

Proposed Mallard Pass Solar Development Essendine, Rutland

Planning Inspectorate Project Ref: EN010127

Planning Inspectorate ID No: 20036230

Appendix CT-C

Landscape & Visual Effects Assessment Criteria

prepared by

Carly Tinkler BA CMLI FRSA MIALE

for

Mallard Pass Action Group and CPRE

Final

May 2023

Tables of Criteria & Matrices for Landscape & Visual Assessment

Landscape

Table 1: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Quality

Table 2: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Value

Table 3: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Susceptibility to Change

Table 4: Matrix for Evaluating Levels of Landscape Sensitivity

Table 5: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of Effect (Landscape Character)

Table 6: Matrix for Evaluating Overall Level of Landscape Effects

Visual

Table 7: Criteria for Judging Levels of Visual Value

Table 8: Criteria for Judging Levels of a Landscape's Visual Susceptibility to Change

Table 9: Criteria for Judging Levels of Visual Receptors' Susceptibility to Change

Table 10: Matrix for Evaluating Levels of Visual and Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Table 11: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of Effect (Views and Visual Amenity)

Table 12: Matrix for Determining Overall Levels of Visual Effects

Table 1: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Quality

Level of Quality	Definition
Very 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 (DMRB) • Unspoilt areas comprising a strong, clear and highly aesthetically-pleasing composition of highly characteristic landscape elements and features in excellent condition and health, 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
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very attractive landscapes which are of high value nationally and can be defined as highly scenic (DMRB) • Areas with components combined in an aesthetically pleasing composition, in very good condition and health • 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
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good landscape containing areas that, although still attractive, have less significant and more common landscape features (DMRB) • 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 and health • 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 (DMRB) • 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. Poor condition / health • Limited representation of the landscape area / type • Limited management, or care, environment in fair to poor form and health • Poor scenic integrity • Little if any sense of place

Level of Quality	Definition
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several atypical or incongruous features or detractors
Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 (DMRB) • Areas with few or no valued landscape components or comprising degraded and / or lost characteristic elements and features, making negative contribution to aesthetic composition • Poor or no representation of the landscape area / type • Little or no management, or care, environment in very poor form and health • Little or no scenic integrity • Negative sense of place • Widespread atypical or incongruous features or detractors

Table 2: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Value

Level of Value	Definition
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Outstanding’ landscapes (ELC) • 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 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
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscapes between ‘Outstanding’ and ‘Everyday’ (ELC) • 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 /

Level of Value	Definition
	<p>themed trails, well-used public rights of way, Heritage Coast, Public Open Space / Local Green Space. May be protected by / subject of planning policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important wider, or significant local Green Infrastructure assets
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Everyday' landscapes (ELC) • 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. • 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' (ELC) • 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

Level of Value	Definition
Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Degraded' landscapes (ELC) • Undesignated landscapes, and not subject of strategy and / or guidance (unless for restoration) • No areas / features of landscape, nature conservation, archaeological, historic, geological and / or other interest • Negligible or no landscape / visual function • Landscapes in very poor condition and / or of very low quality as defined by appropriate criteria – may be contaminated land. Situation likely to be permanent, and very little if any potential for improvement • No cultural associations • Poor representation of landscape area / type / characteristics • Negative aesthetic and perceptual attributes and qualities: no sense of place, high levels of landscape and visual disturbance • Widespread detractors present / dominant • The quality / qualities of, and / or features in, the landscape may discourage people from visiting • No contribution to public amenity, access and recreation • Very few or no Green Infrastructure assets

Table 3: Criteria for Judging Levels of Landscape Susceptibility to Change

Level of Susceptibility	Definition
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape is of a very large scale and / or there is a negligible level of containment, resulting in a significant degree of interaction between landform, topography, vegetation cover, field pattern and built form • There is no existing reference or context within the landscape to the type of change / development proposed • Detracting features are not present in the area • The majority of the existing landscape characteristics / elements / features of value (e.g. ancient woodland, mature / veteran trees, traditional orchards etc.) could not be replaced / substituted and their loss could not be compensated for • Very limited or no opportunities for mitigation • The landscape receptor has a very low level of ability to tolerate the nature / scale of change / development proposed: permanent serious negative consequences in terms of the maintenance of the baseline situation • The proposed change / development would not comply with relevant national planning policies, guidance, and / or strategies
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 • 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 • The proposed change / development is unlikely to comply with relevant national planning policies, guidance, and / or strategies
Moderate	<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

