

LAND AT FORMER HOOK ESTATE & KENNELS, NORTHAW

Addendum to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

JSL4303_171
Land at Former Hook Estate
and Kennels, Northaw
V1
April 2024

REPORT

Document status

Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
V1	Issue	PH	MW/PE	CT	22/23.04.24

Approval for issue

Craig Thomson

This report was prepared by **RPS Consulting Services Ltd** ('RPS') within the terms of its engagement and in direct response to a scope of services. This report is strictly limited to the purpose and the facts and matters stated in it and does not apply directly or indirectly and must not be used for any other application, purpose, use or matter. In preparing the report, RPS may have relied upon information provided to it at the time by other parties. RPS accepts no responsibility as to the accuracy or completeness of information provided by those parties at the time of preparing the report. The report does not take into account any changes in information that may have occurred since the publication of the report. If the information relied upon is subsequently determined to be false, inaccurate or incomplete then it is possible that the observations and conclusions expressed in the report may have changed. RPS does not warrant the contents of this report and shall not assume any responsibility or liability for loss whatsoever to any third party caused by, related to or arising out of any use or reliance on the report howsoever. No part of this report, its attachments or appendices may be reproduced by any process without the written consent of RPS. All enquiries should be directed to RPS.

Prepared by:

RPS

Prepared for:

Swing Ltd

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT.....	3
3	BASELINE ENVIRONMENT.....	6
4	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION.....	12
5	ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS.....	13
6	CONCLUSIONS.....	22
7	REFERENCES.....	23
	APPENDIX A: LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY.....	25

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 RPS has been commissioned by Swing Ltd to prepare an addendum to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (Doc No. JSL4303_170), which accompanied an outline planning application for a proposed extra care facility (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Proposed Development’) on the former Hook Estate and Kennels site, Northaw, near Potters Bar, Hertfordshire. The addendum has been prepared in response to a report prepared by Wyn Williams Associates (WWA) on behalf of Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council (WHBC), which included a review of the LVIA.
- 1.2 The WWA report considers that the LVIA prepared by RPS, *“underestimates the likely effects of the proposed development on landscape character and visual amenity”* (see Section 4.1, paragraph 6). It cites some omissions from the LVIA Methodology, including a lack of consideration of susceptibility, as reasons why the magnitude of change and significance of effect of the proposed development on the receiving landscape may be different to that stated in the LVIA. Albeit at section 4.2, paragraph 8, WWA state that they disagree with the *“stated changes that have been highlighted in the”* LVIA with respect to its potential landscape effects..
- 1.3 On further review of the WWA document, it states (Section 4.3, paragraph 1), that *“the LVIA provides an accurate description and assessment of most predicted changes to visual amenity.”* However, WWA state that they disagree with the conclusions in the LVIA with respect to views for users of the public right of way (Hook Lane) to the west of the Site, stating that the LVIA has concluded a ‘Negligible’ adverse significance of effect upon views for users of the route, whereas WWA conclude that these potential effects would be Minor adverse at both winter Year 1 and summer Year 15. In fact, the LVIA has assessed potential effects upon views from four separate locations on this route, and does not provide an overall assessment of potential effects upon views for users of the route, which is a bridleway in the main. Representative viewpoints 4, 5, 6 and 7 in the LVIA are from this bridleway. Potential effects upon views for users of this route would vary between Moderate adverse significance of effect at winter Year 1 at the location of representative viewpoint 5 to Minor and Negligible adverse at the position of representative viewpoint 6 and 7 respectively. During summer (including Year 15), potential effects are assessed as either Negligible adverse or No Change (see paragraphs 5.29 to 5.32 of the LVIA). We would, however, agree, that this is a minor misunderstanding and consider that WWA generally concur with the findings of the assessment of potential effects upon views and visual amenity. As such, this addendum focusses on the potential

landscape effects of the proposed development where a clear difference of opinion has been stated.

Assessment Methodology

- 1.4 The detailed methodology used for this assessment is set out at Appendix A. It is largely the same as that used in the LVIA. However, in order to address the comments in the WWA report, it was necessary to add a set of criteria to define susceptibility of the receiving landscape, which is assessed as ‘High’, ‘Medium’ or ‘Low’. This has also required some adjustments to the criteria used for assessing landscape value and sensitivity in the LVIA, including reducing the assessment of landscape value to a similar three-point scale of ‘High’, ‘Medium’ and ‘Low’ (a four point scale was used in the LVIA) and adding a further criterion to the assessment of landscape sensitivity to more fully cover susceptibility. Landscape sensitivity, however, has continued to be assessed using a three-point scale as it was in the LVIA. As such, value, susceptibility and sensitivity are all now assessed using a similar three-point scale.

- 1.5 In response to comments in the WWA report, baseline descriptions and separate assessments of value, susceptibility and sensitivity are included in this LVIA Addendum for the individual features, elements and characteristics which combine to give the Site and its local surrounds their own landscape character. In turn, the likely magnitude of impact and significance of effect upon each has also been assessed. The results of these separate assessments are listed and described and any changes to the findings of the LVIA identified and described.

2 PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 The LVIA included a review of national planning policy of relevance to landscape and visual effects as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (as amended 2023) and local planning policy as contained within the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Local Plan (2016-2036). It also made brief reference to the Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan (NCNP) 2021.

2.2 The following is a summary of planning policy as contained in the LVIA (paragraph 2.18 to 2.20):

The NPPF sets out overarching aims to ensure development is appropriately located, well designed and sustainable. In summary, policies in the NPPF aim to improve the overall quality of an area, establish a strong sense of place and create an attractive and comfortable location, responding to the local character. National policies seek to conserve, protect and enhance valued landscapes (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in a development plan) and provide protection of scenic areas within nationally designated areas such as AONBs.

The Welwyn Hatfield Borough BC Local Plan (2016-2036) incorporates strategies to preserve local distinctiveness and protect and enhance, where possible, important characteristics of the rural landscape, built environment and visual amenity. It also requires green infrastructure to be incorporated within proposed developments and seeks to enhance the character and biodiversity of the countryside and provide an attractive resource for communities.

At the Parish scale, the draft Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan (2021) has an emerging policy which aims to respect and retain landscape character in new development.

Development of Evidence for Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan: Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (July 2019)

2.3 The LVIA made reference to the WHBC Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study (2016). However, WWA have drawn attention to the presence of the later WHBC Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2019 (Section 4.2, paragraph 1). This study was prepared by LUC on behalf of WHBC. Its aim, “was to undertake a robust and transparent comparative assessment of landscape sensitivity by landscape character area, to inform decision making in relation to site selection as part of the Local Plan review process.” The study provides an assessment of the sensitivity of the landscape within the entirety of the borough to ‘built’ development, although in

paragraph 1.4, the study does make specific reference to the sensitivities of the landscape to 'residential development'.

