

APPENDIX 1

HBA Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) Methodology (Non-EIA)

HBA Landscape and Visual Appraisal Methodology (non-EIA)

- A1.1 The methodology used for the accompanying appraisal of landscape and visual effects is based on the guidance set out in the third edition of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3) by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment in April 2013. The guidance sets out some differences between works carried out as part of an EIA and non-EIA work, although the approach to both is essentially the same. Assessment work carried out for non-EIA projects is referred to as a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA).
- A1.2 GLVIA3 states that the role of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is to “consider the effects of development on the landscape as a resource in its own right and the effects on views and visual amenity”. GLVIA3 refers to landscape in accordance with the definition adopted by the Council of Europe the European Landscape Convention 2002 i.e., “an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and / or human factors”. The Convention is all encompassing, referring to natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas, including land, inland water and marine areas and includes “landscapes that might be considered outstanding as well as everyday or degraded landscapes”. Its main thrust is landscape protection.
- A1.3 Set out below are tables containing the criteria used within the appraisal. The tables are:
- Table 1** Landscape Condition
 - Table 2** Landscape Receptor Value
 - Table 3** Landscape Susceptibility
 - Table 4** Magnitude of Landscape Effects – Thresholds
 - Table 5** Visual Value
 - Table 6** Susceptibility of Visual Receptors -Thresholds
 - Table 7** Magnitude of Visual Effects – Thresholds
 - Table 8** Hierarchy of Landscape and Visual Sensitivity
 - Table 9** Importance of Effects Thresholds - Landscape or Visual Effects
- A1.4 Despite the tables, it should be noted that there is necessarily scope for professional judgements to be made. The tables are there to clarify and support the appraisal, not solely as a mechanism to be applied in their own right irrespective of professional judgement. In this regard GLVIA3 stresses the need to avoid a formulaic approach to appraisal, also noting the need for proportionality, focus on likely significant effects and focus on what is likely to be important to the competent authority’s decision.
- A1.5 Landscape and visual effects are related subject areas but are considered separately. Landscape effects derive from changes in the natural and built environments which may give rise to changes in their fabric, character and quality and how these are experienced. Visual effects relate to the changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of a development proposal.
- A1.6 Effects can be positive (beneficial), negative (adverse) and are sometimes neutral. Proposals frequently include both beneficial and adverse elements. These are taken into account in determining the ranking of effect recorded in the assessment. Neutral effects may most frequently occur where the change is very limited. A neutral effect may also occur where a visual change may be very discernible but is considered no better or worse than what it replaced having regard to the context of the view, or where the beneficial elements are considered to be balanced by the adverse elements.

A1.7 The landscape and visual appraisals undertaken as part of this study have involved a combination of desktop study and field surveys with subsequent analysis and assessment, summarised below:

A1.8 Establishing the landscape/townscape and visual baseline:

- A review of relevant background data (including salient drawings and reports forming part of the planning application, planning policies, designations, OS and historic mapping, aerial photography and published Landscape Character Assessments, Studies and other relevant evidence base supporting documents).
- Field surveys of the site and surrounding area and inspection of publicly accessible views with consideration of private views for groups of properties and broad locations based upon the nearest available public location alongside professional judgement. Representative photographs will be taken during field work and will be presented in the LVIA in accordance with current best practice guidance from the Landscape Institute (currently under review). Where available, digital Zone of Theoretical mapping would have been generated prior to field surveys and this will be inspected and reviewed on the ground.
- Evaluation of the features and components of the landscape and their contribution to the landscape character, context and setting, based on the above desktop study and field work.
- Evaluation of the potential area in which the development may be visible, considering people (visual receptors) who may experience views, viewpoints and the nature of views based upon the above desktop study and field work.
- The landscape and visual baseline is based upon the site as it was at the time the appraisal is undertaken but, where appropriate, taking into account committed development and / or development allocations not yet implemented, where appropriate including a cumulative appraisal.

A1.9 Design: input into the ongoing design scheme as part of an iterative assessment and design process, reviewing initial design proposals and considering and advising upon mitigation options to avoid, reduce, or offset adverse landscape and visual effects and maximise opportunities for landscape integration and enhancement.