	<p>baseline situation without mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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
Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape is of such a small scale and / or has such a high level of containment, that there is little or no interaction between landform, topography, vegetation cover, field pattern and built form • The landscape displays the characteristics of the type of development / change proposed • Widespread detractors present which negatively influence the character and / or experience of the landscape • No landscape characteristics / elements / features of value are present • The landscape receptor has a very high level of ability to tolerate the nature / scale of change / development proposed: no concern in terms of the maintenance of the baseline situation • Change / development could result in noticeable improvements to the area • The proposed change / development is likely to comply with relevant national planning policies, guidance, and / or strategies. The site may be allocated for the type of development proposed or for restoration

Table 4: Matrix for Evaluating Levels of Landscape Sensitivity

		Level of Landscape Susceptibility to Change				
		Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
Level of Landscape Value	Very High	Very High	High to Very High	High	Medium to High	Medium
	High	High to Very High	High	Medium to High	Medium	Low to Medium
	Moderate	High	Medium to High	Medium	Low to Medium	Low
	Low	Medium to High	Medium	Low to Medium	Low	Very Low to Low
	Very Low	Medium	Low to Medium	Low	Very Low to Low	Very Low

Table 5: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of Effect (Landscape Character)

Level of Magnitude	Definition
Very Large Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major alteration to, or complete loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered very large due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components • Effects likely to be experienced at a very large scale, influencing several character areas or types • Major alteration to, or complete loss of, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of highly uncharacteristic, conspicuous elements, features and / activities, would result in major alteration to, or complete loss of, aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • The duration of effect would be considered permanent and irreversible
Large Adverse	<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 probably irreversible
Moderate Adverse	<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 characteristic 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 and very difficult to reverse in practical terms

Level of Magnitude	Definition
Small Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor 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 not 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 potentially reversible
Negligible Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely discernible alterations to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of change is considered very small due to the extent and proportion of loss of, or change to, existing landscape components • Effects likely to be experienced at a very small scale, with no influence beyond the site and its immediate surroundings on the landscape within which the change is proposed • Barely discernible alterations to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition, and / or the addition of elements, features and / activities which are entirely characteristic in the area, would result in barely discernible alteration to aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • The duration of effect may be considered temporary (i.e. short- or medium-term); but may also be long-term / permanent. Some effects potentially reversible
Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to the baseline condition, or an equal balance of negative / positive effects
Negligible Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barely discernible improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered very small due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a very small scale, with no influence beyond the site and its immediate surroundings on the landscape within which the improvement is proposed • Barely discernible improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in barely discernible improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • Some / all improvements are temporary (i.e. short- or medium-term)

Level of Magnitude	Definition
Small Beneficial	<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
Moderate Beneficial	<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
Large Beneficial	<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
Very Large Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial improvements to key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition • The size, scale and / or geographical extent of improvement is considered very large due to the extent and proportion of new landscape components • Beneficial effects likely to be experienced at a very large scale, influencing several character areas or types • Substantial improvements to existing, or addition of new, key elements, features, characteristics and functions of the baseline condition would result in substantial improvements in aesthetic and / or perceptual qualities • Improvements are permanent

Table 6: Matrix for Evaluating Overall Levels of Landscape Effects

NOTE 1: The level of Magnitude of Effect can be expressed as Adverse or Beneficial, and the overall Level of Effect can be expressed as Negative or Positive.