2.4 Paragraph 2.5 provides further detail and advises that, *"This landscape sensitivity assessment considers the landscape's sensitivity to the principle of 2-3 storey residential development, without knowing the specific size or exact location. It is not an impact assessment and cannot therefore conclude what the exact impacts of a development on the landscape would be."* It uses a series of defined criteria to determine the sensitivity of the landscape to residential development which are, 'Landform', 'Landscape pattern and time depth', 'Natural character', 'Built character', 'Recreational value', 'Perceptual; aspects', 'Settlement setting' and 'Visual prominence'. The term 'susceptibility' is not mentioned in the study although the document makes many references to 'value'.

2.5 The study sub-divides landscape character area 'Northaw Common Parkland' into four sub areas. The Site is within sub area 'LCA 53 away from main settlement edges'. It concludes the following:

"There are some urbanising influences within the area from the c. 20th century housing within Northaw village and the small detached settlement of Northaw Valley, along with the disturbance from large individual houses within estates; albeit these are visually enclosed by woodland. However, the historic parklands and their associated woodlands, the historic and organic field patterns, the distinctive landform pattern, and the historic buildings within the area, results overall in a moderate-high sensitivity to residential development.

There is more enclosure in the northern part of the area from the existing vegetation and the properties along 'The Ridgeway' and from Well Wood, and with some fields lacking in strong hedgerow boundaries, resulting in a moderate sensitivity to residential development.

The southern extents of the area comprises steep south facing slopes which are contained between the M25 to the south and wooded vegetation lining Coopers Lane Road in the north, which restricts intervisibility with the wider LCA. In this area fields are larger, crossed by pylons and generally lack hedgerows. The proximity to the M25 results in aural intrusion, having an impact on the tranquillity, and results in low-moderate sensitivity to residential development."

2.6 The Site, outwith the LWSs/ LNRs, which are noted as 'All Absolute Constraints', is within an area labelled RS1 on page 202 of the document with the land to the immediate south of the Site, inclusive of Northaw Park housing, properties along Hook Lane and elsewhere, Hook House, the Daresar and its car park, are within an area labelled RS1a. Both are assessed as

being of 'Moderate-High' sensitivity to built development, despite the fact that RS1a is already a largely developed landscape.

2.7 The study describes the following measures as ways in which adverse effects upon landscape and visual character due to built development within this sub-area may be minimised:

- *Preserve the rural nature and time-depth of the landscape including the historic parklands of Leggatts Park, Nyn Park and Northaw Park.*
- *Minimise intrusion on the distinctive landform pattern comprising narrow ridgelines and valley bowls.*
- *Maintain the organic and irregular field pattern comprising small-medium scale fields.*
- *Retain and protect the frequent blocks of deciduous woodland and hedgerows along field boundaries and rural lanes.*
- *Maintain the relationship between listed buildings clustered within Northaw village and their surrounding rural landscapes.*
- *Minimise impact on public rights of way including the Hertfordshire Long Distance Footpath.*

3 BASELINE ENVIRONMENT

3.1 The LVIA (Doc No. JSL4303_170) includes a description of the baseline landscape within the Site and the study area, including description of the following:

- Site Context;
- Landform and Drainage Features;
- Land Use and Land Cover;
- Public Rights of Way; and
- Designations.

3.2 It also makes reference to existing landscape character studies. The Site and the study area are within National Character Area (NCA) 111 Northern Thames Basin as described by Natural England and, at a district level, it is within the 'Northaw Common Parkland' landscape character area as defined within the Welwyn and Hatfield Borough Landscape Character Assessment 2005. The LVIA included a description of the Northaw Common Parkland landscape character area.

Baseline Conditions

3.3 In order to provide a clear framework to the assessment within this LVIA Addendum, the following section provides a baseline description of the individual features, elements and characteristics of the Site and its local surrounds that have been taken forward for further assessment. This baseline information contains information, which has largely been extracted from Section 3 of the LVIA, entitled 'Baseline Environment'.

3.4 The Site (as defined by the redline boundary) is continuous, albeit of a somewhat irregular shape. It is connected to Coopers Lane Road via Firs Wood Close.

Individual Trees and Veteran Trees

3.5 Individual and veteran trees are a key and defining characteristic of the Site. Most of these are mature specimen Oak trees, predominantly Pedunculate Oak, but also occasional Sessile Oak, as well as other species. A tree survey has been prepared for the Site (ADAS, 2022). The survey notes that several of these mature specimens are classified as 'Veteran' trees. A number of the larger trees also have fallen limbs or other damage/ die-back.

Woodland and Scrub

- 3.6 The Site contains a mix of developing woodland and scrub. The Site boundaries are generally densely wooded. Woodland along its western boundary comprises semi-mature Oak with occasional mature trees in the canopy. However, there is no understorey and the ground flora is dominated by leaf litter with occasional Common Nettle, Pendulous Sedge and Ground-ivy. Elsewhere, adjacent the pond in the north-east corner of the Site, woodland comprises a canopy of mature Willow with a sparse understorey comprising Willow and Blackthorn occasionally present in dense thickets.

Grasslands (and other herbaceous vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats

- 3.7 Rough and semi improved grasslands, together with other herbaceous vegetation are a characteristic of the more open areas of the Site. The Site also includes an area of amenity grassland with two tennis courts which are located adjacent to the east facing façade of the quadrant of residential properties comprising Northaw Park.
- 3.8 Either side of the Site are existing watercourses which ultimately drain into Northaw Brook. There is also a pond within the north-east corner of the Site which overflows into the Brook.

Derelict Structures/ Fencing

- 3.9 The Site includes sections of concrete post and chain link fencing, amongst other structures. These are the remains of a mix of buildings and structures and other enclosures, which previously catered for the housing and care of dogs. Many of the former structures are still apparent on the Site today, including the extensive paddock fences, the hydrotherapy pool, drainage systems and foundations of former buildings.

Landform

- 3.10 The Site occupies the north-east facing slopes of a valley drained by Northaw Brook. Either side of the Site are existing watercourses which ultimately drain into Northaw Brook. There is also a pond within the north-east corner of the Site which overflows into the Brook.
- 3.11 Landform elevation within the Site is at its highest adjacent to Coopers Lane Road (about 111mAOD). Thereafter, there is a slight fall to about 107mAOD, and then a further fall from about 93mAOD adjacent the tennis courts to about 62mAOD adjacent to the pond in the north-east corner of the Site. An overall drop in elevation of some 49m from the highest to the lowest parts of the Site.

