

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 2: EXISTING

The image has been created using the specified 50 mm lens but with the camera set in panoramic mode. This is necessary to show the whole of the proposed building in its setting.

Distance to Site: 293 m
Bearing to Site: 339° NNW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 91064 90612
Viewpoint ground height: 107.5 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 05.01.18 10:28
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1. 8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title:View 2: Pywell Road, Willow Brook Industrial Estate

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW - PROPOSED

The image has been created using the specified 50 mm lens but with the camera set in panoramic mode. This is necessary to show the whole of the proposed building in its setting.

Distance to Site: 293 m
Bearing to Site : 339° NNW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 91064 90612
Viewpoint ground height: 107.5 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 05.01.18 10:28
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1. 8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 2 - Pywell Road, Willow Brook Industrial Estate

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 4 - EXISTING

The image has been created using the specified 50 mm lens but with the camera set in panoramic mode. This is necessary to show the whole of the proposed building in its setting.

Distance to Site: 1.61 km
Bearing to site : 65° NE
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 89446 90052
Viewpoint ground height: 110.6 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 05.01.18 11:18
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 OSS

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 4 - Stephenson Way public open space

0

20
cm

10
cm



Stacks

VIEW 4 - PROPOSED

The image has been created using the specified 50 mm lens but with the camera set in panoramic mode. This is necessary to show the whole of the proposed building in its setting.

Distance to Site: 1.61 km
Bearing to Site: 65° NE
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 89446 90052
Viewpoint ground height: 110.6 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 05.01.18 11:18
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens: Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 OSS

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 4 - Stephenson Way public open space

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 7 - EXISTING

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 737 m
Bearing to Site: 248° W
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 91757 91191
Viewpoint ground height: 103.9m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 03201.18 13:32
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 7 - Edge of Rockingham Gate new residential area

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 7 - PROPOSED

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 737 m
Bearing to Site: 248°
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 91757 91191
Viewpoint ground height: 103.9m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 03201.18 13:32
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 7 - Edge of Rockingham Gate new residential area

0

20
cm

10
cm



VIEW 9 - EXISTING

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 7.18 km
Bearing to Site: 122.6° SE
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 84615 94563
Viewpoint ground height: 90.35m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 11:25
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 9 - Lane west of Eyebrook Reservoir

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 9 - PROPOSED

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 7.18 km
Bearing to Site: 122.6° SE
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 84615 94563
Viewpoint ground height: 90.35m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 11:25
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 9 - Lane west of Eyebrook Reservoir

0

20
cm

10
cm



VIEW 13 - EXISTING

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 1.56 km
Bearing to Site: 160 58° SE
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 90400 92345
Viewpoint ground height: 109.15 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 11:45
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 13 - Corby Rd between Gretton and Gretton Brook Rd

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 13 - PROPOSED

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 1.56 km
Bearing to Site: 160 58° SE
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 90400 92345
Viewpoint ground height: 109.15 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 11:45
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 13 - Corby Rd between Gretton and Gretton Brook Rd

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 14a - EXISTING GARDEN VIEW

Single frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 2.31 km
Bearing to Site: 221° SW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 92571 92694
Viewpoint ground height: 91.2 m
Date & time of photo: 19.09.18 12:08
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1. 8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title:View 14: Kirby Hall, garden

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 14a - PROPOSED

Single frame

Distance to Site: 2.31 km
Bearing to Site : 221° SW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 92571 92694
Viewpoint ground height: 91.2 m
Date & time of photo: 19.09.18 12:08
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1. 8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 14 - Kirby Hall Garden

0

20
cm

10
cm



VIEW 14b: THE EXISTING VIEW

Single frame 19 mm wide angle

Distance to Site: 2.31 km
Bearing to Site: 221°
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 92571 92694
Viewpoint ground height: 94.70
Date & time of photo: 19.09.18 12:03
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony 18200 LE

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title:View 14b: Kirby Hall first floor window