NOTE 2: If the Magnitude of Effect is Neutral (i.e. 'No Change'), all effects will be Neutral

		Sensitivity of Receptor				
		Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Level of Magnitude of Effect	Very Large	Substantial	Major to Substantial	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate
	Large	Major to Substantial	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Moderate to Minor
	Moderate	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor
	Small	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible
	Negligible	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible	Negligible

Table 7: Criteria for Judging Levels of Visual Value

Level of Visual Value	Criteria
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from, or towards, designated landscapes and / or features of international and national importance (e.g. World Heritage Sites, National Parks, AONBs, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Monuments, Grade I or II* Listed Buildings etc.) especially where contributing to the significance of an asset / feature • View is of outstanding scenic beauty and very high quality • View makes a highly important contribution to understanding of landscape function / contribution • Likely to be the subject of planning policy and / or guidance / protected views • Views from landscapes / viewpoints within highly popular visitor attractions / tourist destinations, and / or from national trails, used by very large numbers of people • Views with social / cultural / historic associations (e.g. in art and literature, or an historically-important vista over a battlefield) of international / national importance
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from within, or towards, designated landscapes and / or features of regional or countywide importance (e.g. Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), Country Parks, Conservation Areas, Grade II listed buildings, National Trust land etc.), especially where contributing to the significance of an asset / feature • View is of high scenic beauty and high quality • View makes an important contribution to understanding of landscape function / contribution • Views from well-used and popular visitor attractions / tourist destinations, including long-distance / themed trails, Heritage Coasts, Public Open Spaces / Local Green Spaces, used by relatively large numbers of people • Views with social / cultural / historic associations of countywide importance • Views in which receptors have a proprietary interest, including people living in residential properties
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from within, or towards, undesignated landscapes and / or features of local importance • View is of moderate scenic beauty and moderate quality • View makes a moderate contribution to understanding of landscape function / contribution • Views from locally-popular recreation areas / green open spaces / public rights of way, but not used by many visitors • Views with social / cultural / historic associations of local importance
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from within, or towards, undesignated landscapes and / or features of site-wide importance • View is of low scenic beauty and low quality • View makes a very limited contribution to understanding of landscape function / contribution • Views from landscapes / viewpoints which are not particularly popular or recognised as being destinations in their own right, including infrequently used rights of way • Views with no social / cultural / historic associations

Very Low

- Views from, or towards, undesignated landscapes and / or features of no importance
- View is of poor scenic beauty / quality - landscape may be permanently degraded

Table 8: Criteria for Judging Levels of a Landscape's Visual Susceptibility to Change

Level of Visual Sensitivity	Definition
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly visible in wider area • Forms part of exceptional / iconic / very highly valued views • Internationally / nationally important visual function (context, setting, gateway, gap, screen, buffer, transition zone, skyline, panorama, vista, focal point, cultural association etc.) • Very open to public or private views of the countryside or open space which are significant • Development would create unacceptable visual intrusion into the wider landscape that almost certainly could not be mitigated
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visible in wider area • Highly visible in local area • Forms part of wider important / highly valued views • Forms part of views of significant local value • Important wider visual function • Significant local visual function • Very open to public or private views of the countryside or open space which are of wider importance • Development would be uncharacteristically conspicuous in the wider area and mitigation unlikely to reduce adverse effects • Development would create unacceptable visual intrusion into the local landscape that almost certainly could not be mitigated
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not visible from wider area or of no influence • Locally visible but limited influence • Views are of some wider importance but there is scope for mitigating potential adverse visual effects • Locally highly-valued views • Limited wider visual function • Important local visual function • Partially open to public or private views of the countryside or open space which are of wider importance • Open to views public or private views of the countryside or open space which are of local importance • Development likely to be perceptible in the wider area but would not significantly alter the balance of features or elements within the existing view • Development would be uncharacteristically conspicuous in the local area and mitigation unlikely to reduce adverse effects

Level of Visual Sensitivity	Definition
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not visible from wider area • Limited local visibility • Views of limited importance • Development could be integrated into the land- / town- / villagescape although possibly only with mitigation • Site is fairly well-screened from public and private views • Development may be discernible in the wider area but would not result in loss of, or change to, important views or wider visual amenity • Development likely to be perceptible in the local area but would not significantly alter the balance of features or elements within the existing view
Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not visible from wider area • Little or no local visibility • Views of little or no importance • Development would not lead to unacceptable visual intrusion into the landscape, or adverse effects on the settlement, with or without mitigation • Site is very well-screened from public and private views • Development would not be discernible or would enhance views or existing visual amenity

Table 9: Criteria for Judging Levels of Visual Receptors' Susceptibility to Change