Setting of the Site

3.12 The wider landscape to the north and east is largely managed farmland, interspersed with woodland. It includes land within Northaw Riding Centre, which generally lacks hedgerows and exhibits a field pattern defined by post and tape. Hook Wood is to the west. Parts of the Site are also under 1km from the settlement edge of Potters Bar and the M25 is just over 1km to the south of the Site. The setting to the Site does have an edge of settlement character given the frequent visual references and its close proximity to the existing settlement edge, inclusive of the Daresar and Northaw Park.

Scenic Quality

3.13 Sections of the Site, where fencing and other structures are exposed are of a lower scenic quality, but other parts of the Site are intact and it forms part of a relatively attractive wider wooded river valley drained by Northaw Brook. These areas are of a higher scenic quality.

Perceptual Aspects

3.14 The landscape within the Site has some sense of wildness and a sense of isolation from the surrounding landscape due to the enclosure provided by woodland along much of the Site boundary, this includes the thicket of tree and shrubs which separate much of the Site from the area of amenity grassland adjacent to Northaw Park. It is however, near to the cluster of buildings containing Northaw Park, the Oshwal Centre (including its Daresar), together with other residential properties. These exert some characterising effects upon the perception of the Site and give it an edge of settlement landscape character. It is a settlement edge landscape and not countryside wholly detached from the urban area without visual and perceptual references to the latter. Elsewhere, the Site is managed and there are immediately adjacent areas of active residential development, where car and people movement is frequent.

3.15 The Site is characterised by individual trees, woodland and scrub which impart a sense of enclosure and the perception that this is a small to medium scale landscape. The woodland which is prevalent along the boundaries of the Site and sloping valley sides naturally restrict views from the surrounding landscape, resulting in a relatively low level of intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, certainly from publicly accessible areas.

Landscape Value

3.16 A baseline assessment of the landscape value of the Site using the Landscape Institute TGN-02-21 Table 1, is included in the LVIA (Doc No. (Doc No. JSL4303_170). This also includes an assessment of the value of the wider, rural landscape within the valley drained by Northaw

Brook and the Northaw Common Parkland landscape character area. The purpose of this section of the addendum is to assess the value of the individual landscape characteristics, elements and features of the Site.

Landscape Characteristics, Elements and Features

Individual Trees and Veteran Trees

3.17 The individual and veteran trees within the Site are distinctive features and are important and **High** value landscape elements which contribute markedly to the parkland landscape character of the Site.

Woodland and Scrub

3.18 The woodland and scrub is typical and commonplace as a landscape element, but nonetheless adds a sense of enclosure and is an important landscape characteristic. Much is also secondary woodland which developed following the closure of the former kennels. It is considered to be of **Medium** landscape value.

Grasslands (and other herbaceous vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats

3.19 These landscape elements are typical and commonplace, albeit they are worthy of retention, but are also substitutable. They are considered to be of **Medium** value.

Derelict Structures/ Fencing

3.20 These are features of the Site which remain after the demise of the former kennels. They give the Site some sense of dereliction and dis-use. They are **Low** value landscape elements.

Landform

3.21 The landform of the Site is distinctive in that it forms part of the north facing valley sides and is an integral part of the river valley topography. Landform is a landscape element which is considered to be of **High** value given its contribution to the landscape character of the Site and the river valley drained by Northaw Brook.

Setting of the Site

3.22 The landscape character of the setting to the Site and its landscape condition varies. The setting provided by Hook Wood and the valley sides to the north and east being of a higher value than the developed areas to the south. The woodland and valley sides are important landscape elements, which help define the landscape character within the Site's setting.

Overall, given these variations in landscape condition and character within the setting of the Site, it is considered to be of a **Medium** landscape value.

Scenic Quality

3.23 The Site is assessed as having no more than a **Medium** value for its scenic quality. Sections of the Site, where fencing and other structures are exposed are of a lower scenic quality, but other areas are intact and the Site forms part of a relatively attractive wider wooded river valley drained by Northaw Brook. These areas are of a higher scenic quality.

Perceptual Aspects

3.24 The Site has an edge of settlement character with some sense of dereliction, set within a more naturalistic fringe of woodland and scrub, which provide some sense of enclosure and containment. The small to medium scale of the landscape and its low intervisibility with its local surrounds reflect how the landscape is perceived. The perceptual qualities of the Site and their contribution to local landscape character are assessed as no more than **Medium** value.

Summary of Landscape Value

3.25 A summary of the value of individual landscape characteristics, features and elements is provided in the table below.

Table 1: Value of Landscape Receptors

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Value
Individual and Veteran Trees	High
Woodland and Scrub	Medium
Grassland (and other herbaceous vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats	Medium
Derelict Structures/ Fencing	Low
Landform	High
Setting of the Site	Medium
Scenic Quality	Medium
Perceptual Aspects	Medium

3.26 An assessment of the landscape value of the Site, the wider rural landscape within the valley drained by Northaw Brook and the Northaw Common Parkland landscape character area is

included in the LVIA. All are assessed as being of Medium landscape value.

4 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

Scheme Description

4.1 The Proposed Development is as described in the LVIA (Doc No. JSL4303_170).

5 ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS

Assessment of Operational Effects

Landscape Susceptibility

5.1 The ability of the landscape receptors, including its characteristics, features and elements, to accommodate the type of development proposed without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies is assessed below in accordance with the method and criteria in Appendix A.

Landscape Characteristics, Elements and Features

Individual and Veteran Trees

5.2 Whilst most of the individual trees, together with all of the Veteran trees which make a major contribution to the landscape character of the Site, would be retained. They are assessed as being of High susceptibility to the type of development proposed. They provide the Site with a sense of maturity which would take many years to replace. The susceptibility of both the individual and the veteran trees on the Site to the type of development proposed is assessed as **High**.

Woodland and Scrub

5.3 The woodland and scrub would be largely retained and managed. Most is secondary woodland and is substitutable in a relatively short time. This landscape element is thus assessed as being of **Medium** susceptibility to the type of development proposed.

Grasslands (and other herbaceous vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats

5.4 The semi-improved grassland, scrub and riparian habitats along the periphery of the Site would be maintained and enhanced. They are also replaceable. These distinctive landscape elements are assessed as being of **Medium** susceptibility to the type of development proposed.