0

20
cm

10
cm



VIEW 14b: PROPOSED

19 mm wide angle single frame

Distance to Site: 2.31 km
Bearing to Site: 221°
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 92571 92694
Viewpoint ground height: 94.70
Date & time of photo: 19.09.18 12:03
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens: Sony 18200 LE

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 14b - Kirby Hall first floor window Estate

0

20
cm

10
cm



VIEW 16 - EXISTING

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 2.94 km
Bearing to Site: 1242° SW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 93648 92332
Viewpoint ground height: 109.15 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 12:52
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 136 - Rural footpath on the west boundary of Deene Park

0

20
cm

10
cm



VIEW 16 - PROPOSED

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 2.94 km
Bearing to Site: 242° SW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 93648 92332
Viewpoint ground height: 109.15 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 12:52
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 16: Rural footpath on the west boundary of Deene Park

0

20
cm



10
cm

VIEW 17 - EXISTING

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to Site: 3.60 km
Bearing to Site: 252.9 ° SW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 94502 92018
Viewpoint ground height: 92.16 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 12:52
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1.8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 17 - Rural footpath within Deene Park

0

20
cm

10
cm



Stacks

VIEW 17 - PROPOSED

Single Frame 50 mm lens

Distance to site: 3.60 km
Bearing to new building: 252.9 ° SW
Viewpoint grid reference: SP 94502 92018
Viewpoint ground height: 92.16 m + 1.65 m Camera height
Date & time of photo: 28.01.18 12:52
Camera: Sony Alpha 7 Full Frame
Lens : Sony Fixed 50 mm F1. 8 Oss

Revision:

Sheet Size: A3 Landscape

Project: Proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Corby

Client: KSP Renewables Limited

Title: View 17 - Rural footpath within Deene Park

0

APPENDIX 10.3 TOWNSCAPE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACTS

The study assesses the significance of the impact of the visual changes arising from the Proposed Development, together with the changes to the character and quality of the landscape.

The existing landscape character and the visual environment have been separately surveyed and assessed. The landscape assessment identifies characteristics, features and elements which constitute this particular landscape and its character. The visual baseline identifies existing views to, across or from the application site, and identifies the visual receptors, such as nearby residents or users of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) who might be affected by the Proposed Development.

The assessment of the likely significant effects of the proposed development on landscape character and visual impact has been undertaken by Chartered Landscape Architect and member of the landscape Institute from Sightline Landscape Ltd following the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Third Edition', Landscape Institute/Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013 (GLVIA 3).

A baseline study is undertaken to determine:

- 1) Relevant landscape designations on or near the Site;
- 2) Relevant planning designations and policies;
- 3) Landscape character;
- 4) The value of the landscape in terms of landscape features, cultural, historical and recreational values and its value to the community;
- 5) How susceptible is the landscape to the type of development proposed?
- 6) The contribution the Site makes to landscape character and its value;
- 7) How the landscape appears to people within the landscape (visual receptors), and
- 8) How does the Site fit in and contribute to these views.

The second part of the assessment examines the changes that would occur if the development were to be implemented. In terms of landscape it describes the likely changes that would occur to landscape character, determines whether any landscape features would be lost or created and whether there would be any changes to community or cultural aspects. The significance of the effect of these is then determined. To determine the likely changes in visual amenity to people a series of viewpoints are selected from where the Proposed Development is likely to be visible. These are chosen to illustrate changes to views from a variety of sensitive views, such as those from PRoW, residential properties, roads etc. at a variety of distances, elevations and directions around the Site. They are presented as a series of photographs with a narrative describing the changes, and if required, the proposed mitigation and likely effectiveness.

Landscape quality, sensitivity, value and susceptibility

Landscapes can vary in quality, their value to communities and their sensitivity and these factors can be used to determine the susceptibility of the landscape to the proposed development. The criteria for quantifying the degree of quality, sensitivity, value and susceptibility are set out in Tables 1 – 5.

