

West Burton C (Gas Fired Generating Station)

Appendix 10A: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
Methodology

EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Ltd

Project Number: 60572265

April 2019



Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Assessment Process	2
3. Landscape Assessment Methodology	3
3.1 Prediction of Landscape Effects	3
3.2 Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors	3
3.3 Susceptibility to Change	3
3.4 Landscape Value	4
3.5 Landscape Sensitivity	6
3.6 Magnitude of Landscape Effects	7
4. Visual Assessment Methodology	15
4.1 Predicting Visual Impacts	15
4.2 Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	15
5. Magnitude of Visual Impacts	19
5.1 Assessing the Significance of Effects	20
6. References	22

Tables

Table 1: Landscape Susceptibility to Change	4
Table 2: Landscape Value Criteria	5
Table 3: Landscape Sensitivity Criteria	6
Table 4: Landscape Size/Scale Criteria	9
Table 5: Geographical Extent Criteria	9
Table 6: Duration Criteria	10
Table 7: Reversibility Criteria	10
Table 8: Landscape Impact Magnitude Criteria (indicative)	10
Table 9: Classification of Effects	12
Table 10: Landscape Significance Category Descriptions	13
Table 11: Visual Susceptibility to Change Criteria	16
Table 12: Value of View Criteria	17
Table 13: Visual Sensitivity Criteria	17
Table 14: Visual Size/Scale Criteria	19
Table 15: Geographical Extent Criteria	20
Table 16: Visual Magnitude Criteria (indicative)	20
Table 17: Significance of Effect Category	21

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been based on the following guidance:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition. (2013) (Ref 10A-1) Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, referred to as GLVIA3 in this assessment; and
- Landscape Character Assessment; Guidance for England and Scotland (2002) (Ref 10A-2) The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage.

1.1.2 Photography incorporated into the figures accompanying the LVIA (ES Volume III) has been undertaken in accordance with guidance given in Landscape Institute Advice Note 01/11 '*Photography and photomontage in landscape and visual impact assessment*' unless stated otherwise.

2. Assessment Process

2.1 Overview

2.1.1 Following assessment of the baseline landscape and visual context of the development the LVIA assesses the:

- sensitivity of receptors, whether the landscape or viewers;
- magnitude of effect, whether adverse or beneficial; and
- significance of the effects based on a comparison of sensitivity of receptor to magnitude of effect.

2.1.2 Effects may be temporary, permanent, short-term or long-term. Landscape and visual effects may be further categorised as being either direct (i.e. originating from the Site) or indirect (e.g. off-site visual effect of construction traffic).

2.1.3 For the purposes of this LVIA effects of moderate or major significance are considered to be significant (paragraph 3.34 GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1)).

3. Landscape Assessment Methodology

3.1 General

- 3.1.1 In assessing the predicted effects on the landscape resulting from the Proposed Development, the following criteria are considered: landscape value, landscape quality, landscape character and landscape sensitivity.
- 3.1.2 Landscape effects of the Proposed Development upon landscape elements and features (or components) are considered, as well as direct or indirect effects on the general landscape character of the surrounding area. The sensitivity of the landscape to change is the degree to which a particular Landscape Character Area (LCA) or feature can accommodate changes or new features without unacceptable detrimental effects to its essential characteristics.

3.2 Prediction of Landscape Effects

- 3.2.1 In predicting the effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape within the study area GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1) states the following steps should be undertaken in order to identify and describe the landscape effects:
- identify the components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the scheme (landscape receptors); and
 - identify the interactions between the landscape receptors and different components of the scheme at its different stages.

3.3 Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

- 3.3.1 Landscape receptors are described within GLVIA3 (paragraph 5.34) as '*components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the scheme*'. These can include overall character and key characteristics, individual elements or features and specific aesthetic or perceptual aspects.
- 3.3.2 It is the interaction between the different components of the Proposed Development (as described above) and these landscape receptors which has potential to result in landscape effects (both adverse and beneficial).
- 3.3.3 The sensitivity of the landscape receptor is a combination of their susceptibility to change of the receptor to the specific type of development being assessed combined with the value of the landscape.

3.4 Susceptibility to Change

- 3.4.1 The susceptibility to change is a measure of the ability of a landscape to accommodate the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies (paragraph 5.40 GLVIA3).