Derelict Structures/ Fencing

5.5 These landscape elements within part of the Site would be completely out of place within the context of the type of development proposed. They are not landscape elements which are important to the river valley landscape and are assessed as being of **Low** susceptibility.

Landform

5.6 Landform is an integral component of the valley side landscape setting of the Site. It is assessed as being of **High** susceptibility to the type of development proposed.

Setting of the Site

5.7 The setting of the Site to the south includes Northaw Park and a considerable number of detached residential properties, together with the Daresar and its associated large car park. The Site has an edge of settlement character, which would be extended to the north east and west, albeit Hook Wood would limit the characterising effects of the new edge of settlement provided by the proposed development to the immediate west. The landscape character of the Site setting to the north and east is already partly influenced by existing settlement adjacent the Site. The setting of the Site is assessed as being of **Medium** susceptibility to the type of development proposed.

Scenic Quality

5.8 The type of change proposed would mainly replace a disturbed landscape with some sense of dereliction to a developed landscape containing buildings, set within a relatively mature landscape setting. There would be some considerable change to the baseline scenic quality of the Site. The scenic quality of the Site is assessed as being of **Medium** susceptibility to the type of development proposed.

Perceptual Aspects

5.9 The perceptual aspects of the Site would be altered by the type of development proposed. A developed landscape of new buildings interspersed with mature trees would replace a landscape with some sense of dereliction, and a very limited sense of wildness and tranquillity. These perceptual characteristics being diluted but largely retained within the peripheral areas of the Site. This small to medium scale landscape could absorb the type of development proposed whilst retaining its existing treed and wooded character. The framework of woodland and trees would break up the extent of the proposed development. The woodland which is prevalent along the boundaries of the Site and shallow valley sides restricts views from the surrounding landscape, especially from publicly accessible areas. Overall, the perceptual aspects of the Site and their contribution to its landscape character are assessed as being of **Medium** susceptibility.

Summary of Landscape Susceptibility

5.10 A summary of the susceptibility of the landscape characteristics, features and elements to the type of change proposed is provided in the table below. In terms of planning policy, the Site itself is not within an existing settlement boundary and would compromise some landscape planning policy in the local plan. However, it would incorporate many of the Site’s key landscape elements within the proposed development and, through the positive management of existing habitats within the Site, including its individual and veteran trees, conserve and enhance these features. These aspects of the proposed development would comply with planning policy intended to protect such landscape elements. It is thus considered that the development would both compromise in part, but also complement (in part) the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies for the landscape.

Table 2: Susceptibility of Landscape Receptors

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Susceptibility
Individual and Veteran Trees	High
Woodland and Scrub	Medium
Grassland (and Other Herbaceous Vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats	Medium
Derelict Structures/ Fencing	Low
Landform	High
Setting of the Site	Medium
Scenic Quality	Medium
Perceptual Aspects	Medium

5.11 The landscape susceptibility of most of the landscape receptors included in the assessment is assessed as **Medium**, except for the individual and veteran trees and landform, which are assessed as being of **High** susceptibility and the redundant structures/ fencing and enclosures, which are assessed as being of a **Low** susceptibility.

5.12 The LVIA did not include an assessment of the susceptibility of the Site and the Northaw Common Parkland landscape character area to the type of development proposed.

5.13 It is considered that the landscape of the Site is also of **Medium** susceptibility. There would be some alteration to the overall character and condition of its landscape. However, the overall

integrity of a parkland landscape on the sloping valley sides, enclosed by a fringe of woodland would be maintained. The Site would be partly developed; the condition of which is assessed as being Ordinary, and the proposed development would be set within the local setting of Northaw Park and the Daresar, which are also developed landscapes.

5.14 The landscape character of the Northaw Common Parkland is a settled landscape and the type of development proposed would not be completely out of keeping set within it. It includes large houses and mansions, together with other more isolated areas of development such as Northaw Park and the Daresar and the Northaw Valley development to the east. With the retention of characteristic landscape elements and features within the Site as part of the proposed development, some baseline characteristics of the Northaw Common Parkland landscape character area would be retained and positively managed. It is thus assessed as being of **Medium** susceptibility to the type of development proposed.

Landscape Sensitivity

5.15 Landscape sensitivity is a product of consideration of the value associated with the landscape receptor and its susceptibility to the changes likely to arise from the development proposals. For this addendum, the assessment of sensitivity is based on bringing the separate value and susceptibility assessments together in one combined step, in accordance with the criteria set out in Appendix A and as summarised in the table below.

Table 3: Sensitivity of Landscape Receptors

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity
Individual and Veteran Trees	High	High	High
Woodland and Scrub	Medium	Medium	Medium
Grassland (and Other Herbaceous Vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats	Medium	Medium	Medium
Derelict Structures/ Fencing	Low	Low	Low

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Value	Landscape Susceptibility	Landscape Sensitivity
Landform	High	High	High
Setting of the Site	Medium	Medium	Medium
Scenic Quality	Medium	Medium	Medium
Perceptual Aspects	Medium	Medium	Medium

5.16 For most of the landscape receptors, the combined assessments of value and susceptibility would lead to an overall evaluation of sensitivity as **Medium**. These are landscape elements that are replaceable and reasonably tolerant of the type of change that would result from the proposed development. However, the landscape sensitivity of the individual and veteran trees and landform is assessed as being of **High** sensitivity as both are integral to the parkland landscape of the Site and its valley side landscape setting

5.17 The LVIA includes an assessment of the landscape sensitivity of the Site and the Northaw Common Parkland landscape character area. Both are assessed as being of **Medium** sensitivity to the type of change that would result from the proposed development.

Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect

5.18 The LVIA (Doc No. JSL4303_170) included an assessment of the potential effects of the proposed development upon the following landscape receptors:

- Site Specific Effects;
- Landscape Elements; and
- Northaw Common Parkland and other district level landscape character areas within the study area.

5.19 However, for consistency with the assessment of landscape value, susceptibility and sensitivity in this addendum, separate assessments of magnitude of impact and significance of effect of the proposed development upon each of the landscape characteristics, features and elements are provided in the following section.

Landscape Characteristics, Elements and Features

Individual and Veteran Trees

5.20 New specimen tree planting would replace the few individual trees that would require removal. None of the veteran trees would be removed, albeit there may be some slight incursions into their defined root protection areas. However, this would be avoided wherever practical and possible to do so. It is considered that there would be a net increase in individual trees on the Site and veteran and over mature trees would be positively managed to prolong their longevity. There would be a Small magnitude of impact upon individual and veteran trees and a **Minor adverse** significance of effect upon a landscape receptor of High sensitivity.