Determination of the Study Area

The study area has been identified through an iterative process. A baseline study has been conducted with respect to the following three areas of the assessment: landscape elements on site, landscape character and visual amenity. The likely effects on landscape elements, character and visual amenity are assessed against the current baseline conditions, focussing specifically on the receptors identified as part of the baseline evaluation. The spatial scope of this study area is then re-fined through the initial stages of the assessment to focus on the key sensitive receptors and likely significant effects.

Table 1: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Quality

Level of quality	Definition
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes of an 'awe-inspiring' or 'sublime' nature and which are important and valued on an international and national level • Unspoilt areas comprising a strong, clear and highly aesthetically-pleasing composition of highly characteristic landscape elements and features in excellent condition, intact and distinctive • Excellent representation of the landscape area / type • Very high level of management, or care, or pristine natural / semi-natural environment • Exceptional scenic integrity • Very strong sense of place • Negligible or no atypical or incongruous features or detractors • Very attractive landscapes which are of high value nationally and can be defined as highly scenic with components combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition, in very good condition • Very good representation of the landscape area / type • High level of management, or care, or natural / semi-natural environment in very good form and health • Very good scenic integrity • Strong sense of place • Few atypical or incongruous features or detractors
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good landscape containing areas that, although still attractive, have less significant and more common landscape features • Areas of some value for their landscapes, components combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition but showing signs of erosion and loss, in good to fair condition • Good to fair representation of the landscape area / type • Good to fair level of management, environment in good to fair form and health • Good to fair scenic integrity • Some loss of, or change to, intrinsic sense of place • Some atypical or incongruous features or detractors
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordinary landscape containing areas that have only common landscape features and some intrusive elements such as conspicuous infrastructure with scope for improvement in management • Areas of limited landscape value, disturbed and lacking coherence and structure. Limited aesthetically-pleasing composition. Signs of urbanisation and / or erosion, characteristic landscape elements and features degraded and / or lost • Limited representation of the landscape area / type • Limited management, or care, environment in fair to poor form and health • Little if any sense of place • Several atypical or incongruous features or detractors • Poor landscape with areas that contain frequent detracting aspects and/or lack of management which results in a degraded landscape with very few valued features • Areas with few or no valued landscape components or comprising degraded and / or lost characteristic elements and features, making negative contribution to aesthetic composition