Level of Susceptibility	Criteria
Very 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 nationally-designated routes where the view is likely to be the focus of attention
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptors (tourists / visitors) within, or looking towards, landscapes, areas and features with regional / countywide designations e.g. Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), Country Parks, Conservation Areas, Grade II listed buildings, National Trust land etc. and other places (such as Open Access Land) where the landscape / feature is part of the reason for the visit • People using long-distance footpaths / scenic routes / themed trails / 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 living in residential properties • Communities living in areas where the landscape setting makes a highly important contribution to visual amenity
Moderate	<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 using local public rights of way / 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
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 • People using main roads, rail corridors, infrequently used / inaccessible public rights of way and likely to be travelling for a purpose other than to enjoy the view
Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Table 10: Matrix for Evaluating Levels of Visual and Visual Receptor Sensitivity

		Level of Visual Susceptibility to Change				
		Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
Level of Visual Value	Very High	Very High	High to Very High	High	Medium to High	Medium
	High	High to Very High	High	Medium to High	Medium	Low to Medium
	Moderate	High	Medium to High	Medium	Low to Medium	Low
	Low	Medium to High	Medium	Low to Medium	Low	Very Low to Low
	Very Low	Medium	Low to Medium	Low	Very Low to Low	Very Low

Table 11: Criteria for Judging Levels of Magnitude of Effect (Views & Visual Amenity)

Level of Magnitude	Definition
Very Large Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and substantial deterioration in, or a significant and substantial change to, a very large proportion of the existing view • Complete loss of, or substantial change to, site's visual function / contribution • The change may be noticeable over a large geographical area, or substantial over a more limited area • Development, or a large part of it, would be a dominant new component and / or focus in the view, and would have a strongly-defining influence on it • The duration of effect would be considered permanent and irreversible
Large Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would cause a highly noticeable deterioration in, or a highly noticeable change to, a large proportion of the existing view, or significant deterioration in or a significant change to a smaller proportion of the existing view • Noticeable loss of, or change to, site's visual function / contribution • Development, or a large part of it, would be a significant new component and / or focus in the view, and would have a defining influence on it • The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent and probably irreversible
Moderate Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would cause a visible deterioration in, or change to, a large proportion of the existing view, or highly noticeable deterioration in, or change to, a smaller proportion of the existing view • Partial loss of, or change to, site's visual function / contribution • Development appears at odds with local landscape character and would form an apparent element within local views • The duration of effect would be considered long-term / permanent and very difficult to reverse in practical terms
Small Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would cause a small deterioration in, or change to, a large proportion of the existing view, or a visible deterioration in, or change to, a smaller proportion of the existing view • Small change to site's visual function / contribution • 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 potentially reversible
Negligible Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would cause a barely-perceptible deterioration in, or change to, the existing view • Barely-perceptible change to site's visual function / contribution • The duration of effect may be considered temporary (i.e. short- or medium-term); but if long-term / permanent, effects potentially reversible (and may be likely to happen)
Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to the existing view, or equal balance of negative and positive effects

Level of Magnitude	Definition
Negligible Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in a barely-discernible improvement in the existing view • Improvements are temporary (i.e. short- or medium-term)
Small Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in a small improvement in a large proportion of the existing view, or a noticeable improvement to a smaller proportion of the existing view • Small improvement to site's visual function / contribution • Development would improve a small part of the view • Improvements are long-term / permanent
Moderate Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in a noticeable improvement to a large proportion of the existing view, or locally-important improvement to a smaller proportion of the existing view • Improvements are long-term / permanent
Large Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in an important improvement to a large proportion of the existing view, or significant improvement to a smaller proportion of the existing view • Improvements are long-term / permanent
Very Large Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would result in a significant improvement to a large proportion of the existing view • Improvements are permanent

Table 12: Matrix for Determining Overall Levels of Visual Effects

NOTE 1: The level of Magnitude of Effect can be expressed as Adverse or Beneficial, and the overall Level of Effect can be expressed as Negative or Positive.

NOTE 2: If the Magnitude of Effect is Neutral (i.e. 'No Change'), all effects will be Neutral

		Sensitivity of Receptor				
		Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Level of Magnitude of Effect	Very Large	Substantial	Major to Substantial	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate
	Large	Major to Substantial	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Moderate to Minor
	Moderate	Major	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor
	Small	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible
	Negligible	Moderate	Moderate to Minor	Minor	Minor to Negligible	Negligible