A1.10 Appraisal of landscape/townscape effects:

- Identification of the components of the landscape that are likely to be affected by the scheme (landscape receptors), such as overall character and any key characteristics, individual elements or features, and specific aesthetic or perceptual aspects.
- Review the design proposals and any mitigation measures proposed to avoid, reduce or offset significant adverse effects.
- Analysis of the development proposals and consideration of the potential landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development on landscape receptors.
- Appraisal of the sensitivity of the landscape to the changes likely to arise from the development, combining judgements about:
 - The value attached to the landscape receptor; and
 - the susceptibility of the receptor to the type of change arising.
- Appraisal of the magnitude of effect, made up of judgements about:
 - the size and scale of the effect;

- the geographical extent of the area that will be affected; and
- the duration of the effect and its reversibility*.
- Appraisal of the importance of the effect on the landscape, (taking into consideration the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of effect) at Winter Day 1 (or winter during construction whichever is the 'worse case') and Summer Year 10 or Year 15.

A1.11 Appraisal of visual effects:

- Identification of the likely visual effects of the development on visual receptors (people). Unless specifically instructed to do so, individual residential receptors will not be considered although comments may be included to summarise properties likely to be exposed to visual change.
- Appraisal of the sensitivity of visual receptors to the changes likely to arise from the development, combining judgements about:
 - The value attached to views; and
 - the susceptibility of the receptor to the type of change arising and the value attached to views).
- Consideration of the design proposals and mitigation measures proposed to avoid, reduce or offset significant adverse effects.
- Appraisal of the magnitude of effect, made up of judgements about:
 - the size and scale of the effect,
 - the geographical extent of the area that will be affected; and
 - the duration of the effect and its reversibility*.
- Appraisal of the importance of visual effects (taking into consideration the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of effect) at Winter Day 1 (or winter during construction whichever is the 'worse case') and Summer Year 10 or Year 15.
- View lengths: Close to short distance 0m -100m, Middle distance 100m-500m, Long distance 500m-1500m, Very long distance 1500m+.

* Unless stated otherwise in the appraisal projects are usually assumed to be irreversible.

A1.12 In the accompanying appraisal, adverse effects ranked as **Moderate** or above are considered to be potentially determining landscape or visual issues, particularly where combined with other similar rankings.

A1.13 Unless noted otherwise, definitions are those contained in GLVIA3.

Assumptions / Limitations

- A1.14 Where adverse effects have been predicted to reduce over time on account of proposed mitigation planting, it has been assumed that the planting will be subject to appropriate long-term management and maintenance so that the mitigation scheme establishes and performs the mitigation role identified.
- A1.15 Unless noted otherwise in the appraisal, the Day 1 effects reported exclude any allowance for mitigation by planting unless advance planting has been carried out, but they will include allowance for screening measures such as land raising, fencing and walls as may be appropriate.
- A1.16 Other key assumptions or limitations that have been made in undertaking the accompanying appraisal are set out in the body of the LVA report.

TABLE 1 – Landscape Condition (Quality)

TYPICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR LANDSCAPE CONDITION	CONDITION
EG: A landscape, including topographic form, features, pattern and visual attributes, that is in substantially unchanged / intact form as evidenced by reference to early historic mapping or other evidence. It will be likely to be well managed in a way that is sympathetic to its landscape type and form. It may be either representative or rare and could form part of a wider tract sharing the same or similar attributes. Does not require restoration.	Very Good ↕ Good
EG: A landscape, including topographic form, features, pattern and visual attributes, that is in generally unchanged / intact form as evidenced by reference to early historic mapping or other evidence. It will be likely to be managed in a way that is broadly sympathetic to its landscape type and form. It may not be either representative or rare and could form part of a wider tract sharing the same or similar attributes. Would / might benefit from modest restoration.	↕ Ordinary ↕ Low
EG: A landscape, including topographic form, features, pattern and visual attributes, that is in generally substantially changed / fragmented / heavily eroded form as evidenced by reference to early historic mapping or other evidence. It will be managed in a way that may be unsympathetic to its landscape type and form or it may be unmanaged. It may not be either representative or rare or form part of a wider tract sharing the same or similar attributes. Requires landscape creation and /or restoration.	↕ Poor ↕ Very Poor