Table 2: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Value

Level of quality	Definition
<p>High</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Outstanding landscapes' • Internationally and / or nationally-designated landscapes e.g. World Heritage Sites, National Parks, AONBs • Presence of internationally and / or nationally-designated areas / features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and / or other importance e.g. SACs, SSSIs, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and / or II* listed buildings, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Local Geodiversity Sites • Significant wider landscape / visual function e.g. Green Belt, context / setting of heritage asset, contribution to character of settlement of international or national importance • Landscapes in excellent condition and / or of very high quality as defined by appropriate criteria. • Significant cultural associations • Exceptional representation of landscape area / type / characteristics and / or rare • Exceptional aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities e.g. significant scenic beauty, iconic views, very distinctive sense of place, very high degree of wildness /remoteness, tranquillity • No or very few detractors present • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are likely to be the primary purpose of the visit • Significant contribution to wider public amenity, access and recreation e.g. national trails, Open Access Land • Significant Green Infrastructure assets • Regionally / locally-designated landscapes e.g. Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) which may be subject of strategy and / or guidance • Presence of regionally / countywide-level designated areas / features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and / or other importance e.g. Country Parks, TPOs, National Forest Inventory, Priority Habitat Inventory sites, Local Wildlife Sites / Local Nature Reserves, Grade II Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Unregistered Historic Parks and Gardens, SMR / HER. Also National Trust land • Important wider, or significant local, landscape / visual function e.g. context / setting of heritage asset, contribution to character of settlement of regional importance, green gap, buffer zone etc. • Landscapes in very good condition and / or of high quality as defined by appropriate criteria • Important cultural associations • Very good representation of landscape area / type / characteristics and / or uncommon • Very good aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities e.g. high degree of scenic beauty, fine / key views, distinctive sense of place, high degree of wildness /remoteness, tranquillity • Negligible / few detractors present • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are likely to be one of the main reasons for the visit • Important contribution to wider public amenity, access and recreation e.g. long-distance / themed trails, well-used public rights of way, Heritage Coast, Public Open Space / Local Green Space. May be protected by / subject of planning policy • Important wider, or significant local Green Infrastructure assets
<p>Medium</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Everyday' landscapes • Undesignated landscapes although may be subject of strategy and / or guidance • Presence of undesignated, 'informally' designated and / or locally-important areas /features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and /or other interest • Important local landscape / visual function e.g. context / setting of heritage asset, contribution to character of settlement, green gap, buffer zone etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes in good to fair condition and / or of moderate quality as defined by appropriate criteria but good potential for improvement • Important local cultural associations • Good to fair representation of landscape area / type / characteristics but common • Good to fair aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities e.g. moderate degree of scenic beauty, local key views, moderate sense of place, moderate degree of wildness / remoteness, tranquillity • Some detractors present • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are unlikely to be one of the main reasons for the visit, but make a positive contribution to the experience • Important contribution to local public amenity, access and recreation e.g. well-used public rights of way, green open spaces, common land • Good local Green Infrastructure assets
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes between 'Everyday' and 'Degraded' • Undesignated landscapes unlikely to be subject of strategy and / or guidance (unless for restoration) • Few if any areas / features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and / or other interest • Little or no local landscape / visual function • Landscapes in fair to poor condition and / or of low quality as defined by appropriate criteria but some potential for improvement • Few if any cultural associations • Fair to poor representation of landscape area / type / characteristics and common • Few if any aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities: little sense of place, little or no sense of wildness / remoteness, tranquillity • Several detractors present • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape are unlikely to be a reason for visiting • Little or no contribution to public amenity, access and recreation • Few Green Infrastructure assets

Table 3: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Character Sensitivity

Level of sensitivity	Definition
High	<p><u>Natural Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique / internationally- or nationally-rare / important / designated landscape, heritage, and / or biodiversity areas / features • Features are irreplaceable and cannot be substituted • Strongly defining features (geology, topography, hydrology, vegetation, landcover etc.) make highly important contribution to intrinsic character • Unpolluted (air, soil, water) <p><u>Cultural / Social Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly characteristic / traditional landuse • Unsettled, or very sparsely-settled with strongly characteristic patterns, small-scale / historic / vernacular built form. Absence of modern development • Significant time depth <p><u>Landscape quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes of very high quality and in excellent condition / intact (refer criteria for Landscape Quality in Table 1) • Highly important contribution to, and excellent representation of, several landscape character areas / types • Highly distinctive character and very strong sense of place <p><u>Perceptual and Aesthetic Factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional perceptual and aesthetic qualities • Exceptional scenic beauty • Complex patterns, intact, intimate scale, very harmonious • Distinctive, undeveloped skylines / skylines with iconic historic landmarks • Physically or perceptually extremely remote • Tranquil • Little of movement / disturbance • Important function • Internationally- / nationally-important cultural associations • National trails / Open Access Land give access to exceptional landscapes <p>OVERALL SENSITIVITY: Unique / rare landscape character, key characteristics and highly important areas / elements / features are fragile and highly vulnerable to the type of change proposed</p>
Medium	<p><u>Natural factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locally-important but undesignated landscape, heritage, and / or biodiversity areas / features • Some potential for replacement / substitution of features • Defining features (geology, topography, hydrology, vegetation, landcover etc.) make important contribution to local character • 'Acceptable' levels of pollution (air, soil, water) <p><u>Cultural and social factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landuse retains some of original / intrinsic character but also reflects modern trends • Moderately-settled, some loss / erosion of characteristic patterns. Medium-scale built form, combination of historic / vernacular and modern development • Moderate time depth <p><u>Landscape quality/condition</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes of moderate quality and in good to fair condition but some erosion /loss (refer criteria for Landscape Quality in Table 1) • Good to fair contribution to, and good to fair representation of, landscape character type but commonplace • Signs of erosion of character and moderate sense of place