3.4.2 The guidance recognises that in many cases there may be existing landscape sensitivity or capacity studies for the area in which the Proposed Development is located. These cannot provide a substitute for an individual assessment of the susceptibility of the receptors in relation to change arising from the specific development proposal. The assessment of susceptibility should be recorded as part of the landscape baseline and considered as part of the assessment of the effects. **Table 1** considers factors which determine landscape susceptibility to change.

Table 1: Landscape susceptibility to change

Criteria Level	Susceptibility to Change
High	The receptor has a low capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development without effects upon its overall integrity. The landscape is likely to have a strong pattern/texture or is a simple but distinctive landscape and/or with high value features and essentially intact.
Medium	The receptor has some capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development without effects upon its overall integrity. The pattern of the landscape is mostly intact and/or with a degree of complexity and with features mostly in reasonable condition.
Low	The receptor is robust; it can accommodate the Proposed Development without effects upon its overall integrity. The landscape is likely to be simple, monotonous and/or degraded with common/indistinct features and minimal variation in landscape pattern.

3.5 Landscape Value

3.5.1 Establishing landscape value is necessary to determine the landscape sensitivity at both a site and study area scale. GLVIA (Ref 10A-1) paragraph 5.19 states that landscape value can include areas of landscape as a whole or, to the individual elements, features and aesthetics or perceptual dimensions which contribute to the character of a landscape.

3.5.2 The guidance also refers to the fact that different people and user groups value the landscape differently and for different reasons. Where landscapes have no formal landscape designations such as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Conservation Area, they may be valued locally. **Table 2** considers factors which determine landscape value.

3.5.3 The value of the landscape receptor should reflect the following:

- landscape designations (international, national and local);
- value attached to Landscape Character Types/Areas; and

- the value of individual elements within the landscape, especially the key characteristics.

3.5.4 Factors that can help in identifying valued landscapes include:

- presence/absence of statutory landscape designations;
- presence/absence of local landscape designations and associated policies;
- landscape quality/condition;
- scenic quality;
- rarity of particular elements/features;
- representiveness;
- conservation interest;
- recreation value;
- perceptual aspects; and
- cultural associations.

Table 2: Landscape value criteria

Criteria Level	Value
High	<p>The receptor is highly valued for one or more of its attributes protected by a statutory landscape designation or is of greater than local/county significance and/or contains elements/features that could be described as unique; or are nationally scarce; or mature vegetation with provenance such as ancient woodland.</p> <p>Mature landscape features which are characteristic of and contribute to a sense of place and illustrates time-depth in a landscape and if replaceable, could not be replaced other than in the long-term.</p>
Medium	<p>Areas that have a positive landscape character but include some areas of alteration/degradation/or erosion of features; and/or perceptual/aesthetic aspects has some vulnerability to unsympathetic development; and/or features/elements that are locally commonplace; unusual locally but in moderate/poor condition; or mature vegetation that is in moderate/poor condition or readily replicated. The receptor is likely to be valued at a local level only.</p>
Low	<p>The receptor is undesignated and has little or no recognised value. Areas which are relatively bland or neutral in character with few/no notable features and/or landscape elements/features that are common place or make little contribution to local distinctiveness.</p>

3.6 Landscape Sensitivity

3.6.1 The sensitivity of the landscape receptor is determined by the combination of its susceptibility to change due to the specific type of development being assessed and the value attached to the landscape receptor. Landscape sensitivity is not an absolute scale and requires professional judgement to determine the sensitivity for each receptor. However, it is generally accepted that a combination of high susceptibility and high value is likely to result in the highest sensitivity, whereas a low susceptibility and low value is likely to result in the lowest level of sensitivity. A summary of the likely characteristics of the different levels of sensitivity is described in **Table 3**. It must be noted that these are indicative and in practice do not have a clear distinction between criteria levels.

Table 3: Landscape sensitivity criteria

Criteria Level	Characteristics
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key characteristic(s) of landscape could be adversely affected by development; and/or • areas of landscape character that are highly valued for their scenic quality (including most statutorily designated landscapes); and/or • elements/features that could be described as unique; or are nationally scarce; or mature vegetation with provenance such as ancient woodland or mature parkland trees; and/or • mature landscape features which are characteristic of and contribute to a sense of place and illustrates time-depth in a landscape and if replaceable, could not be replaced other than in the long-term – for example ancient woodland/mature trees/mature species rich hedgerows/historical land use features.
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A landscape with some key characteristics which could be adversely effected from inappropriate or unsympathetic development that may lead to wider effects on character; and/or • areas that have a positive landscape character but include some areas of alteration/degradation/or erosion of features; and/or • Perceptual/aesthetic aspects has some vulnerability to unsympathetic development; and/or • features/elements that are locally commonplace; unusual locally but in moderate/poor condition; or mature vegetation that is in moderate/poor condition or readily replicated; and/or • well established landscape features which contribute positively to a sense of place and landscape maturity but are capable of being replaced in the medium term – for example trees in hedgerows, shelter belts or plantations.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A landscape with key characteristics that are robust and unlikely to be adversely effected by development; and/or • areas that are relatively bland or neutral in character with few/no notable features; and/or • a landscape that includes areas of alteration/degradation or