TABLE 2 - Landscape Receptor Value

TYPICAL LANDSCAPE RECEPTOR VALUE (to be read in conjunction with GLVIA Box 5.1 and TGN 02/21)	TYPICAL VALUE
EG: important components or particularly distinctive positive character and may be susceptible to relatively small changes. Usually all National Parks / AONB's and some areas with County / District notations and some Conservation Areas and settings of some Listed Buildings. May also be undesignated land. Probably only very limited minor detracting features. Landscape components may be nationally rare whilst locally abundant or locally rare but nationally abundant. Landscape condition likely to be good or very good. Likely to have specific biodiversity interest. Commonly would have significant literary or other cultural associations and high recreational value.	Exceptional* ↕ High Value ↕
EG: an area of moderately positive characteristics and possibly reasonably tolerant of changes, occasionally parts of AONB's, Conservation Areas and settings of some Listed Buildings, usually County / District notations, and with few detracting features. May also be undesignated land. Landscape components not rare either nationally or locally. Landscape condition likely to be fair or good. Likely to have some biodiversity interest. May have significant literary or other cultural associations and good recreational value.	Medium Value ↕
EG: A relatively unimportant area, weak landscape structure or character, the nature of which is potentially tolerant of substantial change and probably has frequent detracting features. Usually undesignated land. Landscape components common nationally and locally. Landscape condition likely to be fair to poor. Likely to have relatively poor biodiversity interest. Unlikely to have significant literary or cultural associations. Some recreational value.	Low Value ↕
EG: A degraded landscape structure, characteristic landscape patterns and combinations of landform and landcover are masked by land use. Landscape components common nationally and locally. Landscape condition likely to be poor. Likely to have poor biodiversity interest. Unlikely to have literary or cultural associations. Little or no recreational value.	Poor Value
* In this instance the site does not lie in an area of exceptional value, thus this value ranking is not referenced in subsequent Tables.	

TABLE 3 - Landscape Susceptibility

TYPICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR LANDSCAPE SUSCEPTIBILITY	TYPICAL SUSCEPTIBILITY
EG: A landscape, including topographic form, features and visual attributes, that would be unlikely to accommodate the specific proposed development without undue negative consequences including such issues such as being out of scale and out of character. Effective, in character, mitigation would be difficult to achieve, would be very unlikely to enhance.	High
	↑↓
EG: A landscape, including topographic form, features and visual attributes, that would be reasonably able to accommodate the specific proposed development without negative consequences including such issues such as in scale and character which and would not therefore be wholly out of character. Effective, in character, mitigation would be possible, but results may take time to be effective and exceptionally might give rise to an element of enhancement.	Medium
	↑↓
EG: A landscape, including topographic form, features and visual attributes, that would be likely to be able to accommodate the specific proposed development with not more than very minor negative consequences including such issues such as being in scale and character which and would therefore not be out of character. If required, effective, in character, mitigation would be readily achievable and could enhance.	Low

TABLE 4 - Magnitude of Landscape Effects – Thresholds

MAGNITUDE OF LANDSCAPE EFFECTS (Day 1 - excluding proposed "soft" mitigation)	MAGNITUDE
EG: Total loss or major alteration to key elements / features characteristics of the baseline i.e. predevelopment landscape and / or introduction of elements considered to be totally uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the wider receiving landscape.	High Adverse
	↑↓
EG: Partial loss of or alteration to one or more key elements / features / characteristics of the baseline i.e. predevelopment landscape and /or introduction of elements that may be prominent and may be considered to be substantially uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the wider receiving landscape.	Medium Adverse
	↑↓
EG: Minor loss of or alteration to one or more key elements / features / characteristics of the baseline i.e. predevelopment landscape and /or introduction of elements that may not be uncharacteristic when set within the attributes of the wider receiving landscape.	Low Adverse
	↑↓
EG: Very minor loss of or alteration to one or more key elements / features / characteristics of the baseline i.e. predevelopment landscape and /or introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic with the surrounding landscape.	Minimal / No change
	↑↓
EG: Very minor introduction of one or more key elements / features / characteristics of the baseline i.e. predevelopment landscape and /or introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic with the surrounding landscape.	Low Beneficial
	↑↓
EG: Moderate introduction of one or more key elements / features / characteristics of the baseline i.e. predevelopment landscape and /or introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic with the surrounding landscape.	Medium Beneficial
	↑↓
EG: Substantial introduction of one or more key elements / features / characteristics of the baseline i.e. predevelopment landscape and /or introduction of elements that are not uncharacteristic with the surrounding landscape.	High Beneficial