	<p><u>Perceptual and aesthetic matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to fair perceptual and aesthetic qualities • Moderate level of scenic beauty • Fairly simple patterns, some loss and erosion, medium-scale, some discordance • Some development on skylines / skylines with important local historic landmarks • Moderate physical or perceptual remoteness • Moderate tranquillity • Some noticeable movement / disturbance • Important local function • Locally-important cultural associations • Rights of way / public open spaces give access to locally- valued landscapes <p>OVERALL SENSITIVITY: Common but locally-valuable landscape character, key characteristics and areas / elements / features are relatively robust and have some resilience to / tolerance of the type of change proposed</p>
<p>Low</p>	<p><u>Natural factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undesignated landscape, heritage, and / or biodiversity areas / features • Good potential for replacement / substitution of features and improvements • Defining features (geology, topography, hydrology, vegetation, landcover etc.) make limited contribution to local character • Evidence of pollution (air, soil, water) <p><u>Cultural and social factors</u> □</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landuse retains little original / intrinsic character with strong modern trends • Densely-settled, loss / erosion of characteristic patterns. Medium- to large-scale built form, predominantly modern development • Little time depth <p><u>Landscape quality/condition</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes of low quality and in fair to poor condition with noticeable erosion /loss (refer criteria for Landscape Quality in Table 1) • Limited contribution to, and fair to poor representation of, landscape character type and very commonplace • Considerable erosion of character and little sense of place <p><u>Perceptual and aesthetic factors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few / poor / negative perceptual and aesthetic qualities • Low / no scenic beauty • Very simple patterns, regular and uniform, loss and erosion, medium- to large-scale, discordant • Non-prominent / screened skylines. Developed / built or cluttered skyline character • Very little physical / no perceptual remoteness • Not tranquil • Noticeable movement / disturbance • Little or no function • Few if any local cultural associations • Very limited access to, or amenity within, wider landscape <p>OVERALL SENSITIVITY: Common landscape character, key characteristics and areas / elements / features are very robust and have considerable resilience to /tolerance of the type of change proposed</p>

Table 4: Matrix for combining landscape value and landscape sensitivity to assist in determining the susceptibility of a landscape to change.

Landscape value	Landscape sensitivity		
	High	Medium	Low
High	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate
Medium	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Minor
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible

Landscape Susceptibility to Change

The susceptibility of a landscape to change is dependent on the characteristics of the receiving landscape and the type and nature of the development proposed. Landscape types also have varying sensitivity to the types of development they are able to accommodate. The judgement on the susceptibility of a landscape is recorded as high, moderate or low; with high being a landscape which is highly susceptible or sensitive to change and low being a more robust landscape which is less susceptible to change.

Table 5: Table 4: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Susceptibility to Change

Level of susceptibility	Definition
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape is of a large scale and / or there is a low level of containment, resulting in a high degree of interaction between landform, topography, vegetation cover, field pattern and built form • There is very limited existing reference or context within the landscape to the type of change / development proposed • Few detracting features in the area and where present, these have little influence on the character and experience of the landscape • Many of the existing landscape characteristics / elements / features of value would not be easy to replace or substitute, and it is unlikely that loss could be compensated for • Some potential for mitigation and enhancement • Combination of sensitivity and value is Major. • The landscape receptor has a low level of ability to tolerate the nature / scale of change / development proposed: long-term / permanent consequences of concern in terms of the maintenance of the baseline situation. • High landscape value • High sensitivity • The proposed change / development is unlikely to comply with relevant national planning policies, guidance, and / or strategies

Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape is of a medium scale and / or there is a moderate level of containment, resulting in a moderate degree of interaction between landform, topography, vegetation cover, field pattern and built form • There is some existing reference or context within the landscape to the type of change / development proposed • Some detracting features and / or major infrastructure are present in the area, and these have a noticeable influence on the character and experience of the landscape • Existing landscape characteristics / elements / features of limited value and could potentially be replaced / substituted, and / or loss satisfactorily compensated for • Good potential for mitigation and enhancement • The landscape receptor has a moderate level of ability to tolerate the nature / scale of change / development proposed: some concern in terms of the maintenance of the baseline situation without mitigation • Combination of landscape value and sensitivity is Moderate. • The proposed change / development may be in conflict with some relevant national planning policies, guidance, and / or strategies, but may comply with others
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape is small scale and / or has a high level of containment, resulting in only a slight degree of interaction between landform, topography, vegetation cover, field pattern and built form • There are many existing references within the landscape to the type of development / change proposed • Several detractors present which have a negative influence on the character and / or experience of the landscape • Few / no landscape characteristics / elements / features of value are present or, where they are present, they can easily be replaced / substituted and / or loss could be satisfactorily compensated for • The landscape receptor has a high level of ability to tolerate the nature / scale of change / development proposed: limited concern in terms of the maintenance of the baseline situation • Very good opportunities for mitigation and enhancement • Combination of landscape value and sensitivity is Minor. • The proposed change / development is unlikely to be in conflict with relevant national planning policies, guidance, and / or strategies. The site may be allocated for the type of development proposed

Table 6: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of change in relation to Landscape Character

Level of Magnitude	Definition
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noticeable alteration to, or significant loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered large due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components • Effects likely to be experienced at a large scale, influencing the character area and / or type within which the change is proposed • Noticeable alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of uncharacteristic, conspicuous elements, features and / activities, would result in noticeable alteration to, or loss of, aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent and would be very difficult to reverse in practical terms •

<p>Medium</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered medium due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components • Effects likely to be experienced at a moderate scale, influencing the character type within which the change is proposed but at a local level • Partial alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of elements, features and / activities which are not uncharacteristic in the area, would result in partial alteration to, or loss of, aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent but is potentially reversible
<p>Low adverse</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor or barely discernible alteration to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered small due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components • Effects likely to be experienced at a small scale, influencing the landscape within which the change is proposed at a local level • Minor alteration to, or loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of elements, features and / activities which are characteristic in the area, would result in minor alteration to aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • The duration of effect may be considered long-term / permanent but is easily reversible; or, the duration may be medium-term
<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Beneficial effects counterbalance adverse effects</p>
<p>Low beneficial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small but noticeable improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered small due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a small scale, influencing the local landscape • Small but noticeable improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in discernible improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • Improvements are medium- to long-term
<p>Medium beneficial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noticeable improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered medium due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a moderate scale, influencing the character type within which the change is proposed but at a local level • Noticeable improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in noticeable improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • Improvements are long-term / permanent
<p>High beneficial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered large due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a large scale, influencing the character area and / or type within which the change is proposed • Major improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in considerable improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • Improvements are long-term / permanent

Table 7: Matrix for determining the level of impact on landscape character

Magnitude of change	Landscape sensitivity		
	High	Medium	Low
High	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate
Medium	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Minor
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible

Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Visual receptors are people who potentially would have a view of the proposed development. The sensitivity of a visual receptor depends on the susceptibility of the visual receptor to change and the value of the view.

Susceptibility to Change

The susceptibility of visual receptors to a potential change in the view is a function of their occupation and activity and the extent to which their attention is focused on the views. The land use planning system considers that public views are of greater value than views from private property because an individual has no 'right to a view'. The criteria in Table 7 acknowledges this but the sensitivity increases the more residents there are who are likely to see the development from their properties. In visual assessment, lower storey views from residential properties are generally considered to be of greater susceptibility to change than upper storey views, as these are the rooms in which residents spend more time experiencing the view. There are exceptions to this as some residences have living rooms on upper storeys and this has been taken into consideration if evident.