Woodland and Scrub

5.21 There would be some loss of existing woodland and scrub as a result of the proposed development. However, this would be replaced with new woodland planting, most notably with the replacement of the existing scrub woodland between the existing residential development of Northaw Park and the Site. Existing woodland scrub on the periphery of the Site would be retained and positively managed to enhance its landscape and nature conservation value and contribution to landscape character. The magnitude of impact would be Medium, which would result in a **Moderate adverse** significance of effect.

Grasslands (and other herbaceous vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats

5.22 There would be some loss of semi-improved grassland at the Site. However, new proposed wildflower grassland would replace the grasslands removed. The existing grasslands, wetlands and riparian habitat within both the Hook Copse LWS and the Woodland south-west of Northaw Brook Pastures LWS would be retained and positively managed to improve their landscape and nature conservation value. The magnitude of impact is assessed as Small and the significance of effect as **Minor adverse** on this landscape receptor of Medium sensitivity.

Derelict Structures and Remnant Fencing

5.23 The redundant features of the Site associated with the former Hook Estate and Kennels would be removed by the proposed development, such as its redundant fences, traces of the swimming pool and other redundant structures. They are assessed as being of Low sensitivity. The resultant magnitude of impact resulting from the removal of these features, which give the Site some sense of dereliction is assessed as Medium and the significance of effect as **Minor beneficial** as their removal would slightly improve the character of the landscape.

Landform

- 5.24 There would be some direct impacts upon the landform of the Site, with a number of development platforms cut into the gently sloping north facing valley sides. However, the use of retaining walls would at least partly mitigate these direct impacts upon landform enabling both existing trees to be retained and the perception of the Site as forming part of the sloping valley sides would remain. Users of the proposed development and the Site would continue to appreciate that the Site still forms part of the river valley landscape drained by Northaw Brook. The scale of the proposed development is considered to fit with this distinctive landscape characteristic thus resulting in a Medium magnitude of impact. Landform is assessed as being of High sensitivity to the type of change resulting from the proposed development. As such, the significance of effect is assessed as Moderate adverse.

Setting of the Site

- 5.25 Whilst the local and wider Site surrounds would not be directly impacted by the proposed development, there would be some perceptual effects upon the appreciation and interpretation of these landscapes. Effectively, the existing local Site surrounds would form a new and revised rural edge of settlement area and would be perceived as such, albeit against a baseline in which existing settlement exerts some locally characterising effects. The wider Site surrounds are assessed as being of Medium sensitivity, with the proposed development assessed as exerting a Small magnitude of impact and an overall **Minor adverse** significance of effect.

Scenic Quality

- 5.26 The type of change proposed would mainly replace a disturbed landscape with some sense of dereliction to a developed landscape containing buildings, set within a relatively mature landscape setting. This mature periphery of the Site, which is of a higher scenic quality to those parts of the Site directly impacted, and which contains woodland, scrub, wetland and riparian landscape elements, would be retained and managed. The existing sense of dereliction would be removed as a result of the proposed development. New buildings interspersed with plantings comprising specimen trees, wildflower grasslands and amenity landscapes, set within a framework of retained woodland and scrub, would partly balance the change from the scenic qualities of a rural landscape with some sense of dereliction to a developed landscape within the local setting of existing development to the south, including Northaw Park and the Daresar. There would be some considerable change to the scenic

quality of the Site, however, the perceived adverse effects of this would at least be partly balanced by the removal of the sense of dereliction from those parts of the Site directly impacted. The magnitude of impact upon the scenic quality of the Site is assessed as **Medium** and the significance of effect upon a landscape receptor of **Medium** susceptibility is considered to be **Moderate adverse**.

Perceptual Aspects

5.27 There would be some considerable change to the perception of the landscape within the Site. This area would become a developed Site with new buildings set within a parkland landscape with areas of both amenity and a more naturalistic landscape character. Any perception of dereliction associated with the Site would be removed. However, this would markedly contrast with the rural, edge of settlement character of the existing Site, albeit with its areas of disturbance and redundant structures which contribute to some sense of dereliction over parts of the Site. These perceptual aspects of the Site and their contribution to its landscape character are assessed as being of **Medium** sensitivity to the type of development proposed. The adverse effects of this change in perception from a rural, edge of settlement site, to that of a developed site would be partly balanced by the removal of any sense of dereliction. The magnitude of impact is assessed as **Medium** and the significance of effect as **Moderate adverse**.

Summary of Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect

5.28 The assessment of magnitude of Impact and significance of effect upon each of the landscape receptors included in the assessment is summarised in the table below.

Table 4: Magnitude of Impact and Significance of Effect

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect
Individual and Veteran Trees	High	Small	Minor adverse
Woodland and Scrub	Medium	Medium	Moderate adverse
Grassland ((and other herbaceous vegetation), Wetlands and Riparian Habitats	Medium	Small	Minor adverse

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect
Derelict Structures/ Fencing	Low	Medium	Minor beneficial
Landform	High	Medium	Moderate adverse
Setting of the Site	Low	Small	Minor adverse
Scenic Quality	Medium	Medium	Moderate adverse
Perceptual Aspects	Medium	Medium	Moderate adverse

5.29 Potential effects upon four of the landscape receptors included in the assessment are assessed as **Moderate adverse**. Other effects are **Minor adverse** or **Minor beneficial**. This corresponds with the assessment of site specific effects as contained within the LVIA itself which are assessed as Medium magnitude of impact and an overall **Moderate adverse** significance of effect. Potential effects upon the larger and more extensive Northaw Common Parkland landscape character area similarly being assessed as Small magnitude of impact and an overall **Minor adverse** significance of effect. Albeit this may also be interpreted as a local **Moderate adverse** significance of effect upon the Northaw Common Parkland which, due to its size and extent, and variations in landscape character, would equate to a **Minor adverse** significance of effect upon the landscape character area as a whole.

5.30 There would be a residual adverse effect upon the landscape of the Site and its local landscape setting. However, the retention of individual trees, most notably the veteran trees and the use of retaining walls to retain as much of the existing landform as possible is considered to be sufficient to retain the sense of a parkland landscape and the sense that the Site continues to form part of the sloping valley sides. These are two features of the Site which make a considerable contribution to its landscape character. Existing detracting landscape elements would be removed and new buildings would be set within a parkland landscape with specimen trees, wildflower meadow enclosed by native woodland. This on an edge of settlement landscape, the character of which is already influenced by existing residential development to the immediate south. including Northaw Park and the Daresar, The Site and its local landscape setting is considered to have the capacity to accommodate the proposed development, with some adverse residual effects upon landscape character.