Criteria Level	Characteristics
	erosion of features; and/or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceptual/aesthetic aspect that are robust and unlikely to be affected by development; and/or • landscape elements/features that are common place or make little contribution to local distinctiveness; and/or • immature or poor quality/degraded landscape features which are capable of being replicated in the short-term – for example recently planted woodland/trees/hedges, agricultural or recreational land or land disturbed by development; and/or • landscape elements/features that might be considered to detract from landscape character such as obtrusive man-made artefacts (e.g. power lines, large scale developments etc).

3.7 Magnitude of Landscape Effects

3.7.1 The nature of the effect that is likely to occur (i.e. its magnitude), is determined by considering four separate factors, namely:

- size/scale;
- geographical extent;
- duration; and
- reversibility.

Size/scale

3.7.2 Making judgements regarding the size or scale of the changes to the landscape need to made for each potential effect. GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1) (paragraph 5.59) specifies that these judgements should take into account of the following:

- the extent of existing landscape elements that would be lost, the proportion of the total extent that this represents and the contribution of that element to the character of the landscape – in some cases this may be quantified;
- the degree to which aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape are altered either by removal of existing components of the landscape or by the addition of new ones; and
- whether the effect changes the key characteristics of the landscape, which are critical to its distinctive character.

3.7.3 The criteria should be presented in a verbal scale, which ‘*distinguishes the amount of change without being overly complex*’ (GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1) paragraph 5.49).

3.7.4 The size and scale of an effect is determined by considering the amount of change experienced by a receptor, based on the indicative criteria set out in **Table 4**.



Table 4: Landscape size/scale criteria

Criteria Level	Feature/element	Aesthetic/perceptual aspect	Key characteristics/overall character
Large	Total or substantial loss or large scale damage to landscape features resulting in the integrity of the landscape being compromised.	Change wholly or largely alters an aesthetic/perceptual aspect, such that it becomes difficult/impossible to appreciate, when considered against the baseline.	Loss of or changes to the critical key characteristics of the landscape, resulting in a change to the overall landscape character.
Medium	Partial loss or medium scale damage to landscape features resulting in a partial change to the element/feature which may in some cases diminish its overall integrity.	Change is such that the development has an influence upon an aesthetic/perceptual aspect, but said aspect remains appreciable.	Partial loss or small changes to the key characteristics of the landscape but not resulting in an obvious change to the overall character of the area.
Small	Slight loss or small scale damage to landscape features with its integrity remaining unchanged.	Change has little tangible effect upon an aesthetic/perceptual aspect.	Minor changes to key characteristics which result in no or little change to the overall landscape character.

Geographical Extent

3.7.5 The criteria for defining geographical extent is contained in **Table 5**.

Table 5: Geographical extent criteria

Criteria Level	Value
Large	The effects may influence several landscape types/character areas.
Medium	The effects may influence the landscape type/character area within which the development is located.
Small	The effects may influence the immediate setting of the Site.
Negligible	The effects may influence the development Site only.

Duration and Reversibility

3.7.6 The duration of an effect and its reversibility are linked, but separate consideration of the criteria for defining these are as below in **Table 6** and **Table 7**.

Table 6: Duration criteria

Criteria Level	Description
Temporary	Less than 12 months
Short-term	0-5 years
Medium-term	5-10 years

Table 7: Reversibility Criteria

Criteria Level	Description
Reversible	Change can be wholly or largely reversed. For example the removal of a wind farm development following decommissioning.
Partially reversible	Change is partially reversible. For example the restoration of a quarry to something similar to the baseline.
Irreversible	Change cannot realistically be reversed (i.e., it is permanent).

Magnitude Criteria

3.7.7 The factors above are considered in combination to provide an overall magnitude of impact for each receptor, which may be interpreted as per the indicative scales in **Table 8**.

