



A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross Environmental Statement

Volume 6 Document Ref 6.4 ES Appendix 7.1 Landscape and visual assessment criteria

HA551502-ARP-ELS-SW-RP-LE-000002 C01 | A3 22/08/18

Planning Act 2008 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended) APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Table of Contents

		Pages
7 Appei	ndix 7.1	i
7.1	Typical assessment Criteria	i
Table of T	Tables	
Table 7-1	Landscape sensitivity and typical examples	İ
Table 7-2	Magnitude of landscape change	ii
Table 7-3	Significance of landscape effects	ii
Table 7-4	Sensitivity of visual receptors	iii
Table 7-5	Magnitude of change to views	iv
Table 7-6	Significance of visual effects	iv
Table 7-7	Significance of effect categories	V

7 Appendix 7.1

7.1 Typical assessment Criteria

- 7.1.1 For details of the assessment methodology and how it has been applied please refer to Volume 6 Document Ref 6.2 ES Chapter 7 of the main report.
- 7.1.2 Please note that the criteria below are taken from DMRB IAN135/10 and are typical examples. In reality, the nature of receptors and proposed changes may vary such that they fit into other sensitivity or magnitude categories. Where this is the case the judgements made and justification for each assessment is provided in the respective columns in Tables 7.8 7.10 below.

 Table 7-1
 Landscape sensitivity and typical examples

Visual receptor sensitivity	Typical definition
High	Landscapes which by nature of their character would be unable to
	accommodate change of the type proposed. Typically, these would be;
	Of high quality with distinctive elements and features making a positive contribution to character and sense of place.
	Likely to be designated, but the aspects which underpin such value may also be present outside designated areas, especially at the local scale.
	Areas of special recognised value through use, perception or historic and cultural associations.
	Likely to contain features and elements that are rare and could not be replaced.
Moderate	Landscapes which by nature of their character would be able to partly
	accommodate change of the type proposed. Typically, these would be;
	Comprised of commonplace elements and features creating generally unremarkable character but with some sense of place.
	locally designated, or their value may be expressed through non-statutory local publications.
	Containing some features of value through use, perception or historic and cultural associations.
	Likely to contain some features and elements that could not be replaced.
Low	Landscapes which by nature of their character would be able to
	accommodate change of the type proposed. Typically, these would be;
	Comprised of some features and elements that are discordant, derelict or in decline, resulting in indistinct character with little or no sense of place. Not designated.
	Containing few, if any, features of value through use, perception or historic and cultural associations.
	Likely to contain few, if any, features and elements that could not be replaced.

 Table 7-2
 Magnitude of landscape change

Visual magnitude of effect	Typical definition
Major adverse	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.
Moderate adverse	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.
Minor adverse	Slight loss or damage to existing character or features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic features and elements.
Negligible adverse	Barely noticeable loss or damage to existing character or features and elements, and/or the addition of new but uncharacteristic features and elements.
No change	No noticeable loss, damage or alteration to character or features or elements.
Negligible beneficial	Barely noticeable improvement of character by the restoration of existing features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic features and elements, or by the addition of new characteristic elements.
Minor beneficial	Slight improvement of character by the restoration of existing features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic features and elements, or by the addition of new characteristic elements.
Moderate beneficial	Partial or noticeable improvement of character by the restoration of existing features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic and noticeable features and elements, or by the addition of new characteristic features.
Major beneficial	Large scale improvement of character by the restoration of features and elements, and/or the removal of uncharacteristic and conspicuous features and elements, or by the addition of new distinctive features.

 Table 7-3
 Significance of landscape effects

Significance	Typical descriptors of effect
Very Large Beneficial (Positive) Effect	The project would: Greatly enhance the character (including quality and value) of the landscape Create an iconic high quality feature and/or series of elements. Enable a sense of place to be created or greatly enhanced.
Large Beneficial (Positive) Effect	The project would: Enhance the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Enable the restoration of characteristic features and elements lost as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development. Enable a sense of place to be enhanced.
Moderate Beneficial (Positive) Effect	The project would: Improve the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Enable the restoration of characteristic features and elements partially lost or diminished as a result of changes from inappropriate management or development. Enable a sense of place to be restored.
Slight Beneficial (Positive) Effect	The project would: Complement the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Maintain or enhance characteristic features and elements.

Significance	Typical descriptors of effect		
	Enable some sense of place to be restored.		
Neutral effect	The project would: 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.		
Slight adverse (negative) effect	The project would: Not quite fit the character (including quality and value) of the landscape. Be at variance with characteristic features and elements. Detract from a sense of place.		
Moderate adverse (negative) effect	The project would: 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		
Large adverse (negative) effect	The project would: Be 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.		
Very large adverse (negative) effect	The project would: Be 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.		

Table 7-4 Sensitivity of visual receptors

Visual	Typical definition
receptor sensitivity	
High	Residential properties.
	Users of PRoW and other recreational trails (e.g. national trails, footpaths, bridleways). Users of recreational facilities where the purpose of that recreation is enjoyment of the countryside (e.g. Country Parks, National Trust or other access land).
Moderate	Outdoor workers.
	Users of scenic roads, railways or waterways or users of designated tourist routes.
	Schools and other institutional buildings and their outdoor areas.
Low	Indoor workers.
	Users of main roads (e.g. trunk roads) or passengers in public transport on main arterial routes.
	Users of recreational facilities where the purpose of that recreation is not related to the view (e.g. sports facilities).

Table 7-5 Magnitude of change to views

Visual magnitude of effect	Typical definition		
Major	The project, or a part of it, would become the dominant feature or focal point of the view.		
Moderate	The project, or a part of it, would form a noticeable feature or element of the view that is readily apparent to the receptor.		
Minor	The project, or a part of it, would be perceptible but not alter the overall balance of features and elements that comprise the existing view.		
Negligible	Only a very small part of the project would be discernible, or it is at such a distance that it would form a barely noticeable feature or element of the view.		
No Change	No part of the project, or work or activity associated with it is discernible.		

Table 7-6 Significance of visual effects

Significance	Typical descriptors of effect		
Very large beneficial	The project would create an iconic new feature that would greatly enhance the view.		
Large beneficial	The project would lead to a major improvement in a view from a highly sensitive receptor.		
Moderate beneficial	The proposals would cause obvious improvement to a view from a moderately sensitive receptor, or perceptible improvement to a view from a more sensitive receptor.		
Slight beneficial	The project would cause limited improvement to a view from a receptor of medium sensitivity, or would cause greater improvement to a view from a receptor of low sensitivity.		
Neutral	No perceptible change in the view. Or positive and beneficial effects balance each other out.		
Slight adverse	The project would cause limited deterioration to a view from a receptor of medium sensitivity, or cause greater deterioration to a view from a receptor of low sensitivity.		
Moderate adverse	The project would cause obvious deterioration to a view from a moderately sensitive receptor, or perceptible damage to a view from a more sensitive receptor.		
Large adverse	The project would cause major deterioration to a view from a highly sensitive receptor, and would constitute a major discordant element in the view.		
Very large adverse	The project would cause the loss of views from a highly sensitive receptor, and would constitute a dominant discordant feature in the view.		

Table 7-7 Significance of effect categories

		Magnitude of impact				
		No change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
SENSITIVITY	High	Neutral	Slight	Slight/Moderate	Moderate/Large	Large/Very Large
	Moderate	Neutral	Neutral/Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate/Large
S	Low	Neutral	Neutral/Slight	Neutral/Slight	Slight	Slight/Moderate