Table 8: Criteria for Judging Levels of Receptor sensitivity

Level of value	Definition
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receptors (tourists / visitors) within, or looking towards, internationally- or nationally- designated landscapes, areas and features such as World Heritage Sites, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Grade I and II* listed buildings and other places where the landscape / feature is the main reason for the visit People using national trails and other designated routes where the view is likely to be the focus of attention People living in residential properties Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents in the area People engaged in outdoor recreation e.g. walkers, riders, cyclists, boat users, motorists, whose attention may be focused on the landscape and / or particular views, and / or for whom the view is a factor in the enjoyment of the activity People travelling through the landscape on roads, rail or other routes on recognised scenic routes or where there is a distinct awareness of views of their surroundings and their visual amenity A large number of residents within properties (typically 100+), particularly if views are from ground floor, gardens or main habitable rooms.

Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptors within, or looking towards, undesignated landscapes, areas and features of local importance, and in places where the landscape / feature is not necessarily part of the reason for the visit • People engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is unlikely to be focused on the landscape and / or particular views, and / or for whom the view is not necessarily a factor in the enjoyment of the activity • People staying in hotels and healthcare institutions who are likely to appreciate and / or benefit from views of their surroundings • People working in premises where the views are likely to make an important contribution to the setting, and / or to the quality of working life • A moderate number of residents within properties (10 – 100), particularly if views are from ground floor, gardens or main habitable rooms.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptors in commercial and industrial premises, schools, playing fields etc. where the view is not central to the use • A low number of resident (less than 10), particularly if views are mainly from bedrooms rather than the main rooms of the house. • People using main roads, infrequently used / inaccessible public rights of way and likely to be travelling for a purpose other than to enjoy the view • People moving past the view often at high speed (e.g. on motorways and main line railways) and with little or no focus on or interest in the landscape through which they are travelling

Magnitude of Effect

The magnitude of effect evaluates the visual effects identified in terms of the size or scale of a development; the geographical extent of the area influenced; the nature of the effect (adverse or beneficial); and its duration and reversibility. More weight is usually given to effects that are greater in scale and long-term in duration. In assessing the duration of the effect, consideration is given to the effectiveness of mitigation, particularly where planting is proposed as part of the works which would change the scale of visual effect. The following aspects have been taken into consideration in determining the magnitude of visual effects on a receptor.

Size or Scale

The relative size or scale of the development within the view varies and reflects:

Scale of Change

The scale of change from the present views experienced has been considered with

respect to the loss or addition of features in the view and changes in its composition, including the proportion of view occupied by the proposed development. For example the introduction of a development into a view where similar developments are already present is more likely to result in a lower scale of change than the introduction of a new development into a view where there is no or little development present.

Consideration of how the proposed development affects the main focus of the existing view is also important.

Nature of the View

The relative amount of time over which views of the proposed development would be experienced on each occasion, for example along a short length of a PRoW, and whether views would be full, partial or glimpsed. Any filtering or screening of a view by vegetation, landform or built form as the filtering or screening of even part of a development can reduce the scale of change on the view. Consideration has also been given to the extent of filtering in 'full leaf' and during winter.

Geographical Extent

The geographical extent of visual effects varies with different viewpoints and reflects:

Angle of View

The angle of view has been considered with changes to direct views generally considered to be of greater importance than changes in oblique or indirect views.

Distance between the Receptor and the Proposed Development

The distance between the receptor and the proposed development is important with the magnitude generally decreasing with distance.

Proportion of View Affected

The proportion of view affected is an important consideration, with a change to a large proportion generally having a greater effect than a change to a small proportion.