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Despite having undertaken further assessment in the manner suggested in the WWA report, the conclusions to the assessment are unchanged from those reported in the LVIA (Doc No. JSL4303_170). In our opinion, the Site has the capacity to accommodate a development of the type proposed, with some adverse effects upon the landscape characteristics, features and elements for which it is valued. Whilst we accept that the change from a rural, edge of settlement site, with some sense of dereliction, to a developed site, with retained specimen trees and a new part naturalistic and part amenity landscape may represent a significant change in landscape character, this does not necessarily translate into a significant adverse landscape effect. In our opinion, whilst the proposed development would result in an overall residual adverse landscape effect, these effects should not be regarded as significant adverse effects given the baseline landscape character and condition of the Site and that of its local landscape setting and the nature and degree of landscape change that would result from the proposed development.

7 REFERENCES

Agricultural Development and Advisory Service (ADAS) (June 2022); Tree Survey and Schedule;

Department for Communities and Local Government (July 2021); National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);

Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013); *'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment'* (GLVIA) 3rd Edition;

Landscape Institute (26th May 2021), TGN-02-21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations;

LUC (July 2019): Development of Evidence for Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan: Landscape Sensitivity Assessment;

Natural England (2013); National Character Area Profile 111 Northern Thames Basin;

Northaw and Cuffley Parish Council (September 2021); Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan (Draft);

RPS (July 2022); Landscape Strategy, Drwg No. 100;

Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council (October 2023); Local Plan 2016-2036;

The Landscape Partnership Ltd (2005); Welwyn and Hatfield Borough Landscape Character Assessment;

Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council (2016); Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study.

Wynn-Williams Associates (February 2024): Former Hook Estate and Kennels, Northaw Landscape Review.

Appendix A

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology

APPENDIX A: LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Assessment Methodology

A1.1 The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment considers the potential effects of the development upon:

- Individual landscape features and elements
- Landscape character; and
- Visual amenity and the people who view the landscape.

Distinction between Landscape and Visual Effects

A1.2 In accordance with the '*Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition*' 2013 by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, landscape and visual effects have been assessed separately, although the procedure for assessing each of these is closely linked. A clear distinction has been drawn between landscape and visual effects as described below:

- Landscape effects relate to the effects of the project on the physical and other characteristics of the landscape and its resulting character and quality
- Visual effects relate to the effects on views experienced by visual receptors (e.g. residents, footpath users, tourists etc.) and on the visual amenity experienced by those people

Duration of Landscape and Visual Effects

A1.3 The appraisal assesses the short term effects of the construction phase and the permanent effects relating to the projects operational phase.

A1.4 Consideration has been given to the likely seasonal variations in the visibility of the development in a context including deciduous vegetation.

A1.5 Consideration has been given to changes in the level of effects likely to take place as new planting, proposed as part of the project, and existing planting matures.

Landscape and Visual Assessment Process

A1.6 The assessment of the landscape effects of the project has followed a recognised process set out below:

- Identify the baseline landscape resource (e.g. individual elements and character) and its value
- Identify forces for change in the landscape of the surrounding area;

- Evaluate the sensitivity of the landscape resource and its susceptibility to change as a result of the type of development proposed;
- Identify potential landscape effects of the project through review of initial plans;
- Develop measures to avoid, reduce and ameliorate adverse effects and to maximise the positive benefits of the project;
- Identify scale or magnitude of likely impact of the project;
- Assess the level of effects of the project on the landscape, taking into account the designed in mitigation measures proposed; and
- Report the findings of the assessment.

A1.7 The assessment of visual effects follows a similar recognised process set out below:

- Identify potential visual receptors of the project (i.e. people who will have views of the development);
- Select an appropriate number of representative or sensitive viewpoints to be illustrated through photography and to reflect the full range of different views towards the project;
- Describe the nature of the baseline views towards the project for each representative viewpoint;
- Identify forces for change in the visual amenity of the surrounding area;
- Evaluate the sensitivity of the visual receptors and their susceptibility to change as a result of the project represented by the viewpoints;
- Identify potential visual effects of the project through review of initial plans;
- Develop measures to avoid, reduce and ameliorate adverse effects and to maximise the positive benefits of the project;
- Identify the scale or magnitude of the likely impact of the project;
- Assess the level of effects on the receptors from representative viewpoints, taking into account the visual context of the development and the mitigation measures proposed;
- Assess the level of effects on overall visual amenity; and
- Report the findings of the assessment.

A1.8 The assessment of representative viewpoints has been supplemented by scheduling of specific visual receptors to determine visual effects upon those likely to be affected to the greatest degree.

Assessment Criteria

A1.9 The purpose of the assessment is to evaluate the magnitude of change to landscape and visual resources to enable the likely key effects of the project to be identified.

A1.10 Published guidance states that the level of effects is ascertained by professional judgement based on consideration of the intrinsic sensitivity of the baseline landscape or visual receptor, the receptors susceptibility to the development and the magnitude of change as a result of the project.

Value

A1.11 Landscape value is defined in the glossary of the GLVIA (2013) at paragraph 5.44 as the “*the value of the Landscape Character Type or Areas that may be affected, based on review of any designations at both national and local levels, and, where there are no designations, judgements based on criteria that can be used to establish landscape value*” and “*the value of individual contributors to landscape character, especially the key characteristics, which may include elements of the landscape, particular landscape features, notable aesthetic, perceptual or experiential qualities, and combinations of these contributors.*”

A1.12 The value of certain landscapes has been recognised, e.g. the national designations of National Park (NP). Some landscapes are locally designated, e.g. Special Landscape Area (SLA). The aspects/special qualities of the landscape that led to the designations have been noted, as has the degree to which that aspect is present in the particular area under consideration.

A1.13 Other landscapes are undesignated but, valued locally for specific reasons or specific elements / features. The value of an area of landscape is expressed both through designation and also other criteria, such as tranquillity, remoteness, wildness, scenic beauty, cultural associations and conservation interests. These aspects have been summarised in the main assessment.

A1.14 How that value might be affected by a development is classified on a four point scale (low, medium, high and very high) as set out in Table 1 below. The table can only illustrate general categories, as the effects on an area or element of landscape is specific to the development proposed and that particular aspect affected.

