visual, dark skies)

- 3.8.1. The site retains a slight sense of remoteness but is influenced by traffic noise, power lines and nearby development especially in the south. and is assigned a low sensitivity. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in additional lighting and traffic movements and a further loss of tranquility. On balance this would result in a high adverse magnitude of effect. Combined with a low sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on tranquility would be moderate adverse.

3.9. Condition and coherence

- 3.9.1. The site is a somewhat isolated area of open ground surrounded by woodland to the north, west and (partially) the east. Whilst it connects fairly well to the landscape to the north-east it is less well-connected in the south and west. It is in a neglected state with self-sown trees and scrub, litter and evidence of use for unauthorised motocross. Condition is considered on balance to be of low sensitivity and coherence is considered to be of medium sensitivity.
- 3.9.2. The proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would result in more management of boundary vegetation and mature trees, high quality landscape and deter motocross. On balance this would result in a medium beneficial magnitude of effect. Combined with a low sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on condition would be moderate beneficial.
- 3.9.3. Whilst the surrounding woodland would largely remain unchanged the proposed introduction of buildings, highways and landscaping on part of the site would serve to sever the historic link with the wider landscape and form a new connection with the adjacent housing. This is considered to be a medium adverse magnitude of effect. Combined with medium sensitivity, the overall landscape effect on coherence would be moderate adverse.

4. Additional mitigation and residual landscape effects

- 4.1. 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 2.4.
- 4.2. 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 management and maintenance of existing retained and proposed landscape
- Establishment of vegetation over time

4.3. 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 adverse	Moderate/minor adverse		Moderate/minor adverse
Soils	Low	Medium adverse	Moderate/minor adverse	Careful storage and re-use of soils	Minor adverse
Hydrology	Medium	Nil	Neutral		Neutral
Vegetation (designated)	High	Nil	Neutral	Management of boundary vegetation and SINC grassland for ecology	Minor beneficial
Vegetation (interior)	High	Medium adverse	Major/moderate adverse	Management of new planting and establishment over time	Moderate adverse
Vegetation (Swanmore Road boundary)	Medium	Low adverse	Moderate/minor adverse	Management of boundary vegetation	Minor adverse
Settlements and road pattern	Medium	Nil	Neutral		Neutral
Access and recreation	Medium	Medium beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Management of new planting and establishment over time	Moderate beneficial
History	Medium	Low adverse	Moderate/minor adverse		Moderate/minor adverse
Tranquility	Low	High adverse	Moderate adverse		Moderate adverse
Condition	Low	Medium beneficial	Moderate beneficial	Management of new planting and establishment over time	Moderate beneficial
Coherence	Medium	Medium adverse	Moderate adverse		Moderate adverse

5. Appraisal of visual effects

5.1. 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.

- 5.1.1. Views of a similar nature are grouped together and an overall appraisal 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.

5.2. Effect on representative viewpoints 1 to 4 – views from Swanmore and Calshot Roads.

- 5.2.1. Visual receptors are motorists concentrating on the road ahead at moderate speed and pedestrians and cyclists who would have a potentially greater interest in their surroundings. Viewers are considered to be of medium sensitivity. The proposed development would result in a variety of effects, depending on the exact location and orientation of the viewer including views of the site entrance and partial, filtered views of the proposed built form seen through existing, retained boundary vegetation and in the context of existing built form. On balance the magnitude of change would be low adverse.
- 5.2.2. A medium sensitivity combined with a low adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate/minor adverse effect, which would be expected where viewpoints are close to the new development.

5.3. Effect on representative viewpoint 7 – views from PRow to the east-bridleway 108/121/1.

- 5.3.1. Visual receptors are walkers and horse-riders on PRow adjacent to Staunton Country Park in a rural setting with an interest in their surroundings. Viewers 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 including partial, filtered views of the proposed built form seen through existing, retained boundary vegetation. On balance the magnitude of change would be low adverse.
- 5.3.2. A high sensitivity combined with a low adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate adverse effect, which would be expected where viewpoints are close to the new development.

5.4. Effect on representative viewpoints 8, 9, 10 & 14 – Views from PRow to the north-bridleways 108/120/1 and 108/120/2.

- 5.4.1. Visual receptors are walkers and horse-riders on PRow close to a settlement but with an interest in their surroundings. Viewers are considered to be of medium sensitivity. The proposed development would result in a variety of effects, depending on the exact location and orientation of the viewer including indirect, partial, filtered views of the proposed built form seen through existing woodland (viewpoint 14) and indirect, partial views of proposed built form as it rises above the skyline to the south (viewpoints 8-10). On balance the magnitude of change would be nil for viewpoint 14 and medium adverse for viewpoints 8-10.
- 5.4.2. A medium sensitivity combined with a nil magnitude of change would result in a neutral effect for viewpoint 14 and a combined with a medium adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate adverse effect for viewpoints 8-10, which would be expected where viewpoints are close to the new development.

5.5. Effect on representative viewpoint 12 – Views from PRow within Staunton Country Park - bridleway 108/120/3.

- 5.5.1. Visual receptors are walkers and horse-riders on PRow within Staunton Country Park in a rural setting but close to the settlement edge. Viewers 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 including partial, filtered views of the roof-lines of proposed built form seen through and above existing woodland but seen in relation to existing built form on Swanmore Road. On balance the magnitude of change would be low adverse.
- 5.5.2. A high sensitivity combined with a low adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate adverse effect, which would be expected where viewpoints are close to the new development.