TABLE 5 - Visual Value

TYPICAL VISUAL RECEPTOR VALUES	TYPICAL VALUE
EG: A recognised view within, towards or across a designated landscape or heritage asset, or locally important feature of key importance to defining or appreciating the local context. Historic or published viewpoints either identified in published guidebooks or literature. Views from most rural public rights of way in such locations noted above. Views from private residences may fall into this category.	High ↑↓
EG: A view within, towards or across a locally important landscape or heritage feature, or important to defining or appreciating the local context. Viewpoints either identified in published local guidebooks or literature. Views from private residences may fall into this category.	Medium ↑↓
EG: A view of little intrinsic merit in the local context and does not add to an appreciation of the locality. Views from some public rights of way in such locations noted above. Views from private residences may fall into this category.	Low

TABLE 6 – Susceptibility of Visual Receptors – typical thresholds

TYPICAL DESCRIPTION	TYPICAL SUSCEPTIBILITY
EG. Visitors to nationally or international designated landscape, particularly at specific viewpoints or viewing places, where views of the landscape are fundamental to the experience. People engaged in specific activities for enjoyment of dark skies.	Very high
EG. Residents at home. Visitors to tourist hotspots, heritage assts or other attractions where views of the landscape are important to the experience. People engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention or interest is likely to be focused on the landscape and on particular views, for example those on rural rights of way or using promoted walking and cycling routes. People travelling along promoted scenic routes.	High
EG. People engaged in outdoor recreation or travelling along public rights of way or local roads, which are not promoted routes but where an appreciation of the surrounding landscape may be relevant to the experience. People working outdoors.	Medium
EG. People engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not involve or depend upon appreciation of views of the landscape. People travelling on major road, rail or other transport routes which are not recognised as scenic routes.	Low
EG. People working indoors.	Very Low

TABLE 7 - Magnitude of Visual Effect – Thresholds

RANK	MAGNITUDE OF VISUAL EFFECT (Day 1 - excluding proposed "soft" mitigation)
High ↓	EG: the majority of viewers affected / major change(s) in open direct close view or notable change in more distant view. Could be either adverse or beneficial.
Medium ↓	EG: many viewers affected / moderate change(s) in view, could be some fragmentation of view or sequence of views. Could be either adverse or beneficial.
Low ↓	EG: few viewers affected / minor change(s) in view or very small changes in wide scale / panoramic view or oblique / fragmented views etc. Could be either adverse or beneficial or possibly neutral.
No/ Minimal	EG: few viewers affected / change(s) in view barely discernible. Could be either adverse or beneficial but usually neutral.

TABLE 8 - Hierarchy of Landscape/Townscape and Visual Sensitivity

LANDSCAPE / TOWNSCAPE SENSITIVITY or VISUAL SENSITIVITY			
Value	Susceptibility*		
	Low	Medium	High
High	Medium	Medium high	High
Medium	Medium low	Medium	Medium high
Low	Low	Medium low	Medium
Poor	Minimal / Low	Low / Medium low	Medium low
Refer to text for rankings of visual susceptibility of receptors adopted in this case			

TABLE 9 - Importance of Effects Thresholds – Landscape/Townscape or Visual effects

IMPORTANCE OF LANDSCAPE or VISUAL EFFECTS			
MAGNITUDE OF EFFECT	LANDSCAPE / TOWNSCAPE SENSITIVITY OR VISUAL SENSITIVITY		
	Low	Medium	High
High	Moderate Effect	Moderate / Substantial Effect	Substantial Effect
Medium	Slight Effect	Moderate Effect	Moderate / Substantial Effect
Low	Minimal / Slight Effect	Slight Effect	Moderate Effect
No / Minimal Change	No Effect	No / Minimal Effect	No / Minimal / Slight Effect
Substantial adverse or beneficial effect - where the proposal would cause a very significant deterioration or improvement in the landscape resource or visual appearance. Could be a determining issue in its own right. Moderate adverse or beneficial effect - where the proposal would cause a noticeable and clear deterioration or improvement in the landscape resource or visual appearance. Could be a determining issue, especially where combined with other similar rankings. Slight adverse or beneficial effect - where the proposal would cause a perceptible but small deterioration or improvement in the landscape resource or visual appearance. Unlikely to be a determining issue in its own right but will contribute to other landscape and / or visual effects in terms of overall effect. Minimal adverse or beneficial effect - where the proposal would cause a barely perceptible deterioration or improvement in the landscape resource or visual appearance. Can be regarded as "de minimis" or "not material" and may thus be regarded as neutral. The colour coding of effects identifies the most important levels of effect.			