Table 1: Landscape and Value (primarily expressed through designation)

Value	Designation	Example
High	National/Regional/ Local	Very attractive or attractive scenic quality, very good or good landscape condition, limited potential for substitution. E.g. National Park, AONB, SLA or key elements within them.
Medium	Regional/Local	Typical and commonplace or in part unusual scenic quality, good, ordinary or poor landscape condition, potential for substitution, E.g. Locally designated (SLA) or undesignated, but value expressed through literature and cultural associations or through demonstrable use.

Value	Designation	Example
Low	Local	Dull, degraded or damaged scenic quality, poor or very poor landscape condition, can be readily substituted. E.g. Undesignated. Certain individual landscape elements or features may be worthy of conservation or landscape identified would benefit from restoration or enhancement.

Condition

A1.15 The evaluation of condition is based on judgements about the physical state of the landscape resource. It reflects the state of repair of individual features and elements, as indicated by the categories within Table 2 below, or can be applied to the intactness of the resource as a whole outlined by the corresponding descriptions:

Table 2: Landscape Condition

Condition	Example
Very Good	Strong structure; very attractive with distinct features worthy of conservation; strong sense of place; no detracting features.
Good	Recognisable structure; attractive with many features worthy of conservation; occasional detracting features.
Ordinary	Distinguishable structure; common place with limited distinctiveness and features worthy of conservation; some detracting features.
Poor	Weak structure; evidence of degradation; lacks distinctiveness and sense of place; frequent detracting features.
Very Poor	Damaged structure; evidence of severe disturbance or dereliction; no distinctiveness; detracting features dominate.

Susceptibility of Landscape Receptor

A1.16 Susceptibility to change provided in para 5.40 of GLVIA (2013) means the ability of the landscape receptor to accommodate the type of development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies. As stated in GLVIA (2013) paragraph 5.42, *“since landscape effects in LVIA are particular to both the specific landscape in question and the specific nature of the proposed development, the assessment of susceptibility must be tailored to the project. it should not be recorded as part of the landscape baseline but should be recorded as part of the assessment of effects”*.

A1.17 When determining the landscape susceptibility, the following elements were considered:

- The ability of the landscape receptor to accommodate the type of development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the landscape character and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies;
- The degree to which the changes arising from the type of development would alter the overall character, quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area;
- The degree to which the changes arising from the type of development would alter individual elements or features or aesthetic and perceptual aspects important to the landscape character; and
- Existing landscape studies may identify the sensitivity of the landscape type or area or its characteristics to the general type of development that is proposed.

Table 3: Susceptibility of Landscape Receptor

Susceptibility	Landscape Receptor
High	<p>The changes arising from the type of development would alter the overall character, quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area.</p> <p>The changes arising from the type of development would alter or remove individual elements or features or aesthetic and perceptual aspects important to, or add new elements incongruous to, the landscape character.</p> <p>The type of development would compromise the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies for the landscape.</p> <p>The changes arising from the type of development would alter or remove elements or features or aesthetic and perceptual aspects important to the landscape character or add new elements that would reinforce the key characteristics of the landscape character.</p>
Medium	<p>The changes arising from the type of development would result in some alteration to the overall character, quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area.</p> <p>The changes arising from the type of development would result in some alteration or would remove some individual elements or features or aesthetic and perceptual aspects important to, or add some new elements incongruous to, the landscape character.</p> <p>The type of development would partly compromise the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies for the landscape.</p> <p>The changes arising from the type of development would result in some alteration or remove some elements or features or aesthetic and perceptual aspects important to the landscape character or add some new elements that would reinforce the key characteristics of the landscape character.</p>

Susceptibility	Landscape Receptor
Low	<p>The changes arising from the type of development would not alter the overall character, quality/condition of a particular landscape type or area.</p> <p>The changes arising from the type of development would not alter or remove individual elements or features or aesthetic and perceptual aspects important to, or add new elements incongruous to, the landscape character.</p> <p>The changes arising from the type of development would not compromise the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies for the landscape.</p> <p>The changes arising from the type of development would not alter or remove elements or features or aesthetic and perceptual aspects important to the landscape character or add new elements that would reinforce the key characteristics of the landscape character.</p>

Sensitivity of Receptor

A1.18 Landscape sensitivity is a product of consideration of the value associated with the landscape receptor and its susceptibility to the changes likely to arise from the development proposals. For this addendum, the assessment of sensitivity is based on bringing value and susceptibility considerations together in one combined step, in accordance with the criteria set out in the Table below.

Table 4: Sensitivity of Receptor

	Landscape Receptor	Visual Receptor
High	<p>Landscape value recognised by national designation.</p> <p>Sense of tranquility or remoteness specifically noted in Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>High sensitivity to disturbance specifically noted in Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>The qualities for which the landscape is valued are in a good condition, with a clearly apparent distinctive character and absence of detractors.</p> <p>The landscape is susceptible to relatively small changes of the type proposed.</p>	<p>Large number or high sensitivity of viewers assumed. Viewers' attention very likely to be focused on landscape.</p> <p>E.g. Residents experiencing views from dwellings; users of strategic recreational footpaths, rural footpaths and cycleways; people experiencing views from important landscape features of physical, cultural or historic interest, beauty spots and picnic areas.</p>

	Landscape Receptor	Visual Receptor
Medium	<p>Landscape value is recognised or designated locally;</p> <p>The landscape is relatively intact, with a distinctive character and few detractors;</p> <p>The landscape is reasonably susceptible to change of the type proposed.</p>	<p>Viewers' attention may be focused on landscape, such as users of secondary or urban footpaths, and people engaged in outdoor sport or recreation. e.g. horse riding or golf. Occupiers of vehicles in scenic areas or on recognised tourist routes.</p>
Low	<p>Landscape value is low, with no designations; landscape integrity is low, with a poor condition and a degraded character with the presence of detractors such as dereliction.</p> <p>The landscape has the susceptibility to accommodate significant change of the type proposed.</p>	<p>May include people at their place of work, or engaged in similar activities, whose attention may be focused on their work or activity and who may therefore be potentially less susceptible to changes in view. Occupiers of vehicles whose attention may be focused on the road.</p>

Magnitude of Change

A1.19 The magnitude of change affecting landscape or visual receptors depends on the nature, scale and duration of the particular change within the landscape, the location of it and the overall effect on a particular view. This may be very small if the development is at some distance. In a landscape, the magnitude of change will depend on the loss or change in any important feature or characteristic or a change in backdrop to, or outlook from, a landscape that affects its character. The angle of view, duration of view, distance from the development, degree of contrast with the existing characteristics of the view, prominence of the development and the extent of visibility can all influence the magnitude of the change in view. In addition, the general visibility and combination of effects of elevation and topography on openness and degree of obstruction by trees and buildings affect the magnitude of change.