Topography and Landform

Consideration has been given to whether the proposed development would be looked down to, looked up to or whether it would be viewed on a level. Views up to a development are generally considered to be of greater magnitude due to the enhanced verticality of the structures than views down to a development where the apparent height appears reduced.

Table 9: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of Effect (Views & Visual Amenity)

Level of magnitude	Definition
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Substantial, obvious, loss or addition of features in the view.• Major change in the composition of the view• A major proportion of the view may be either blocked or occupied by the proposed development.• The development introduces colours or forms which draw the eye and are not commonplace in the view.• Views may be short-distance and direct.• Prominent position within the landscape, such as on the skyline or open hillside or open floodplain or plateau• Changes in the view may be visible over a large proportion of the view. The proposed development is permanent and irreversible. <p>Typically this would be where a development would be seen in close proximity with a large proportion of the view affected with little or no filtering or backgrounding and there would be a great scale of change from the present situation for the long or medium-term.</p>
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Readily noticeable loss or addition of features in the view.• Partial alteration to the existing view and/or the introduction of readily noticeable elements in the view.• There is some screening or backgrounding by landform, woodland, and or built form• The colours and forms are largely in keeping with the colours and forms within the surrounding landscape• Views may be middle-distance, direct or oblique. Views may be filtered by vegetation.• Partial loss of, or change to, sites visual function / contribution• The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent but is potentially reversible <p>Typically this would be where a development would be seen in views for the long or medium-term where a moderate proportion of the views is</p>

	affected. There may be some screening or backgrounding which minimise the scale of change from the present situation.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change in the view would not be readily noticeable. • Development would form a minor constituent of the view, being partially-visible, or at a sufficient distance to be a limited component of a view • The duration of effect may be considered long-term / permanent but is easily reversible; or, the duration may be medium-term • A significant part of the development is screened • It does not lie within a particularly prominent location within the landscape • Introduction of features which may already be present in views. <p>Typically this would be where a moderate or low proportion of the view would be affected for the short-term or the development would be visible for the long-term in distant views; where only a small proportion of the view is affected in the medium-term or long-term; where the medium-term or long-term effect is reduced due to a high degree of filtering, screening or backgrounding or where there is a low scale of change from the existing view.</p>
No Change	The view would not change

The magnitude and sensitivity are combined in the matrix Table 10, to determine the degree of significance of an impact (whether beneficial or adverse) ranging from Major to Negligible.

Table 10: Matrix to determine the level of impact on visual amenity

Magnitude of change	Receptor sensitivity		
	High	Medium	Low
High	Major	Major/Moderate	Moderate
Medium	Major/ Moderate	Moderate	Minor
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible

Duration and Reversibility of Visual Effects

These are separate but linked considerations.

Duration has been judged on a scale of:

- short-term: 0 to 5 years including the construction period and on completion;
- medium-term: 5 to 20 years including the establishment of replacement and proposed mitigation planting
- long-term/permanent: 20 years onwards for the life of the proposed development.

Reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and the practicality of the visual effects being reversed. For example, while some forms of development can be considered permanent, others such as underground cable installation can be considered as reversible since the land will be reinstated. Reversibility is particularly relevant

to construction effects as works will cease and land and most landscape features will be reinstated in the short-term.

Geographical extent of the effects

Effects can be experienced over different areas. For example, a tall structure could be visible at local, borough and district level. An impact on a nationally important feature would have an effect at National Level, and effect on a World Heritage Site would have an effect on International Level. Grade I and Grade II* listed structures are considered to be of national importance and so an effect on the setting of such structures would be on a National Level. The greater the extent of the effect greater weighting should be given to it.

- Local level: relating to the site and the immediate surroundings (ward);
- Borough level: relating to impacts within Borough/Local Authority/parish;
- District level: relating to the wider county area;
- Regional level: relating to the Region e.g. south east;
- National level: relating to England and Wales; and
- International: relating to Europe and beyond.

Viewing distances

Short distance – within 100m

Middle distance – 100 – 1000 m

Long distance – Over kilometre