Table 8: Landscape impact magnitude criteria (indicative)

Criteria Level	Description
Large	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total loss or large scale damage to existing character or distinctive features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic conspicuous features and elements; and/or very obvious permanent and/or long-term change in the balance of landscape characteristics over an extensive area; and/or Substantial changes to the perceptual/aesthetic qualities; and/or total or substantial loss or large scale damage to landscape elements or features which cannot be mitigated for.
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial loss or noticeable damage to existing character or distinctive features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic noticeable features and elements; and/or changes in an extensive area which whilst notable do not alter the balance of the landscape characteristics; and/or partial changes to the perceptual/aesthetic qualities; and/or

Criteria Level	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partial loss of key landscape features or elements that can be mitigated for.
Small	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely noticeable loss or damage to existing character or features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic features and elements; and/or • small short-term/reversible change in landscape character; and/or • changes to the perceptual/aesthetic qualities which would result in it remaining largely intact; and/or • small scale loss of a landscape feature or element or loss of/change to a very small proportion of an extensive feature. Changes that can be fully mitigated; and/or • the addition of new but uncharacteristic features and elements.

Assessing the significance of landscape effects

3.7.8 The overall significance of landscape effects is a combination of the sensitivity of the landscape receptor and the magnitude of the impacts. GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1) (paragraph 5.56) states that there is no definitive rule regarding what defines a significant effect, but in making the judgement it is reasonable to say that:

- major loss or irreversible negative effects, over an extensive area, on element and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspect that are key to the character of nationally valued landscape are likely to be of the greatest significance; and
- reversible negative effects of short duration, over a restricted area, on elements and/or aesthetic and perceptual aspects that contribute to but are not key characteristics of landscape value are likely to be the least significant and may depending upon the circumstance, be judged as not significant.

3.7.9 **Table 9** provides a matrix used to describe the relationship between sensitivity and magnitude of impacts, and so allow a relative level of significance of any predicted landscape effects to be categorised. The key characteristics of each significance scale can be found in

3.7.10 **Table 10.**

Table 9: Classification of effects

Sensitivity of Receptor	Magnitude of Impact			
	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
High	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Medium	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Low	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible

Table 10: Landscape significance category descriptions

Criteria Level	Description
Major Beneficial Effect	Greatly enhanced character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Creation of an iconic high quality feature and/or series of elements. Enabling of a sense of place to be created or greatly enhanced.
Moderate Beneficial Effect	Enhanced character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Enabling of the restoration of characteristic features and elements lost as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development. Enabling of a sense of place to be enhanced.
Minor Beneficial Effect	Improvement of the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Enabling of the restoration of characteristic features and elements partially lost or diminished as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development. Enabling of a sense of place to be restored.
Negligible Beneficial Effect	Complementing the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Maintenance or enhancement of characteristic features and elements. Enabling some sense of place to be restored.
Neutral Effect	Maintain the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Blend in with characteristic features and elements. Enable a sense of place to be retained.
Negligible Adverse Effect	Proposals do not quite fit the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Are at variance with characteristic features and elements. Detract from a sense of place.
Minor Adverse Effect	Proposals conflict with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Have an adverse impact on characteristic features or elements. Diminish a sense of place.
Moderate Adverse Effect	Proposals at considerable variance with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Degrade or diminish the integrity of a range of characteristic features and elements. Damage a sense of place.

Criteria Level	Description
Major Adverse Effect	Proposals at complete variance with the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Cause the integrity of characteristic features and elements to be lost. Cause a sense of place to be lost.

4. Visual Assessment Methodology

4.1 General

4.1.1 The GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1) states 'An assessment of visual effects deals with the effects of change and development on the views available to people and their visual amenity' (paragraph 6.1).

4.2 Predicting Visual Impacts

4.2.1 In predicting the impacts of the Proposed Development on the viewpoints being assessed, GLVIA3 states it is helpful to consider (but not restricted to) the following issues:

- nature of the view (full, partial or glimpsed);
- proportion of the Proposed Development visible;
- distance of the viewpoint from the Proposed Development and whether it would be the focus of the view or only a small element;
- whether the view is stationary, transient or sequential; and
- the nature of the changes to the view.

4.2.2 Additionally, the seasonal effects of vegetation are to be considered, in particular the varying degree of screening and filtering of views.