5.6. Effect on views from private houses

- 5.6.1. Visual receptors are residents at home 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. From north-facing ground and first-floor windows of properties on the southern side of Swanmore Road and in Stacey Court and Teglease Green there will be partial views of the site entrance and built form heavily filtered by existing vegetation and seen in the context of the existing settlement. On balance the magnitude of change would be low adverse.
- 5.6.2. A high sensitivity combined with a low adverse magnitude of change would result in a moderate adverse effect which would be expected where viewpoints are close to the new development.

6. Additional mitigation and residual visual effects

- 6.1. 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 2.4, however the passage of time will increase the screening provided by new vegetation.
- 6.2. Additional mitigation measures will include the following:
- Establishment of vegetation over time on the basis of protection of existing and new vegetation and good management practice
- 6.3. 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
1-4	Medium	Low	Moderate/minor adverse	Establishment of vegetation and good management	Moderate/minor adverse
7	High	Low	Moderate adverse	Establishment of vegetation and good management	Moderate adverse
8-10	Medium	Medium	Moderate adverse	Establishment of vegetation and good management	Moderate/minor adverse
14	Medium	Nil	Neutral	Establishment of vegetation and good management	Neutral
12	High	Low	Moderate adverse	Establishment of vegetation and good management	Moderate 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
Private houses	High	Low	Moderate adverse	Establishment of vegetation and good management	Minor adverse

7. Conclusions

- 7.3.1. 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, CS17 and DM8 as set out in the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011). In addition, proposals are informed by a review of the landscape character assessments.
- 7.3.2. Of the twelve landscape receptors carried forward for appraisal (vegetation being split into three) seven would experience negative effects (topography, soils, vegetation (interior and Swanmore Road boundary), history, tranquility 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 (hydrology and settlements and road pattern) and three would experience beneficial effects (vegetation (designated), access and recreation, and condition).
- 7.3.3. Of the visual receptors carried forward for appraisal none would experience significant residual effects. Receptors on PROW within or adjacent to Staunton Country Park would experience moderate adverse visual effects, those on Calshot and Swanmore Road and PROW to the north would experience moderate/minor adverse visual effects, and those on PROW within the wood to the north-west would experience neutral effects. It is worth noting that due to the likely construction of the Havant Thickett Reservoir on land to the east of the site, the Staunton Country Park will undergo significant changes and some views which have been accessed as part of this study will not be possible. Of those which remain, their character will be significantly changed.
- 7.3.4. A small number of private houses to the south of Swanmore Road, in Stacey Court and Teglease Gardens and would experience minor adverse residual visual effects, which are not considered significant

8. References

- National Character Assessment (NCA, 2014)
- National Design Guide, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2019)
- National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
- Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011)
- Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
- 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 - Design evolution

Figure 2 - Design evolution

Figure 3 - Landscape strategy

Figure 4 - Design evolution

Figure 5 - Design evolution

Figure 6 - Development proposals

Figure 1 - Design evolution



Initial iteration which was submitted as part of the pre-application process. Feedback included the need for 15m buffer form the woodland and offsetting houses from established trees.

Figure 2 - Design evolution



Revised iteration of the proposed layout which incorporates buffers to woodland and shows developing extending northwards along boundary to east, on higher ground and extending slightly into SINC grassland in north. Eastern properties back onto boundary vegetation

Figure 3 - Landscape strategy



High-level landscape strategy diagram informed by initial LVEA findings which proposed setting the built-form back from the grassland SIN and site boundaries and creating green infrastructure linkages across the site to enhance east-west connectivity.

Figure 4 - Design evolution



Further iteration which has development not extending northwards into grassland SINC. Boundary trees are kept in the public domain to reduce shading of private gardens and pressure for cutting back. East-west public open space connects boundary vegetation and enhanced green infrastructure.

Figure 5 - Design evolution



Further iteration which responded to request for different housing mix and places car-parking to front of houses and includes a play area and community orchard. The central cross-roads and paired apartment blocks provide an opportunity for feature tree-planting to enhance place-making.

Schedule of Accommodation

Dwelling Houses (102nr):

- Type 3A.1: 10 nr
3-bed 6 person (m2)(119sqm)
- Type 3A.2: 15 nr
3-bed 6 person (m2)(119sqm)
- Type 3B.1: 45 nr
3-bed 6 person (m2)(111sqm)
- Type 3B.2: 2 nr
3-bed 6 person (m2)(136sqm)
- Type 4A.1: 17 nr
4-bed 8 person (m2)(144sqm)
- Type 4A.2: 8 nr
4-bed 8 person (m2)(144sqm)
- Type 4D.3: 2 nr
4-bed 8 person (m2)(160sqm)
- Type 5A.1: 2 nr
5-bed 10 person (m2)(144sqm)
- Type 5A.2: 1 nr
5-bed 10 person (m2)(160sqm)

Apartments (48nr):

- Type 1F.1: 7 nr
1-bed 2 person (m2)(37nr)
- Type 1F.2: 4 nr
1-bed 2 person (m2)(37nr)
- Type 1F.3: 1 nr
1-bed 2 person (m2)(84nr)
- Type 2F.1: 16 nr
2-bed 4 person (m2)(72nr)
- Type 2F.2: 17 nr
2-bed 4 person (m2)(72nr)
- Type 2F.3: 3 nr
2-bed 4 person (m2)(80nr)

Total Units:

- 12nr 1-bed 2 person apartments
- 30nr 2-bed 4 person apartments
- 72nr 3-bed 6 person houses
- 77nr 4-bed 8 person houses
- 3nr 5-bed 10 person houses

Total: 160 Dwellings

257 car parking spaces

Scale with 50 mm @ 1 : 500 mm @ 1 : 500

1:500 scale bar

site layout plan

5 of 5