Table 5: Magnitude of Change

	Landscape Impacts	Visual Impacts
Negligible	<p>The effect of change on the perception of the landscape the physical features or the character is barely discernible or there is no change.</p>	<p>The character of the view will not be altered by the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development is at such a distance as to be barely perceptible and may only be visible in clear conditions. May go unnoticed.</p>

	Landscape Impacts	Visual Impacts
Small	<p>Changes to the physical landscape, its character and the Perception of the landscape are slight.</p> <p>Long distance to affected landscape with views toward the character area/type the key characteristic.</p>	<p>Visible, but not prominent. Minor component and no marked effect on view.</p>
Medium	<p>The Proposed Development forms a visible and recognisable feature in the landscape.</p> <p>Proposed Development is within or adjacent to affected character area/type.</p> <p>Scale of development fits with existing features.</p>	<p>Prominent.</p> <p>Has an important, but not defining influence on view; is a key element in the view.</p>
Large	<p>Where there are substantial changes affecting the character of the landscape, or important elements through loss of existing features.</p> <p>Proposed Development within or close to affected landscape.</p> <p>Scale, mass and form of development out of character with existing elements.</p>	<p>Dominant.</p> <p>Has a defining influence on view.</p>

A1.20 The following considerations are relevant when evaluating the magnitude of visual change:

- Distance: the distance between the receptor and the development. Generally, the greater the distance, the lower the magnitude of change;
- Extent: the extent of the proposal which is visible;
- Proportion: the arc of view occupied by the development in proportion to the overall field of view. A panoramic view, where the development takes up a small part of it, will generally be of lower magnitude than a narrow, focussed view, even if the arc of view occupied by the proposal is similar;

- Duration: the duration of the effect. An effect experienced in a single location over an extended period of time is likely to result in a higher magnitude of change than an effect which is of a short duration, such as a view from a road;
- Orientation: the angle of the view in relation to the main receptor orientation, where there is a dominant direction to the vista; and,
- Context: the elements, which in combination provide the setting and context to the proposal.

Level of Effect

A1.21 The level of the landscape and visual effects are assessed through consideration of the sensitivity or susceptibility of the receptor and the magnitude of change. The following table outlines the broad approach adopted to assess the level of effect, together with professional judgement. This may lead some effects falling between two categories.

Table 6 – Level of Effect

Landscape and Visual Sensitivity or Susceptibility	Magnitude of Change			
	Large	Medium	Small	Negligible
High	Substantial	Major or Moderate	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible
Medium	Major or Moderate	Moderate	Minor or Negligible	Negligible
Low	Moderate or Minor	Minor or Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

A1.22 The effect of relevant aspects of the project on the landscape has been described and evaluated against the following criteria, defined as:

- Substantial adverse: Where the proposed changes cannot be mitigated; would be completely uncharacteristic and would substantially damage the integrity of a valued and important landscape.
- Major adverse: Where the proposed changes cannot be fully mitigated; would be uncharacteristic and would damage a valued aspect of the landscape.
- Moderate adverse: Where some elements of the proposed changes would be out of scale or uncharacteristic of an area.
- Minor adverse: Where the proposed changes would be at slight variance with the character of an area.
- Negligible adverse: Where the proposed changes would be barely discernible within the landscape.

- Neutral: Where the proposals would be in keeping with the character of the area and/or would maintain the existing quality or where on balance the proposals would maintain quality (e.g. where on balance the adverse effects of the proposals are off-set by beneficial effects).
- Negligible beneficial: Where the proposed changes would be barely discernible within the landscape.
- Minor beneficial: Where the proposed changes would reflect the existing character and would slightly improve the character and quality of the landscape.
- Moderate beneficial: Where the proposed changes would not only fit in well with the existing character of the surrounding landscape, but would improve the quality of the resource through the removal of detracting features.
- Major beneficial: Where the proposed changes would substantially improve character and quality through the removal of large-scale damage and dereliction and provision of far reaching enhancements.

A1.23 The effect of relevant aspects of the project on views has been described and evaluated as follows:

- Substantial adverse: Where the proposed changes would form the dominant feature, or would be completely uncharacteristic and substantially change the scene in highly valued views
- Major adverse: Where the proposed changes would form a major part of the view, or would be uncharacteristic, and would alter valued views.
- Moderate adverse: Where the proposed changes to views would be prominent, or out of scale or uncharacteristic with the existing view.
- Minor adverse: Where the proposed changes to views would be at slight variance with the existing view.
- Negligible adverse: Where the proposed changes would be barely discernible within the existing view.
- Neutral: Where the project would be imperceptible or would be in keeping with and would maintain the existing views or, where on balance, the proposals would maintain the quality of the views (which may include adverse effects of the proposals which are offset by beneficial effects for the same receptor).
- Negligible beneficial: Where the proposed changes would be barely discernible within the existing view.
- Minor beneficial: Where the proposed changes to the existing view would be in keeping with and would improve the quality of the existing view.
- Moderate beneficial: Where the proposed changes to the existing view would not only be in keeping with but would greatly improve the quality of the scene through the removal of visually detracting features.

- Major beneficial: Where the proposed changes to existing views would substantially improve the character and quality through the removal of large scale damage and dereliction and provision of far reaching enhancements.

A1.24 The level of effects is described as substantial, major, moderate, minor or negligible. Where negligible adverse and beneficial effects occur within the same view or same landscape, the effect can be described as neutral on balance. Further, in those instances where the landscape resource or view would not be impacted, the level of significance is recorded as 'No Effect'. The level of effects varies according to individual circumstances and the baseline situation, for example the presence of landscape designations and/or visual detractors.

A1.25 A conclusion regarding the significance of each effect on a landscape or visual receptor needs to combine separate judgements about the sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of change as a result of the Proposed Development. The GLVIA (2013) states at paragraph 5.55 that a sequential approach can be taken to assessment of significance; *“susceptibility to change and value can be combined into an assessment of sensitivity for each receptor, and size/scale, geographical extent and duration and reversibility can be combined into an assessment of magnitude for each effect. Magnitude and sensitivity can then be combined to assess overall significance”*.

A1.26 In the assessment those levels of effect indicated as being 'substantial' or 'major' may be regarded as significant effects. An accumulation of individual 'moderate' effects, for instance experienced as a sequence during a journey, may also be regarded as significant.