4.3 Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

4.3.1 The susceptibility of visual receptors to changes in the view and visual amenity is related to the activity they are engaged in and the extent to which their attention is focussed on the views and visual amenity at that location. As such those receptors most sensitive to change are likely to include people engaged in outdoor activities where an appreciation of the landscape is the focus or residents in areas where the landscape setting contribute to the setting of the properties.

4.3.2 Conversely, those considered least sensitive to change include (but are not restricted to) people engaged in outdoor sports or recreation where there is no focus on the surrounding landscape/views and people at their place of work where there focus is on the work activity.

4.3.3 See **Table 11** for a full description of the criteria use to assess the susceptibility of viewpoints.

Table 11: Visual susceptibility to change criteria

Criteria Level	Susceptibility to Change
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents at home. • People engaged in outdoor recreation, whose attention/interest is likely to be focused on the landscape or particular views, including strategic/popular Public Rights of Way (PRoW). • Visitors to heritage assets or other attractions, where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience. • Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents. • Travellers on scenic routes.
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travellers on road, rail, or other transport routes. • Users of local, and less used PRoW or where the attention is not focused on the landscape. • Schools and other institutional buildings and their outdoor areas, play areas.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travellers on road, rail or other transport routes not focused on the landscape/particular views e.g. on motorways and “A” road or commuter routes. • People engaged in outdoor sport/recreation which does not involve/depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape. • People at their place of work whose attention may be focused on their work/activity and not their surroundings.

Value of Views

4.3.4 In making judgements about the value of each view, the assessment should take into account the following:

- recognition of the value to a particular view (e.g. in relation to heritage assets or planning designations); and
- indicators of the value attached to views by others (e.g. in guide books, tourist maps, literary references, painting).

4.3.5 **Table 12** provides a full description of the criteria used to assess the value of the view.

Table 12: Value of View Criteria

Criteria Level	Description
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A recognised high quality view, well-frequented and/or promoted as a beauty spot/visitor destination. • A view with cultural associations (recognised in art, literature or other media). • A view which relates to the experience of other features, for example heritage assets in which landscape or visual factors are a consideration. • A view which is likely to be an important part of or primary reason for the receptors being there.
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A view, whilst it may be valued locally, is not widely recognised for its quality or has low visitor numbers. The view has no strong cultural associations. • An attractive view which is however unlikely to be the receptor's primary reason for being there.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ordinary, but not necessarily unattractive view, with no recognised quality which is unlikely to be visited specifically to experience the views available. Although the view may be appreciated by receptors, it is typically incidental to the receptor's reason for being there.

4.3.6 In combining susceptibility to change and value it is generally accepted that a combination of high susceptible and high value is likely to result in the highest sensitivity, whereas a low susceptibility and low value is likely to resulting in the lowest level of sensitivity. A summary of the likely characteristics of the different levels of sensitivity is described in **Table 13**.

4.3.7 It must be noted that these are indicative and in practice there is often not a clear distinction between criteria levels which requires professional judgement to be applied.

Table 13: Visual sensitivity criteria

Criteria Level	Description
High	<p>Typical Receptors include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents at home. • People engaged in outdoor recreation, whose attention/interest is likely to be focused on the landscape or particular views, including strategic/popular PRoW. • Visitors to heritage assets or other attractions, where views of the surroundings are a significant contributor to the experience. • Communities where views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travellers on identified scenic routes which people take to experience or enjoy the view. <p>for whom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development type would be of high incongruity in the context of the view. Susceptibility would be reduced for development of lesser incongruity.
Medium	<p>Typical Receptors include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travellers on road, rail, or other transport routes who anticipate some enjoyment of landscape as part of the journey but where the attention is not primarily focused on the landscape. • Users of local, and less used PRow or where the attention is not focused on the landscape. • Schools and other institutional buildings and their outdoor areas, play areas. <p>for whom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development type would be of medium incongruity in the context of the view. Susceptibility would be reduced for development of lesser incongruity.
Low	<p>Typical Receptors include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travellers on road, rail or other transport routes not focused on the landscape/particular views e.g. on motorways and “A” road or commuter routes. • People engaged in outdoor sport/recreation which does not involve/depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape. • People at their place of work whose attention may be focused on their work/activity and not their surroundings. <p>for whom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development type would be of low incongruity in the context of the view. Susceptibility would be reduced for development of lesser incongruity.

5. Magnitude of Visual Impacts

5.1 Overview

5.1.1 The guidance provided in GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1) (paragraph 6.38) requires that each of the following variable need to be evaluated for each of the visual impacts identified:

- size or scale of the change of view, including loss of or additional views, degree of contrast in terms of form, mass, scale, colour and texture etc;
- geographic extent in terms of angle of view, distance etc; and
- duration and reversibility in term of longevity of effects and whether reversible.

5.1.2 For the descriptions of the criteria for geographic extent, duration and reversibility refer to **Table 5**, **Table 6** and **Table 7**.

5.1.3 The size and scale of an effect is determined by considering the amount of change experienced by a receptor, based upon the indicative criteria set out in **Table 14**.

Table 14: Visual size/scale criteria

Criteria Level	Description
Large	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposed Development may result in extensive changes to the existing view (including the loss of existing characteristic features and/or introduction of new discordant landscape features); and/or • a change to an extensive proportion of the view; and/or • views where the Proposed Development would become the dominant landscape feature or contract heavily with the current scene.
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes would result in changes to the view but not fundamentally change its characteristics; and/or • changes that would be immediately visible but not be the key features of the view.
Small	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes which would not result in a change to the composition of the view; and/or • changes that would only affect a small portion of the view or introduce new features that could be screened.

5.1.4 The geographical extent of an effect is determined by the indicative criteria set out in **Table 15**. It should be noted that whether a view is at short, medium or long-range varies depending upon the type of development proposed.

Table 15: Geographical extent criteria

Criteria Level	Description
Large	Changes where the Proposed Development is located in the main focus of the view; and/or at close range; and/or over a large area.
Medium	Changes where the Proposed Development is located obliquely to the main focus of the view; and/or at medium range; and/or over a narrow area.
Small	Changes where the Proposed Development is located on the periphery of the main focus of the view; and/or at long range; and/or over a small area.

5.1.5 These four factors are then considered together to derive an overall magnitude of change for each receptor, which is determined by use of professional judgement, based on the indicative criteria set out in **Table 16**.

Table 16: Visual magnitude criteria (indicative)

Criteria Level	Description
Large	The development, or a part of it, would become the dominant and contrasting feature or focal point in the view. Little or no scope for adequate mitigation.
Medium	The development, or a part of it, would form a prominent feature or element of the view which is readily apparent to the receptor in the view. Partial mitigation is possible.
Small	The development, or a part of it, would be noticeable but not alter the overall balance of features and elements that comprise the existing view. Full mitigation is possible.

5.2 Assessing the Significance of Effects

5.2.1 The overall significance of visual effects is a combination of the sensitivity of the visual receptor and the magnitude of the visual effects. GLVIA3 (Ref 10A-1) states that there is no definitive rule regarding what defines a significant effect, but in making the judgement the following points should be considered:

- *“Effects on people who are particularly sensitive to changes on views and visual amenity are more likely to be significant”* (paragraph 6.44);
- *“Effects on people at recognised and important viewpoints or from recognised scenic routes are more likely to be significant”* (paragraph 6.44); and



- *“Large-scale changes which introduce new, non-characteristic or discordant or intrusive elements into the view are more likely to be significant than small changes or changes involving features already present within the view” (paragraph 6.44).*

5.2.2 The matrix in **Table 9** gives an approximation as to how sensitivity and magnitude can be considered together to determine whether an effect is significant or not.

5.2.3 Further clarification of the type of effects which are likely within each category can be found in **Table 17**.

Table 17: Significance of effect category

Criteria Level	Description
Major	These effects may represent key factors in the decision making process. Potentially associated with sites and features of national importance or likely to be important considerations at a regional or district scale. Major effects may relate to resources or features which are unique and which, if lost, cannot be replaced or relocated.
Moderate	These effects, if adverse, are likely to be important at a local scale and the cumulative effects of such issues may lead to an increase in the overall effects on a particular area or on a particular resource or receptor. Effects, which on their own could have a material influence on decision making and particularly so when combined with other similar effects.
Minor	These effects may be raised as local issues and may be of relevance in the detailed design of the project. In isolation, these factors are unlikely to be critical in the decision making process, however when combined with other effects, may be relevant, particularly if they lead to a cumulative adverse effect on a particular resource or receptor.
Negligible	Effects which are beneath levels of perception, within normal bounds of variation or within the margin of forecasting error. Effects which are unlikely to influence decision making, irrespective of other effects.

6. References

- Ref 10A-1 Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013). *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition*.
- Ref 10A-2 The Countryside Agency (2002) *Landscape character Assessment – Guidance for England and Scotland*